Evaluation of the Building Communities Through Arts and Heritage Program

2015-16 to 2020-21

Table of contents

List of tables

List of acronyms and abbreviations

BCAH	Building Communities through Arts and Heritage
CAPACOA	Canadian Association for the Performing Arts
CAPF	Canada Arts Presentation Fund
CBYB	Community Building and Youth Branch
CCIF	Canadian Cultural Investment Fund
CCP	Celebration and Commemorations Program
CCSF	Canada Cultural Spaces Fund
CED	Citizen Engagement Directorate
CEWS	Canadian Emergency Wage Subsidy
COE	Centre of Expertise
COVID-19	Coronavirus disease 2019
EDIA	Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Accessibility
ESD	Evaluation Services Directorate
ESF	Emergency Support Fund
FAA	*Financial Administration Act*
GBA Plus	Gender-based Analysis Plus
GC	Government of Canada
GCMP	Grants and Contributions Modernization Project
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
Gs&Cs	Grants and contributions
GCIMS	Grants and Contributions Information Management System
2SLGBTQI+	Two-Spirit, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, intersex, plus
MINO	Minister's Office
OLMC	Official Language Minority Community
PCH	Department of Canadian Heritage
PIP	Performance Information Profile
PO	Program Officer
PPE	Personal protective equipment
PRG	Policy Research Group
P/T	Provincial/Territorial
TBS	Treasury Board Secretariat
Ts&Cs	Terms and Conditions

Executive Summary

This document contains the final report of the evaluation of the Building Communities through Arts and Heritage (BCAH) Program. This program increases opportunities for local artists, artisans, heritage performers or specialists to be involved in their community through festivals, events and projects. It also allows local groups to commemorate their local history and heritage. BCAH supports local arts and heritage organizations, local government, band councils.

The evaluation covers the period 2015-16 to 2020-21 and examines the issues of relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency. Data collection and analysis draws upon a document and literature review, administrative and performance data review and key informant interviews.

Relevance

The evaluation finds that BCAH continues to be relevant. A demonstrable need for the Program exists as evidenced by the high level of demand for funding and strong interest by Canadians to engage with local arts and heritage activities. The Program responded to new needs related to the COVID-19 pandemic by providing additional funding and demonstrating flexibility in allowable expenses.

BCAH is aligned with government priorities, and took important steps to address equity, diversity, inclusion, and accessibility (EDIA). The Program allocated resources to Indigenous and 2SLGBTQI+ projects and made some changes to its funding criteria to be more inclusive. There are opportunities to further address EDIA issues moving forward.

Effectiveness

The Program achieved its immediate and intermediate outcomes and contributed to the achievement of its longer-term outcome (many other factors, including other funding programs, also contributed to its achievement). The number of projects supported increased since the previous evaluation, primarily due to more resources being allocated to the Local Festivals component. This increased support led to higher rates of attendance and participation overall. Not surprisingly, the COVID-19 pandemic had a negative impact on opportunities afforded to local artists, artisans and heritage performers, volunteers, and community partners.

The Program delivered ESF funding in a timely manner. The funding was much appreciated by recipients who were able to maintain their activities during a time where they had access to fewer volunteers and community partners were less able to provide financial or in-kind support.

Performance measurement processes are in place for the Program to support reporting and decision-making. However, there are areas for data improvement, including better tracking other sources of recipient financing and funding to priority groups.

Efficiency

The Program's best practices for efficiency include its delivery model for the Local Festivals and Community Anniversaries components. These components are coordinated nationally and delivered regionally, allowing better service to community groups and funding recipients. The Program has also taken steps to streamline operations, such as introducing batch processing for the Local Festivals and Community Anniversaries components, which automated several activities.

There were challenges with efficient delivery of the Program. Its administrative cost ratio continues to be higher than other select PCH programs, a trend that has continued since the previous evaluation. The Program also experienced some difficulties in meeting its service standard for notification of funding decisions, particularly in 2019-20 and 2020-21, with the increased workload due to the additional supplementary and ESF funding for local festivals being the main obstacle. Possible considerations for improving efficiency include multi-year funding agreements, re-examination of funding strategies, and stabilizing operational staffing capacity. However, the evaluation recognizes that the Program faces challenges due, in part, to unstable funding over time which affects longer-term planning and limits the possibility to implement certain alternative funding approaches.

The additional $7 million in supplementary funding introduced in 2019-20 helped the Program to provide more stability to larger organizations with recurring festivals. However, this supplementary funding is scheduled to end on March 31, 2024, which could negatively affect recipient organizations.

Recommendations

The evaluation makes three recommendations related to BCAH's overall design and delivery, EDIA, and performance measurement:

Recommendation 1: The evaluation recommends that the ADM, Community and Identity, in collaboration with the ADM, Official Languages, Heritage and Regions, examine ways to improve the efficiency of the Program.

Recommendation 2: The evaluation recommends that the ADM, Community and Identity, build on existing mechanisms to determine how the Program can further support EDIA priorities and ensure clear tracking of related performance indicators to support decision-making and reporting.

Recommendation 3: The evaluation recommends that the ADM, Community and Identity, build on past efforts and review BCAH's logic model and performance measurement indicators to ensure strategic information is available for planning, decision-making and reporting, while streamlining the effort required by recipients and by program administration.

1. Introduction

This report presents the findings, conclusions and recommendations resulting from an Evaluation of the Building Communities Through Arts and Heritage (BCAH) Program.

The evaluation covers the six-year period from April 1, 2015, to March 31, 2021, and examines targeted issues related to relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency.

The study was undertaken by the Evaluation Services Directorate (ESD) with support from an evaluation consulting firm. It was conducted in accordance with the requirements of the *Financial Administration Act* (FAA), the Treasury Board Policy on Results (2016), commitments made to Treasury Board through several submissions for targeted funding, and the *Canadian Heritage (PCH) Departmental Evaluation Plan 2021-22 to 2025-26*.

2. Program profile

BCAH was launched in 2007-08, in response to the 2007 federal budget, to support local arts and heritage festivals and small capital projects. At the time, the program consisted of two components: Local Arts and Heritage Festivals and Community Historical Anniversaries Programming. In August 2009, the Community Historical Anniversaries Legacy Fund component was added to support larger capital projects that involve the restoration, renovation, or transformation of existing buildings and/or exterior spaces.

2.1. Program activities, objectives and expected outcomes

BCAH supports the engagement of Canadians in their communities through performing and visual arts and in the expression, celebration, and preservation of local heritage by providing funding through grants and contributions (Gs&Cs) to non-profit community organizations, Indigenous governments, and municipal governments. With support of BCAH funding, these groups organize events and activities to address Program objectives. Projects draw on the volunteer efforts of community members.

The following summarizes each of the three BCAH components and their eligibility requirements for applicants seeking G&C funding:

1. The Local Arts and Heritage Festivals (Local Festivals) component provides funding to local groups for recurring festivals that present the work of local artists, artisans, and heritage performers.

2. The Community Historical Anniversaries Programming (Community Anniversaries) component provides funding to local groups for non-recurring local events, with or without a minor capital project. Eligible events and capital projects are those commemorating the 100th anniversary or greater (in increments of 25 years) of a significant local historical event or person.

3. The Community Historical Anniversaries Legacy Fund (Legacy Fund) component provides funding for community-initiated capital projects that restore, renovate, or transform an existing

building or exterior space, such as a statue, community hall, monument, garden, or work of art, intended for community use. Eligible capital projects are those that commemorate the 100th anniversary or greater of a significant local historical event or person, in increments of 25 years.

The program's logic model shown in Table 1 outlines the short, medium, and long-term expected outcomes of BCAH as per the Program Inventory Profile (PIP) approved in 2019.

Table 1: BCAH logic model

Long-Term Outcome	• Citizens across the country are engaged in their communities through local arts and heritage
Medium-Term Outcomes	• Local partners support local arts and heritage in their communities • Local citizens provide volunteer support for local arts and heritage in their communities • Local artists, artisans and/or heritage performers engage in their communities through local arts and heritage • Local citizens are exposed to local arts and heritage in their communities
Short-Term Outcome	• Local organizations carry out local arts and heritage activities in their communities

2.2. Program management and governance

BCAH Program management and governance includes both PCH headquarters as well as the department's five regional offices, consisting of the Atlantic Region, Quebec Region, Ontario Region, Prairies and Northern Region, and Western Region. Table 2 provides an overview of BCAH design and delivery.

The core responsibility for BCAH is with PCH's Community Building and Youth Branch (CBYB) within the Community and Identity Sector at PCH's headquarters in Gatineau, Quebec. The Community Engagement Directorate (CED) of the CBYB is responsible for the direct delivery of the Legacy Fund component as well as overall management of BCAH including:
- managing program budgets;
- maintaining national assessment tools and procedures;
- developing program guidelines and applications forms;
- allocating funding envelopes across the PCH regions;
- leading operational program analysis and reports; and
- coordinating and reporting on performance measurement.

The CED works in close partnership with the department's five regional offices which manage the delivery of the Local Festivals and Community Anniversaries components and are responsible for:

- providing public-facing client service and support, including applications, funding agreements, payments, project monitoring;
- assessing applications and making funding recommendations; and
- collecting performance data.

Funds delegated to the regions are under the authority of the Regional Directors General (RDGs).

Table 2: Key design features of BCAH's components

Program Component	Delivery	Intake Dates	Allocation Method	Funding EligibilityAmounts	Maximum Amount Funded per Project
Local Festivals	Regional	Three intakes: January 31 April 30 September 30*	Funding formula	Up to 100% of eligible project expenses	$200,000
Community Anniversaries	Regional	One intake: January 31 (prior to 2020); April 30 (2020 to present)	Funding formula	Up to 100% of eligible project expenses including up to $25,000 for capital expenses	$200,000
Legacy Fund	Headquarters	Continuous	National Review Committee	Up to 50% of eligible project expenses	$500,000

* The third intake date was changed from September 30 to October 15 in 2021.

2.3. Program resources

Table 3 and 4 shows the planned and actual spending by BCAH over the six-year evaluation period. Spending includes Vote 1, which includes salaries, the employee benefit plan (EBP) and operations and maintenance (O&M), and Vote 5, which is funding through Gs&Cs.

BCAH funded over 4,712 projects for a total of $122 million in funding during the six-year period, 2015-16 to 2020-21. In the first four years, from 2015-16 to 2018-19, the program had a base budget of $17.7 million available for funding recipients. In the fifth year (2019-20), the program began delivering its base budget plus additional resources, as follows:

- an additional $7 million for the Local Festivals component, received via supplementary Vote 5 funding, which was announced in Budget 2019,[1] renewed in the Fall Economic Statement 2020[2], and renewed again in Budget 2021[3]. This additional funding is scheduled to end in 2023-24; and

---

[1] Department of Finance, 2019

[2] Department of Finance, 2020

[3] Department of Finance, 2021

- an additional $4.46 million under the Emergency Support Fund (ESF) which was targeted at Local Festivals recipients.[4]

Table 3: Program financial resources, by Vote, 2015-16 to 2020-21 ($ millions) - Reference Level

Fiscal Year	Vote 1 Salary	Vote 1 EBP	Vote 1 O&M	Vote 5 Grants	Vote 5 Contributions	Total
2015-16	5.2	0.9	0.8	14.4	3.3	24.6
2016-17	4.9	0.9	0.8	14.4	3.3	24.3
2017-18	3.9	0.8	0.7	14.4	3.3	23.1
2018-19	3.9	0.6	0.6	14.4	3.3	22.8
2019-20	3.5	0.5	0.4	14.4	3.3	22.1
2020-21	3.4	0.5	0.6	21.4	3.3	29.1
Totals	**24.8**	**4.2**	**3.9**	**93.4**	**19.8**	**146**

Source: Chief Financial Officer Branch, PCH

[1] The data are the official financial data published by PCH; the Reference Level for Vote 5 does not include the additional $7 million announced in Budget 2019 for FY 2019-20, as this funding was provided midyear, but is included in 2019-20 actual expenditures.

[2] The Reference Level for Vote 5 includes the additional $7 million from Budget 2019 for FY 2020-21. The Reference Level does not include the $4.464 million delivered under the Emergency Support Fund for Cultural, Heritage and Sport Organizations, but the amount is included in the 2020-21 actual expenditures.

---

[4] On May 8, 2020, the Minister of Canadian Heritage announced a new $500 million COVID-19 Emergency Support Fund for Cultural, Heritage and Sport Organizations. Up to $326.8 million would be distributed by Canadian Heritage, of which $198.3 million would be provided to the beneficiaries of arts and culture funding through existing programs. See https://www.canada.ca/en/canadian-heritage/services/funding/information-covid-19/emergency-support-fund.html

Table 4: Program financial resources, by Vote, 2015-16 to 2020-21 ($ millions) - Actual Expenditures

Fiscal Year	Vote 1 Salary	Vote 1 EBP	Vote 1 O&M	Vote 5 Grants	Vote 5 Contributions	Total
2015-16	4.9	0.8	0.4	8.4	8.3	22.8
2016-17	4.5	0.7	0.3	8.9	7.4	21.8
2017-18	4.7	0.6	0.4	9.1	8.0	22.8
2018-19	4.4	0.6	0.4	9.9	7.4	22.7
2019-20	4.1	0.6	0.3	13.9	10.8	29.7
2020-21	4.6	0.7	0.1	16.0	14.0	35.4
Totals	**27.2**	**4.0**	**1.9**	**66.2**	**55.9**	**155.2**

Source: Chief Financial Officer Branch, PCH

[1] The data are the official financial data published by PCH; the Reference Level for Vote 5 does not include the additional $7 million announced in Budget 2019 for FY 2019-20, as this funding was provided midyear, but is included in 2019-20 actual expenditures.

[2] The Reference Level for Vote 5 includes the additional $7 million from Budget 2019 for FY 2020-21. The Reference Level does not include the $4.464 million delivered under the Emergency Support Fund for Cultural, Heritage and Sport Organizations, but the amount is included in the 2020-21 actual expenditures.

3. Approach and methodology

The PCH Evaluation Services Directorate (ESD) led this evaluation in accordance with the requirements of the Treasury Board Secretariat Policy on Results (2016) which stipulates that Gs&Cs programs with actual average annual spending of greater than five million dollars undergo an evaluation every five years. The ESD evaluation team was supported by an evaluation consulting firm in carrying out the data collection, analysis and report writing activities. The evaluation team worked collaboratively with program personnel. Wherever possible, trends in performance indicators related to the program's intended outcomes were analyzed by comparing the findings to those of the previous evaluation that covered the period 2011-12 to 2014-15.

3.1. Scope

The evaluation covered the six-year period 2015-16 to 2020-21. The evaluation issues and questions examined are listed in Table 5. Annex A contains the evaluation matrix, which details the measurement indicators for all questions along with the data collection methods.

Table 5: Evaluation issues and questions

Core Issue	Evaluation questions
Relevance: Ongoing need for the program	1.1. To what extent is BCAH responding to current and changing needs?
Relevance: Alignment with government priorities	1.2. To what extent is BCAH supporting government priorities, including those related to equity and reconciliation?
Effectiveness: Achievement of expected outcomes	2.1. To what extent did BCAH achieve its short, medium, and long-term outcomes? 2.2. a) What were the results from delivery of the Emergency Support Fund (ESF) in 2020-21? 2.2. b) What are the best practices and lessons learned from the delivery of the additional temporary funding?
Efficiency: Demonstration of efficiency	3.1. To what extent was the programming delivered in an efficient manner?

3.2. Calibration

The evaluation study was calibrated to address senior management information needs and to meet project timelines. Scoping meetings were held with program officials and with PCH senior management to determine specific information needs and to refine the evaluation scope. These meetings identified the following core areas of interest:

- Programming reach and achievement of outcomes.
- Needs for programming including demands for funding vs. available resources.
- Client experience with the BCAH programming.
- Early results from the delivery of emergency funding related to COVID-19.

In general, more evaluation resources were devoted on questions related to the achievement of short and medium-term outcomes and on the program's operational efficiency. While the evaluation used a mixed methods approach, it leveraged available program data as much as possible.

3.3. Data collection methods

The methodology involved the design and conduct of a combination of qualitative and quantitative data collection methods and relied on both primary and secondary sources of information. The data collection methods were as follows:

- **Literature review:** A targeted literature review was conducted that focused on such questions and indicators related to the needs for BCAH-type programming in Canada; alignment with Government priorities; diversity and inclusion; and engagement of citizens as volunteers.
- **Document review**: A large volume of programs and Government of Canada documents were reviewed, including program guidelines and application forms; program policy documents; TB submissions; program terms and conditions; and minutes of meetings of BCAH Program managers.
- **Review of administrative, financial and performance data:** The evaluation reviewed data contained in PCH and BCAH administrative, financial and performance information databases.
- **Review of project files**: A sample of twenty projects funded through BCAH in both 2019-20 and 2020-21 were analyzed for evidence of results stemming from the delivery of the additional temporary Emergency Support Fund (ESF) in 2020-21.
- **Key Informant interviews:** Interviews (n=31) were conducted with program managers at PCH headquarters and in the regional offices (8); a sample of funding recipients (13) and non-funded applicants (5) from across the three program components; a selection of experts in community engagement (3); and a sample of municipalities (2).[5]
- **Comparative analysis:** Acknowledging key differences in design and delivery, the evaluation compared certain program elements with three other PCH programs: the Canada Arts Presentation Fund (CAPF), the Celebration and Commemoration Program (CCP) and the Canada Cultural Spaces Fund (CCSF). The analysis examined the extent of complementarity among the programming and identified best practices and lessons learned related to delivery as well as mechanisms to support equity and diversity. Information was gathered through a document review and interviews with program managers.

3.4. Timeline and quality assurance

This evaluation was required under the TB Policy on Results and the FAA with a deadline of October 2021 to meet the five-year requirement. Due to delays caused by COVID-19, PCH was not able to respect

---

[5] The report uses the following rating scale to report the frequency of responses provided by key informants:

All/almost all – findings reflect 90% or more of the responses; Large majority/most – findings reflect 75% but less than 90% of the responses; Majority - findings reflect at least 51% but less than 75% of the responses; Half – findings reflect 50% of the responses; Some - findings reflect at least 25% but less than 50% of the responses; and A few - findings reflect less than 25% of the responses.

the FAA date. The Departmental Evaluation Plan 2022-23 to 2026-27 states that this evaluation would be completed by November 2022.[6]

The following quality assurance measures were implemented:

- Multiple sources of primary and secondary data were used to ensure that the findings are reliable and defensible.
- Interviews with key informants were digitally recorded (with their permission) to ensure accurate interview summaries could be prepared.
- A systematic approach to the synthesis of evidence on each evaluation question was used. A triangulation workshop was held where the evaluators discussed and challenged the preliminary evaluation findings.

---

[6] The report uses the following rating scale to report the frequency of responses of key informants interviewed:

Virtually/almost all – findings reflect 90% or more of the responses; Large majority/most – findings reflect 75% but less than 90% of the responses; Majority - findings reflect at least 51% but less than 75% of the responses; Some - findings reflect at least 25% but less than 50% of the responses; and A few - findings reflect less than 25% of the responses.

3.5. Constraints, limits, and mitigation strategies

Table 6 outlines the main challenges faced by this evaluation and corresponding mitigation strategies.

Table 6: Limitations and mitigation strategies

Limitation	Mitigation Strategy
There have been changes in the programming context and program delivery caused by the COVID-19 pandemic that began in March 2020.	The evaluation examined changes in context caused by the pandemic, in data collection, analysis and reporting. The evaluation also assessed the impacts of funding provided to local festivals by the Government's Emergency Support Fund (ESF) in 2020-21.
The ability of the ESD and the program to respect timelines outlined in the TBS Policy on Results and the FAA was compromised due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which also affected resourcing and availability of key informants.	Delays were negotiated with program officials. Internal approval for delays was provided through the Departmental five-year Evaluation Plans in both 2021-22 and 2022-23. The evaluation project was calibrated to focus on the most important information needs identified in planning. It leveraged existing data, while supplementing with new data collection, as necessary.
As per most government programs, the achievement of the longer-term outcome is difficult to attribute solely to BCAH, given the contribution of other funding programs and factors.	The evaluation can acknowledge that the program has contributed to the achievement of the longer-term outcome. Data from the Arts and Heritage Access and Availability Survey, a national survey conducted every five years, were utilized to measure the generalized level of engagement of Canadians.
Interview bias could occur due to perception and response subjectivity of interviewees denoting only the positive.	The evaluation interviewed a broad cross-section of key informants, allowing a diversity of opinions to be gathered. External key informants included both funding recipients and non-funded applicants. Interviewees' perceptions were triangulated with other lines of evidence to ensure validity.
Online surveys of program applicants and recipients were not undertaken to limit the burden on organizations during the pandemic.	The evaluation team conducted key informant interviews with selected non-funded applicants and funding recipients.

4. Findings

4.1. Relevance

This section examines the continued relevance of BCAH, including its responsiveness to the needs of Canadians, its alignment with government priorities, and the extent of complementarity with other PCH programming.

4.1.1. Relevance: ongoing need for the program

Evaluation question:
To what extent is BCAH responding to current and changing needs?

Key findings:

- BCAH is responding to current and changing needs to a large extent. There is high demand for funding and strong interest by Canadians to engage with arts and heritage activities and to have opportunities to volunteer. Of the three program components, the greatest funding demand is for the Local Festivals component.
- In response to government priorities on equity, diversity and reconciliation, the Program made changes to better address the needs of certain equity communities, including Indigenous peoples and the 2SLGBTQI+ community. The evaluation notes opportunities for further attention to these priorities moving forward.
- BCAH responded to changing needs resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic by delivering supplementary funding to support arts and heritage organizations across Canada which were negatively affected by shutdowns.
- BCAH complements rather than duplicates other PCH programs and programs offered by the provinces, territories, and municipalities.

Canadians support federal government investments in arts and heritage

There is evidence that most Canadians support public investment in arts and heritage. The *Arts and Heritage Access and Availability Survey 2020-2021*[7] found that over 90% of Canadians want to engage with arts and heritage, which is consistent with the findings from the 2017 survey. The findings on the value of arts and culture for society represent all regions and most segments of the population.

According to the survey, 85% of Canadians believe governments should place either a great deal (31%) or a moderate amount (55%) of importance on supporting arts and culture. Furthermore, 88-94% of Canadians believe that the federal government should invest in:

- helping to preserve and protect Canadian heritage;

---

[7] Department of Canadian Heritage and Canada Council for the Arts, 2021

- providing support for the arts and culture;
- promoting awareness of events and activities, ensuring that attendance is affordable; and
- ensuring that there are enough facilities to serve the public.

Canadians from equity communities attach special importance to government support for arts and culture. According to the survey, these Canadians were more likely to be engaged with arts and culture in their communities and were more likely than their counterparts to say governments in Canada should place a great deal of importance on supporting arts and culture. Persons with disabilities, Indigenous and racialized respondents were more likely than others to report undertaking activities in support of the arts and cultural organizations.

The objectives of BCAH continue to be relevant to Canadians

There is evidence that Canadians support the importance of BCAH's objectives and approaches. Over 90% of Canadians surveyed through the *Arts and Heritage Access and Availability Survey 2020-2021*[8] agree that arts experiences are a valuable way of bringing together people from different languages and cultural traditions, and that arts and cultural activities in a community make it a better place to live. These findings are consistent with those of the two previous surveys, in 2017 and 2012.

Members of equity communities generally attend arts and cultural events at least as much as, and in some cases more than, Canadians at large. Respondents who identified as 2SLGBTQI+ were more likely than other Canadians to have attended arts events both pre- and during the pandemic and to agree strongly that they have felt connected to their communities through the arts during the pandemic. Indigenous respondents were more likely to report attending Indigenous arts events.

Canadians also continue to place a high importance on volunteering. According to Statistics Canada, about a third of the population, 12.7 million Canadians, aged 15 and over volunteered their time through organizations and groups in 2018[9]. Using Statistics Canada data, the Conference Board of Canada estimated that the number of volunteer hours contributed in 2017 was equivalent to about 1.1 million full-time jobs, almost as many as exist in the educational services sector.[10] The Conference Board also reported that volunteers seek to make a positive contribution to their communities, and that it is an excellent way for immigrants to integrate into Canadian society.

There is strong demand for BCAH funding

There is strong demand for BCAH funding, with close to 1,000 organizations seeking funding each year. Demand for the Local Festivals component of BCAH, as measured by the number of applications received for project funding, remained relatively steady over most of the evaluation period, with about

---

[8] Ibid.

[9] Statistics Canada, 2020

[10] Conference Board of Canada, 2018

900 organizations seeking support each year (Table B-2). However, and not surprisingly, there was a decline in the number of applications in 2020-21 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

In terms of the dollar volume of demand, the total amount requested increased from $47.8 million in 2015-16 to $64.5 million in 2020-21 (Table B-3). Demand increased the most for the Local Festivals component, from $37.9 million in 2015-16 to $54.3 million in 2020-21. Demand for the Legacy Fund increased from $4.1 million in 2015-16 to $7.1 million in 2019-20, and then decreased to $4.7 million in 2020-21 due to the pandemic.

There is a trend towards fewer applications for funding to the Community Anniversaries and Legacy Fund components, which was also observed by the previous evaluation.[11] PCH key informants noted several factors related to Community Anniversaries, including changes to a single application intake in 2014-15 and in 2019-20. Some suggested that there could be opportunities to improve program awareness. However, key informants also noted that it may be reasonable to assume that demand could increase over the next few years. A review of Canadian municipality incorporation dates shows that many communities in Western Canada will be arriving at their centennial anniversaries.

The reasons for the decline in Legacy fund applications are also not clear. Its application guidelines may be a factor. Some funding recipients reported that the requirements for this component are restrictive regarding the lack of eligibility of costs for marketing and promotion and the specific 25-year increments for anniversary dates prescribed. A few key informants noted that the application process is more onerous than other programs that fund similar activities.

For the Local Festivals component, demand is expected to continue its increase, especially due to tourism trends as the arts and heritage sector emerges from the pandemic. The literature review suggests that travellers are increasingly forming an aspirational view of travel – pursuing personal growth and enrichment. They are defined as "high value travellers," who seek cultural experiences, Indigenous tourism experiences, and ways to engage more deeply with the places they visit. These types of travellers represent a key opportunity for festivals, live performances, and events organizers. In addition, a trend towards business travel combining leisure activities had been observed pre-COVID and is expected to emerge post-pandemic.

Research shows that tourism will continue at the hyperlocal level. During the pandemic, there was a trend towards hyperlocal tourism, meaning visitors are from the community, as opposed to tourists who come from away.[12] This can create innovative opportunities for local festivals focussed on local

---

[11] Further analysis on declining applications and projects for these components is included in other sections of this report.

[12] Clare Daitch, *Performing Arts, Tourism and the Experience Economy: The Untapped Potential,* blog post, APACO, January 2021.

audiences. Some BCAH funding recipients, however, noted the issue of the lack of predictable funding for recurring festivals, impacting negatively on their ability to plan their events.

BCAH funding is essential to support local arts and heritage events and activities

According to BCAH funding recipients, funding from the program is essential to support local arts and heritage and leverage other funding. Overall, BCAH funding covered between 14% to 21% of all project expenses from 2015-16 to 2020-21. These figures were 13% to 20% for Local Festivals, 20% to 35% for Community Anniversaries, and 36% to 42% for Legacy Fund projects (Table B-10). While most events would take place in the absence of BCAH funding, informants stated that they likely would be scaled back. Several BCAH funding recipients indicated that this funding is very important, as federal support enables local organizers to leverage funding from local municipalities and other sources.

BCAH does not duplicate other programs

A comparative analysis of BCAH with three other PCH programs concluded that BCAH does not duplicate, but rather is complementary to other initiatives. The analysis examined these three programs:

- Celebration and Commemoration Program (CCP)
- Canada Arts Presentation Fund (CAPF)
- Canada Cultural Spaces Fund (CCSF)

While BCAH and the three programs provide support for arts, heritage and cultural activities, the key defining characteristics of BCAH are its focus on local communities, citizen engagement at the community level, and local community-building. CAPF and CCSF are focussed on providing opportunities to Canadians to experience professional arts in Canada, and CCP has a focus on promoting attachment to Canada for projects with a national reach. BCAH also has the mandate to fund all eligible applicants, which avoids barriers for organizations with less capacity or access to other resources. By funding all eligible projects, BCAH increases access to funding a diversity of applicants, including smaller, new, or less experienced organizations.

Some projects may benefit from funding from a combination of these programs, though only within a narrow set of parameters. Projects must be separate and distinct, with separate applications demonstrating the project meets the distinct eligibility criteria of each program. Funding from BCAH and CAPF may not be received in the same fiscal year.

Furthermore, BCAH appears to complement rather than duplicate programs offered by the provinces and territories or by municipal governments. Because BCAH funds only a portion of the total costs of a project, proponents tend to search out other funding sources. For example, the Local Festivals component does not fund certain expenses, such as fireworks, alcohol permits, and security services. BCAH recipients may pursue funding from municipalities for such expenses. In the case of the Legacy Fund, some proponents access funding from provincial programs, such as the Trillium Foundation in

Ontario which provides capital grants (to a maximum of $150,000)[13], or a program offered by the Quebec Government that funds the restoration of religious heritage.[14]

BCAH adapted to new needs that emerged due to the global pandemic

BCAH responded to the changing needs of recipients resulting from the pandemic. In particular, the program demonstrated flexibility in providing recipients with opportunities to adapt their projects to new realities including the need for virtual events and introducing new eligible costs associated with changing health measures. BCAH's Terms and Conditions were modified to permit funding to cover a broader range of expenses related to pandemic-related costs for health and safety, digital and security expenses. This funding enabled recipients to honour expenses in the absence or loss of other revenues.

4.1.2. Relevance: harmonization with government priorities and PCH core responsibilities

Evaluation question:
To what extent is BCAH supporting government priorities, including those related to equity and reconciliation?
Key findings: • BCAH is aligned with government priorities and supports the Department's strategic outcomes for arts and heritage, specifically citizen engagement. • While the Program took good measures to address priorities associated with equity, diversity, inclusion, and accessibility (EDIA), there are further opportunities to address the needs of equity communities.

BCAH supports Departmental strategic outcomes for arts and heritage

PCH and its portfolio organizations play a vital role in the cultural, civic, and economic life of Canadians. Policies and programs promote an environment where Canadians can experience dynamic cultural expressions, celebrate Canada's history and heritage, and build strong communities.

BCAH supports the Departments' core responsibility 2: Heritage and Celebration and the expected result that *"Canadians across the country are engaged in their communities through local arts and heritage."* BCAH offers opportunities for Canadians to participate in celebrations and commemorations of national significance, and in local festivals and heritage events. BCAH encourages citizens across the country to connect with one another and engage in their local communities through performing and visual arts, as well as through the expression, celebration, and preservation of local historical heritage.

---

[13] https://www.otf.ca/our-grants/community-investments-grants/capital-grant
[14] https://www.patrimoine-religieux.qc.ca/en/financial-assistance

The program is aligned with key government priorities

There is evidence that BCAH has supported, to some extent, federal government priorities on equity, diversity, and reconciliation. Its support of priorities related to accessibility and greening are less clear[15]. All of these have been priorities of the Government for some time, but focus has intensified in recent years. Recently, it is interesting to note that Budget 2022 introduced new measures "to promote a more equitable, more inclusive Canada, and to build communities where everyone is empowered to succeed." In addition to legislation, such as the *Accessible Canada Act 2019,* the Government established:

- the 2SLGBTQI+ Secretariat and Canada's first 2SLGBTQI+ action plan;
- the Federal Anti-Racism Secretariat and Canada's Anti-Racism Strategy; and
- the Youth Secretariat and Canada's Youth Policy.

In 2019, Environment and Climate Change Canada published *A Federal Sustainable Development Strategy for Canada 2019 to 2022.*

The following are examples of changes to the Program to better address equity, diversity, and reconciliation over the period of the evaluation:

- Budget 2019 enabled the Program to provide more than $2 million in funding to 2SLGBTQI+ groups and to allocate resources to Indigenous cultural events in 2019-20 and 2020-21.
- The Local Festivals guidelines were revised to make Indigenous cultural events eligible for funding, which has resulted in increased demand from Indigenous groups.
- The Program increased its outreach to 2SLGBTQI+ communities to raise awareness of their eligibility to the Local Festivals component, which resulted in a growth in the number of funded Local Festivals projects from these groups.
- In 2018-19, BCAH conducted broad outreach to more than 300 groups organizing Indigenous cultural celebrations contributing to an increased number of these funded events in the years that followed.
- In the fall of 2020, the Program introduced a special intake of the Community Anniversaries component, to allow for applications to commemorate the anniversaries of the Numbered Treaties. These initiatives resulted in increased support to Indigenous applicants.
- Since 2017-18, the Legacy Fund recognizes as an eligible expense the cost of translation into Indigenous languages of historical information intended for the public included on any interpretive panel, plaque, permanent exhibit, etc. Where applicable, a clause to this effect is included in the contribution agreement to encourage recipients to translate their texts into Indigenous language(s).

---

[15] However, for Local Festivals, municipal governments are focused on sustainable development issues; some key informants commented that their festivals take actions to be green.

- In 2020-21, numbered treaty commemoration projects were also funded though the Legacy Fund. Staff worked closely with clients on their applications and provided additional support as needed.

Given the importance of these priorities now and in the future, there are opportunities to build on BCAH's efforts. For example, BCAH's support for priority groups is not systematically tracked, and assessing the program's performance with respect to EDIA is perceived as a challenge.

The comparative analysis of the CCP, CCSF, and CAPF identified initiatives and approaches which could serve as inspiration for BCAH as it moves forward to deepen its alignment with the Government's priorities for EDIA and further reduce the barriers faced by equity communities in obtaining access to funding:

- Application forms that require applicants to identify themselves for the purpose of identifying and ensuring sufficient funds to support EDIA activities. (CCP)
- De-colonized, flexible eligibility requirements intended to overcome barriers to entry. (CCSF)
- Targeted resources and higher funding caps directed to EDIA applicants with the goal of building their capacity and ensuring access. (CAPF)
- Simplified application procedures, including oral applications for projects run by EDIA applicants or significantly serving EDIA communities. (CAPF)
- Creation of an Equitable Funding Advisory Group to advise on initiatives. (CAPF)
- Tracking of funding to EDIA applicants, enabling prioritization. (CAPF)

Finally, there is evidence that BCAH funded projects to support the government's priorities with respect to environmental sustainability. Restoration and reuse of heritage buildings are in itself a recognized sustainable environmental practice. Key informants explained that funded projects are putting in place measures to be more sustainable, often with guidance or assistance of municipal governments. In the future, there may be opportunities for the Program to align with the Department's sustainable development strategy: *2020 to 2023 Departmental Sustainable Development Strategy,* Canadian Heritage, 2020.

4.2. Effectiveness: Achievement of intended outcomes

This section describes the extent to which BCAH achieved its various intended outcomes, identifies the factors that facilitated or inhibited their achievement, and assess the extent it has available and uses performance information. It also outlines the results stemming from the delivery of the Emergency Support Fund in 2020-21.

Evaluation questions:

a) **To what extent did BCAH achieve its short, medium, and long-term outcomes?**
b) **What were the results from the delivery of the Emergency Support Fund (ESF) in 2020-21?**
c) **What are the best practices and lessons learned from the delivery of the additional temporary funding?**

Key findings:

- Overall, the Program achieved its immediate and intermediate outcomes, supporting non-profit community organizations, Indigenous and municipal governments to plan and organize arts and heritage events and projects in their communities across Canada. Projects exposed a large number of local attendees and visitors to arts and heritage. They provided opportunities for local artists/artisans/heritage performers and local volunteers and attracted local partners.

- BCAH contributed to the achievement of its longer-term outcome related to citizen engagement in their communities through arts and heritage. It is not possible to attribute the trends in this outcome solely to BCAH because of the influence of other funding programs and other factors. Facilitators to the achievement of expected outcomes include changes to the programming to improve its reach to equity communities such as Indigenous peoples and members of the 2SLGBTQI+ communities.

- However, there were also some barriers and gaps, particularly related to the availability of some select data for strategic planning and decision-making, including information that would support a better understanding of funding provided to priority groups and other sources of project funding, beyond BCAH.

- The $4.46 million in ESF funding provided to local festivals in 2020-21 helped organizations to adapt to rapidly changing conditions due to the COVID-19 pandemic. For example, the extra funding helped organizations to offset the decline in cash contributions from municipalities and community partners. Many organizations were able to pivot events to a hybrid model of virtual and in-person activities, enabling them to maintain programming using local artists, artisans, and heritage performers.

- While the pandemic limited attendance at in-person performances, total attendance increased, driven by virtual visits. Not surprisingly, volunteer involvement declined substantially.

- Funding recipients appreciated the rapid delivery of the ESF and there were several positive and best practices identified from the delivery of the temporary funding. They include a streamlined application process and modifications to BCAH's Ts&Cs to permit funding to cover new pandemic-related costs.

4.2.1. Support for planning and organizing arts and heritage events

BCAH achieved its short-term outcome of providing support to non-profit community organizations, Indigenous groups, and municipal governments to plan and organize arts and heritage events and projects in their communities. During the 6-year evaluation period 2015-16 to 2020-21, the Program funded a total of 4,712 projects. These included 170 community anniversaries, 110 legacy projects and 4,432 local festivals (Annex B, Table B-1).

BCAH was responsive, funding 81% of the total number of applications. Over the evaluation period, 82% of the number of Local Festivals applications and 78% of Community Anniversary applications were funded. Of applications to the Legacy Fund, 63% were funded. These funding rates are slightly lower than those noted by the previous evaluation, which found that 90% of eligible Local Festivals and Community Anniversaries were approved for funding, while 70% of Legacy Fund applicants received funding.

On average, the 785 projects funded each year was lower than the 834 projects that were funded each year on average in the period covered by the previous evaluation (2011-12 to 2014-15). The pandemic had an impact on the average number of projects funded, due to lower demand in 2020-21. Had demand been maintained at historical levels, the average number of funded projects would have been only slightly lower than in the previous evaluation, at an estimated 809 projects per year.

The number of funded Community Anniversary and Legacy Fund projects declined slightly during the period covered by the present evaluation, from 59 funded projects in 2015-16 to 54 funded projects in 2020-21 (Annex B, Table B-5). The average number of Community Anniversary and Legacy Fund projects funded each year was also lower than the annual average the number of funded projects through these program components in the period covered by the previous evaluation; 47 Community Anniversary and Legacy Fund projects on average were funded each year, which is less than half the number funded during the period covered by the previous evaluation (106 per year).

In 2019-20, Community Anniversaries moved its single application deadline from January to April, to better align with client planning timelines.[16] Given the April deadline is for events occurring in the following calendar year, some evidence suggests that this timing still may be too far in advance. PCH key informants commented that the regional offices sometimes receive enquiries from potential applicants after the deadline has passed. Some suggested that an option may be to permit continuous intake, the approach used by the Commemorate Canada program, for example.

One of the challenges faced by the Program in administering the Legacy Fund is the complexity of projects, such that applications and corresponding commitments are being carried forward from one fiscal year to the next, reducing the funding available for new applications. Legacy Fund commitments

---

[16] With this change, few applications were received in 2019-20, as the application deadline was effectively shifted into the next fiscal year.

carried forward to the next fiscal year have been increasing, accounting for 50% of available funds committed at the start of 2018-19 to 85% of funds committed at the start of 2020-21. According to the Program, projects that span multiple years cause the number of active Legacy Fund files to grow each year. Some funding recipients reported that the requirements for this component are restrictive related to support for marketing and promotion and the specific increments for anniversary dates prescribed. A few of them noted that the application process is more onerous than other programs that fund similar activities.

The number of communities in which projects are based has fallen since the period covered by the previous evaluation, ranging from 526 to 619 communities per year from 2011-12 to 2014-15, to a range of 434 to 471 per year during the period covered by the present evaluation (Annex B, Table B-9). In all, 395 permanent and accessible spaces were supported, which serve as reminders of local anniversaries (Annex B, Table B-18). The number of these spaces has declined since the previous evaluation, which may be related to the decreased demand for funding through the Community Anniversaries component. The program noted that a given project may include multiple tangible reminders and that data is self-reported by recipients.

The fewer number of communities in which projects took place may in part be related to a shift in the intake deadline that occurred in 2019-20, to better align with the planning needs of applicants. This effectively shifted the application deadline to the following fiscal year. There were 10 applications for community anniversaries received in 2019-20 (received before the shift to the later deadline) and 35 applications received in 2020-21 (Annex B, Table B-2). Key informants suggested that there are opportunities to improve awareness of the funding opportunities offered through the Community Anniversary and Legacy Fund components among municipalities and communities.

4.2.2. Opportunities for the public, local artists, volunteers and local partners

The Program achieved its medium-term outcome as funded projects provided opportunities for:

- the public to attend or visit local arts and heritage activities;
- local artists, artisans, and heritage performers to participate in local arts and heritage and volunteers to engage with local arts and heritage; and
- leveraging support from community partners.

Annual attendance was higher than reported in the previous evaluation period. Overall, average annual attendance at funded events and projects were estimated to be 21.6 million from 2018-19 to 2020-21[17], an increase from 19.0 million on average reported in the previous evaluation (Annex B, Table B-20).

On average annually, an estimated 192,000 performers and volunteers were engaged in their communities through BCAH funding (Annex B, Table B-20). Average per-project participation rates were

---

[17] Due to the program's reporting cycle, 2020-21 data from recipients for medium term performance indicators was not available for review by the Evaluation Services Directorate (ESD).

relatively consistent from year-to-year and were comparable to rates reported in the previous evaluation. In 2019-20, the number of visitors/attendees per project increased greatly, which may be attributed to the higher number of online events due to the pandemic (Annex B, Table B-22).

BCAH projects involved many local partners. Funded projects attracted an average of 29,539 local partners each year, an increase since the previous evaluation, which reported between 16,947 and 21,253 local partners annually. Individual projects attracted an average of 31 to 34 partners, which is consistent with the findings of the previous evaluation (Annex B, Table B-14).

Local partners contributed an average of $651,236 in cash and in-kind contributions annually to funded projects. The average cash contribution made by local partners increased from $47,024 to $75,052 over the period covered by the evaluation, while the average value of in-kind contributions increased from $59,141 to $72,055 (Annex B, Table B-14). This is higher than the figure reported by the previous evaluation, which found that $44,434 on average in cash and in-kind support was provided by community partners. These increases may be explained by the Program funding more larger events.

As noted earlier, BCAH Program funding contributed between 14% and 20% of project budgets in the years covered by the evaluation (Annex B, Table B-10). The evaluation was not able to access data on other sources of funding to support a more nuanced analysis of the importance of BCAH funding. For example, it was not possible to examine the importance of the funding for larger versus smaller events, for clients based in different regions of the country where access to regional funding may vary, or to priority groups who may face unique challenges in accessing funding.

4.2.3. Citizen engagement through local arts and heritage

BCAH is contributing to the achievement of its long-term outcome to increase citizen engagement in local arts and heritage. It is not possible to attribute the achievement of this longer-term outcome solely to BCAH, given the influence of other funding programs and other factors. As reported under the discussion of the intermediate outcomes, there was an annual average of 21.6 million visitors and attendees at BCAH funded events – a total estimated reach of almost 129.5 million people (Annex B, Table B-20).

Over the evaluation period, Canadians engaged with their communities by volunteering in local arts and heritage activities. From 2015-16 to 2020-21[18]:

- an estimated 887,283 Canadians volunteered their time in local arts and heritage activities[19];
- funded projects averaged 172 volunteers, each contributing 7 hours of their time; and
- the number of volunteer hours donated per project ranged from 3,504 hours in 2016-17 to 5,493 hours per project in 2020-21 (Table B-15). A similar range was reported by the previous

---

[18] Due to the program's reporting cycle, 2020-21 data from recipients for medium term performance indicators was not available for review by the Evaluation Services Directorate (ESD).

[19] There is some double counting in these numbers as some volunteers may participate over multiple year.

evaluation, with a high of 5,519 volunteer hours on average per project in 2014-15.

Research has shown that those who participate in an event, either as a volunteer or as an attendee, tend to have a greater connection to their communities.[20] Some funding recipients interviewed noted the lasting impact of BCAH in providing opportunities for citizens to be engaged in their communities through arts and heritage.

According to the annual *Arts and Heritage Access and Availability Survey*[21], 51% of Canadians are engaged in their communities through local arts and heritage events and projects (Annex B, Table B-19). Arts participation builds connection between people and engagement with their communities. Canadians who rate arts, culture and leisure in their city or town as 'excellent' are more likely to report a 'very strong' sense of belonging to their city or town. Engagement with arts and culture by senior adults provides increased opportunities for social interaction and developed a sense of belonging and/or inclusion. For their part, festivals contribute to a sense of community belonging and are often staged for broad social goals, including engaging the community, breaking down entry barriers, and increasing tolerance and acceptance of diversity.

4.2.4. Facilitators and barriers to the achievement of outcomes

The evaluation identified several facilitators to the achievement of expected results. For example:

- While applications to the Local Festivals component have always been assessed for sufficient arts and heritage content, a threshold of at least 50% arts and heritage content was introduced to provide clarity on this point to applicants and staff. This resulted in clear communication of expectations to facilitate the achievement of expected outcomes and reduced the number of funded festivals that had a greater number of ineligible activities related to, for example, agriculture, military, sport, or film.
- Budget 2019 provided additional resources to the Program that enabled it to increase uptake and funding to Indigenous cultural events and 2SLGBTQI+ groups in 2019–20 and 2020–21.
- The Local Festivals guidelines were revised to make Indigenous cultural events eligible for funding, which led to increased demand from Indigenous groups. This revision identifies an exception to the guidelines for pow-wows and other Indigenous cultural demonstrations, as contests in general are not eligible for funding. In 2020-21, the Program supported 65 Indigenous celebrations through the Local Festivals component ($2,196,000), up from 25 in 2017-18 ($356,600). Over the evaluation period, BCAH supported 323 Indigenous community celebrations through the Local Festivals component (Table B-12).
- The Program also increased its outreach to 2SLGBTQI+ communities to raise awareness of their eligibility to the Local Festivals component, which resulted in a growth in the number of funded Local Festivals projects from these groups. Budget 2019 funds enabled the Program to provide

---

[20] See for example, Kelly Hill, 2021

[21] Department of Canadian Heritage, 2021

more than $2 million in funding 2SLGBTQI+ groups in 2019–20 and 2020–21. The outreach and additional resources enabled the Program to support 24 2SLGBTQI+ events in 2019–20 ($942,400) and 40 in 2020–21 ($1,427,400).

- For the Community Anniversaries component, demand has increased from Indigenous Band Councils, which can apply to commemorate treaty anniversaries. A special intake took place on September 30, 2020, to allow for applications to commemorate the anniversaries of the Numbered Treaties. Staff are flexible when assessing applications from Indigenous Band Councils for treaty anniversary commemorations, where the signing of these predates colonization and may lack a written record of the event[22].

The evaluation also identified some *barriers* to the achievement of outcomes that serve as areas for further consideration by the Program:

- Some funding recipients noted issues associated with the lack of predictable funding for recurring events, which impact negatively on their ability to undertake long-term planning. The Program noted that unpredictable funding for recurring events has a direct correlation to growing levels of demand from applicants and insufficient resources available for the Program to disburse at a consistent level year after year.
- The Program has a limited ability to systematically track funding provided to priority groups. BCAH uses a funding formula through which EDIA is not factored as a criterion for assessing applications for funding. While the Program collects data deemed of business value, it is limited in its efforts to identify gaps and progress with respect to EDIA, reducing its ability to plan strategically or set targets.
- Finally, there are some gaps in information on other sources of funding for BCAH projects, which is a performance indicator for the Program, and could be used for strategic planning and decision-making. This intelligence could clarify challenges and opportunities faced by recipients of different sizes and located in different parts of the country.

4.2.5. Performance measurement

In general, BCAH has a solid performance measurement approach, and is able to provide data to support information requests and decision-making. Recommendations related to performance measurement from the previous evaluation were implemented and the information contained in recipients' final reports are aligned with the Program's performance indicators in its Performance Information Profile

---

[22] BCAH is conducting a pilot for the Community Anniversaries component in 2022, as part of the Treaty 3 150th anniversary celebrations[22], whereby a six-month intake period will be used to provide flexibility as to when to apply.

(PIP). The latest PIP for BCAH, for 2020-2021, includes 17 performance indicators. The number of indicators was reduced from 21 indicators in 2017-18.

However, several challenges with performance measurement were identified, in particular:

- The program currently collects data on 14 of the PIP indicators, which are quantitative. The three remaining indicators in the PIP can be derived from the 14 that are tracked (totals and averages). The tracking of the indicators in the PIP burdens recipients and requires considerable effort by PCH staff in compiling information, conducting the analysis and in reporting. Some of the indicators do not appear to be insightful or strategic.
- The information captured from recipients' final reports is mostly quantitative, with a focus on the number of artists, partners/sponsors, volunteers. It is more challenging to capture and analyze qualitative benefits.
- While performance data is used to support business cases, briefing notes, etc., and for departmental external reporting, an annual performance report is not prepared (at one time a "performance story" was prepared).
- EDIA does not factor as a criterion for assessing applications for BCAH funding. PCH managers noted the challenge in better capturing data on diversity. In contrast, application forms for CCP require applicants to identify themselves for the purpose of tracking and ensuring sufficient funds to support EDIA activities. Also, CAPF tracks funding to EDIA applicants, enabling prioritization.

The comparative analysis also identified a pilot project on project reporting by recipients. The Commemorate Canada Program worked with the PCH Policy Research Group (PRG) to develop a client-facing survey whereby recipients enter final report information online.

4.2.6. Early results of the ESF funding

A total of $4.46 million in ESF funding was delivered through BCAH in 2020-21. Data on a sample of twenty projects funded through the Program in 2019-20 and 2020-21 was analyzed for evidence of results stemming from the delivery of this additional funding. As shown in Table 7, the total amount of funding provided, including supplementary funding[23] and ESF, to the sample of twenty recipients increased by 41% in 2020-21 compared to 2019-20. Of the total amount of $708,000 awarded to the sample recipients in 2020-21, $155,300 was awarded through the ESF. This amount accounted for 22% of the total paid to recipients through BCAH in 2020-21.

---

[23] In 2019-20, though ESF was not yet available, BCAH distributed supplementary funding.

Table 7: Revenues of a sample of 20 BCAH projects receiving ESF funding, 2019-20 and 2020-21

Funding Component	2019-20	2020-21	% Variance
Total amount paid by BCAH (including supplementary funding and ESF)	$502,000	$708,000	41%
Total Budget 2019 supplementary funding*	$110,800	$0	n/a
Total ESF funding	$0	$155,300	n/a
Number of local community partners	905	376	-59%
Total community contributions	$2,620,394	$2,477,897	-5%
Total municipal contributions	$1,329,623	$353,685	-73%
Total funding from all sources	$4,393,422	$3,614,158	-18%

* As noted in Section 2, the Government provided an additional $7 million in supplementary funding to the Local Festivals component in both years.

The ESF helped recipients in many ways, notably:

- It offset lost revenues from community partners and municipalities. Overall, total contributions from community partners declined slightly, by 5% in 2020-21. The number of local community partners declined substantially, by 59% in 2020-21. Similarly, cash contributions from community partners also declined substantially, by 58% in 2020-21. However, these were offset by a 44% rise in in-kind community contributions. Contributions from municipalities also declined substantially, by 73% in 2020-21. Cash contributions from municipalities were 35% lower in 2020-21, while in-kind municipal contributions declined by 92%.

- With ESF funding in place, many projects were able to pivot to a hybrid model of virtual and in-person activities. This led to increased attendance, driven by virtual visits, as in-person attendance was greatly reduced due to the imposition of capacity restrictions during the pandemic.

- The ESF contributed to the ability of funded recipients to maintain programming using local artists, artisans, and heritage performers, who were largely employed for in-person activities. In some cases, this included modifying the delivery of activities into virtual events. The total number of these artists employed by funded projects was 66% lower in 2020-21, and attendance at their performances fell by 89% in 2020-21. Though the overall number of activities they were involved in was about the same, many recipients reported reducing the number of in-person activities due to the pandemic.

- The ESF contributed to the ability of funded recipients to maintain a reduced number of volunteers. Both the number of volunteers and the number of volunteer hours fell in 2020-21 by about 75%. This is explained by the reduced scope of most funded events. Table 8 provides a breakdown of engagement statistics for the two years.

Table 8: Engagement statistics for BCAH recipients receiving ESF funding, 2019-20 and 2020-21

Engagement Statistic	2019-20	2020-21	% Change
Total attendance	1,158,170	2,207,385	91%
Attendance at performances of local artists, artisans or heritage performers*	949,061	104,780	-89%
# of local artists, artisans & heritage performers	3,382	1,162	-66%
# of activities with local artists/artisans/heritage performers	474	479	1%
# of volunteers	3,867	1,057	-73%
# of volunteer hours	68,656	16,769	-75%

*Available data from recipient's final reports do not distinguish between in-person and online/virtual events.

The evaluation also identified best practices related to the ESF:

- BCAH recipients were not required to submit a separate application; instead, they completed an attestation that they needed the ESF funding to ensure a continuity of operations and to safeguard jobs. Some other PCH programs targeting cultural, heritage and sport organizations did not employ this practice.

- The rapid implementation of the ESF funding enabled recipients to maintain their operations in extremely difficult circumstances of the pandemic according to feedback provided in recipient final project reports. In fact, some BCAH recipients stated that it helped them to continue to operate so that they could offer programming in their local communities.

- The flexibility of ESF funding enabled many to transition from in-person events prior to the pandemic to hybrid or fully virtual events during the pandemic. Some noted that the funding was provided after their festival took place and the Program was flexible in covering the additional costs incurred in shifting to virtual events. PCH key informants noted that the Program's Ts&Cs had to be modified to permit funding to be used to cover a broader range of expenses related to covering pandemic-related costs for health and safety, digital and security purposes. The evaluation notes the elevated workload placed on BCAH staff to obtain the necessary approval from TBS for these adjustments.

- A broader ESF survey of cultural, heritage and sport organizations (funded through various programs) identified several best practices, including funding for the whole value chain, timeliness of payments, a fast, efficient, and easy administrative process, and the availability of information to help complete applications and meet reporting expectations (PCH 2021). They perceived that ESF funding was a recognition of the value of Canadian arts, culture, and heritage.

4.3. Efficiency

This section describes the extent to which BCAH was delivered in an efficient manner and assesses the extent to which the Program has mechanisms and best practices in place that promote efficient program delivery and clientele experience.

Evaluation questions:

To what extent is the programming delivered in an efficient manner?

To what extent does the Program have mechanisms and best practices in place that promote efficient program delivery and clientele experience?

Key findings:

- Overall, the Program has mechanisms in place to support efficient delivery for the achievement of results. BCAH's best practices that support efficiency include its delivery model for the Local Festivals and Community Anniversaries components whereby these components are coordinated nationally and delivered regionally. The recipients of all three components provided positive feedback on the support provided by Program staff. The Program implemented efficiency improvements including the introduction of batch processing that automated several processes.
- The Program's administrative cost ratio is higher than other PCH programs, a trend that has continued since the previous evaluation. While its administrative cost ratio was similar with that of CAPF at the end of the evaluation period, the decrease is attributable, in part, to the increase in BCAH funding received in the final two years.
- The Program also experienced challenges in meeting its service standards in 2019-20 and 2020-21, particularly in issuing timely funding decisions. Increased workload and complexity due to the additional supplementary funding and the impacts of COVID-19 were contributing factors.
- The additional $7 million in supplementary funding introduced in 2019-20 has helped the Program to provide more continuity in funding to the larger organizations with recurring festivals. However, this increased the workload of program staff and contributed to the challenges in achieving service standards. Also, there is concern that the supplementary funding is scheduled to end after March 31, 2024, which, assuming no changes to the design of the Program, would reduce the average level of funding per project, exacerbating unpredictable funding levels for recipients and negatively affecting recipients' capacity.
- There are opportunities for the Program to examine and adapt, where appropriate, the best practices of other PCH programs, including multi-year funding for recurring festivals.

4.3.1. Administrative costs

The Program's administrative cost ratio, defined as the total of direct and indirect costs divided by total program expenditures (i.e., salaries, O&M and Gs&Cs) was 21.3% over the six-year evaluation period (Table 9). The ratio declined substantially over the six years, from 26.4% in 2015-16 to 15.3% in 2020-21. This decrease appears to be due, in part, to the increase in Gs&Cs expenditures in the final two years

from additional $7 million in supplementary funding introduced to the Local Festivals component in 2019-20 and the $4.46 million in ESF in 2020-21[24].

Table 9: BCAH's administrative costs, 2015-16 to 2020-21 ($ millions)

Resources	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Total
Salary and O&M (A)	$6.0	$5.5	$5.7	$5.4	$5.0	$5.4	$33.0
Gs&Cs expenditures (B)	$16.7	$16.3	$17.0	$17.3	$24.6	$30.1	$122.0
Total expenditure (C = A+B)	$22.7	$21.8	$22.7	$22.7	$29.6	$35.5	$155.0
Administrative ratio (A/C)	**26.4%**	**25.2%**	**25.1%**	**23.7%**	**16.9%**	**15.3%**	**21.3%**

Source: Chief Financial Office Branch, PCH

The evaluation compared BCAH's administrative ratio to the ratio for the period covered by the previous evaluation (2011-12 to 2014-15). As the previous evaluation examined only direct costs, the current study calculated the average administration ratio, excluding indirect costs, to be 19.3% over the current six-year period, slightly higher than the 18.7% reported by the previous evaluation.[25] Furthermore, the 2016 evaluation noted that the administrative cost ratio had increased from 16.4% for the period covered by the 2011 evaluation (2007-08 to 2011-12). The report indicated that the increase was due to the addition of the Legacy Fund component in 2009-10, with more complex files.

Acknowledging differences in design and delivery, BCAH's administrative costs were also compared to three other programs: Canada Arts Presentation Fund (CAPF), Canada Cultural Spaces Fund (CCSF) and Canada Cultural Investment Fund (CCIF). The administrative costs for these programs were analyzed as part of an evaluation study completed in 2019; note that the years covered, 2013-14 to 2017-18, do not fully overlap with the years covered by the BCAH evaluation. As shown in Table 10, the average administration cost ratio for the three programs was 10% for the period 2013-14 to 2017-18. Of the three comparison programs, CAPF had the highest ratio, at 17% for the period 2013-14 to 2017-18, whereas BCAH was 21.3% for the period 2015-16 to 2020-21. BCAH's ratio for the final year of the current evaluation (15.3%) is lower than the overall ratio calculated for CAPF (17%) and would indicate comparable costs if similar yearly ratios could be maintained moving forward.

---

[24] The costs to administer BCAH consist of three components: i) the direct costs (salaries and O&M) incurred by National Headquarters to manage the Program overall and to deliver the Legacy Fund; ii) the costs of the Regional Offices to deliver the Local Festivals and Community Anniversaries components; and, iii) the indirect costs incurred by other units within PCH that are allocated to BCAH, such as the office of the ADM, the Gs&Cs COE, Finance, etc. All PCH programs are subject to indirect costs.

[25] Canada. Department of Canadian Heritage. *Evaluation of the Building Communities through Arts and Heritage for the period 2011-12 to 2014-15.,* 2016)

Table 10: Administration costs of other select PCH programs

Program	Administrative Cost	Total Program Expenditures	% of Program Expenditures	Previous Evaluation
CAPF	$30,609,824	$185,728,643	17%	23%
CCSF	$20,914,181	$303,981,623	7%	8%
CCIF	$8,331,838	$115,134,923	7%	16%
Total	$59,855,843	$604,845,189	10%	16%

Source: Department of Canadian Heritage, *Grouped Arts Evaluation: Canada Arts Presentation Fund, Canada Cultural Spaces Fund, and Canada Cultural Investment Fund, 2013-14 to 2017-18*, August 20, 2019, p. 40.

The current findings are similar to those presented in the previous 2016 BCAH evaluation which also compared the Program's administrative cost ratio to these other three programs. That evaluation found that the administration costs of these other programs had decreased since the 2011 evaluation and that BCAH's administrative cost ratio of 18.7% was higher than these other programs.[26]

Finally, the evaluation also examined the efficiency of BCAH as measured by administration cost per unit of output:

- Overall, average administration cost per application was $5,912 over the six-year period, while the average administration cost per project funded was $7,193.

- Administration costs per unit of output have increased compared to the previous evaluation[27] period ($3,438 per application and $4,722 per funded project, respectively).

The evaluation recognizes that comparing administration costs between programs must consider the differences in how each program is designed, structured, and administered. Administration costs are driven by many factors, including the characteristics and complexities of the projects funded, the level of demand, the volume of applications, amount of funding awarded and the structure of the application review and approval processes.

4.3.2. Achievement of service standards

PCH publishes data on the performance of all Gs&Cs programs in meeting three categories of service standards: 1) acknowledgement of receipt of funding applications; 2) notification of funding decisions; and 3) issuing of payments. The data for BCAH and for three other PCH programs are provided in Annex B (Table B-23).

---

[26] Canada. Department of Canadian Heritage. *Evaluation of the Building Communities through Arts and Heritage for the period 2011-12 to 2014-15.*, 2016)

[27] Canada. Department of Canadian Heritage. *Evaluation of the Building Communities through Arts and Heritage for the period 2011-12 to 2014-15.*, 2016)

Strong performance for acknowledgement of receipt of funding applications

BCAH was largely able to achieve its two-week service standard for acknowledgement of receipt of funding applications. Funding recipients who were interviewed did not identify any major issues with BCAH application process, and frequently noted the helpful support provided by program staff.

Some challenges related to the notification of funding decisions

The Program experienced some challenges in meeting its service standard for notification of funding decisions, particularly in 2019-20 and 2020-21 with increased demand related to supplementary funding and the COVID-19 pandemic. The service standard was reduced from 26 to 24 weeks in 2017-18. Here is a summary of the data for notification of funding decisions:

- From 2016-17 to 2018-19, performance for Local Festivals (Component I) and Community Anniversaries (Component II) was strong (96% or above). Legacy Fund (Component III) achieved 79% to 88%.
- In 2019-20, Component 1 achieved 93%, Component II 62% and Component III had 88%.
- In 2020-21, Component 1 achieved 66%, Component II 47% and Component III 59%.

PCH key informants indicated that many factors affect BCAH's ability to meet the notification of funding decisions service standard. The introduction of additional funding, including the supplementary funding in 2019-20 and the ESF in 2020-21 during the COVID-19 pandemic, had a major impact on workload, due to the many cycles of funding announcements by the Government. The administration of this additional funding also increased communications with recipients.

In addition, the application approval process for Components I and II is complex, consisting of many steps and involving several PCH teams and groups. About 20% of files, those recommending funding approval of greater than $100 thousand must be sent to the PCH Grants and Contributions Centre of Expertise (COE), to be forwarded to the Minister's office for approval, which leads to delays. According to some internal key informants, there is considerable back and forth between the COE and the Program, often concerning relatively minor issues.

As shown in Annex B, Table B-23, three other PCH programs (CAPF, CCSF and CCP) generally achieved better performance on this metric in 2020-21.

Good performance on the issuing of payments

BCAH has a service standard of four weeks for issuing of payments. Over the period of 2016-17 to 2020-21, the Program was largely able to meet this standard. For example, in 2020-21, the performance of the three components ranged from 76% to 80% (Annex B, Table B-23).

4.3.3. Mechanisms and best practices that promote efficient program delivery

BCAH's best practices include its delivery models for the three program components. Two of the components, Local Festivals and Community Anniversaries, while coordinated nationally, are delivered

regionally. The main advantage is that regional program officers are knowledgeable of the arts and heritage sector in local communities. They are well suited to interact with local community organizations and to assist in the development of funding applications. Funding recipients frequently noted the strong support provided to them by BCAH Program staff.

In contrast, delivery of the Legacy Fund is centralized at headquarters.[28] PCH managers noted that the centralized administration of this component is necessary to better manage overall program resources. PCH managers explained that Legacy Fund projects, given they are capital projects, are typically complex and have become more so in recent years, leading to project delays by funding recipients. By closely monitoring program expenditures against budget, non-expended funds may be transferred to the other two program components as the end of the fiscal year approaches.

For components I and II, the implementation of batch processing of applications has led to positive results. Working with the Grants and Contributions' COE, batch processing automates several processes including the commitment of funds in the financial system and approval and payments of grants. With batch processing, each region forwards its batch of files to the COE for processing. PCH managers indicated that this approach has reduced the level of effort required of regional program officers. They noted that batch processing would not be appropriate for component III.

There are options to improve efficiency

While the evaluation recognizes that time-limited investments present obstacles to maximizing program efficiency, there were some areas noted for further examination:

- **Multi-year funding.** PCH managers raised the option of multi-year agreements for recurring festivals administered by larger organizations, a suggestion that was also identified by the comparative analysis. This could reduce the burden on Local Festivals recipient organizations, providing greater stability and capacity for planning, as they currently must re-apply every year. It could also reduce the level of effort devoted by BCAH staff in assessing applications and managing recipient agreements.

  The comparative analysis found that the CAPF introduced multi-year funding for recurring clients, and the program stated that this increased efficiency. CAPF currently supports up to 700 organizations and uses a comparative assessment process to make funding decisions. Most are recurring recipients, with 70% supported through multi-year agreements.

  However, according to BCAH Program management, unlike CAPF, the formula-based nature of BCAH may prove incompatible with multi-year funding. Further, to offer multi-year funding, even if only to the larger organizations, the Program would require more stable funding, particularly if demand continues to increase.

- **The funding formula.** BCAH's funding to Local Festivals and Community Anniversaries recipients is based on a policy decision made at the original program design phase to fund all applications

---

[28] Though regional program officers do provide input on funding decisions and may conduct site visits on behalf of headquarters.

deemed eligible upon assessment. The amount of funding received by each applicant depends on several factors that are fed into a funding formula. In 2019, the Program modified its funding formula as per recommendation 1.1 of the previous evaluation. Currently, factors include the number of eligible applicants, eligible amounts requested by applicants and the amount of available program resources.

The formula was intended to provide the greatest level of stability possible to clients. However, some PCH key informants noted that stability was only possible because the program received additional funding through the supplementary support programs. The largest recipient organizations have been subjected to funding fluctuations, while for smaller events, the program will fund 100% of requests up to $5,000. Having program supplementary funding allowed for more continuity in funding for the larger organizations but it was difficult for recipients to plan for these extra amounts, given the timing of delivery for supplemental funds. PCH key informants noted that if the program continues to support all applications assessed as eligible while demand continues to increase, it would not be possible to provide long-term stability for recurring recipients, as their funding amounts would diminish given a static level of program resources.

- **Simplified application for smaller amounts of Legacy funding.** PCH key informants noted that the administration of Legacy Fund projects has become more complex in recent years. These projects require a lot of analysis by program officers. One opportunity may be to simplify the application for smaller amounts of funding. This change would require an increased risk tolerance regarding funding recommendations, since in a simplified application, the program would receive less information on proposed projects.

- **Staff turnover and uneven HR capacity** across the five regions. Regions have a mix of program officers, with a majority at the most junior level. Turnover of junior staff is an issue, as workloads are onerous, and employees can find promotion opportunities elsewhere. In comparison, another of PCH's programs, CAPF, is staffed by more senior personnel based on the complexity of its funding requests. With BCAH's provision of supplement funding in recent years, the complexity of the delivery process has increased, as has workload.

The scheduled ending of supplementary funding could lead to challenges

The supplementary funding has been beneficial to recipients and has allowed for more continuity in funding for the larger recipient organizations. However, it has been difficult for recipients to plan for the additional funding, due to challenges faced by the Program in confirming approved supplemental amounts. More stable funding to the Program could provide greater stability. PCH key informants expressed concern with the end of temporary funding, as the $7 million in supplementary funding for Local Festivals is scheduled to end on March 31, 2024. While PCH managers are supportive of being able to fund all eligible applications, they noted that if demand continues to grow without increases to the Program's budget, then the amount of funding per project would decrease.

5. Conclusions

Overall, the results of this evaluation point to continued relevance and performance of BCAH with some areas for further attention moving forward.

The evaluation finds that BCAH continues to be relevant. A demonstrable need for the Program exists with high funding demand and strong interest by Canadians to engage with arts and heritage activities. There is increasing demand for the Local Festivals component, particularly from larger recurring events. BCAH is not duplicative but rather complementary to other programming, with its unique focus on local engagement through arts and heritage. The Program is responding to current and changing needs, including those resulting from the pandemic, by providing additional funding and exhibiting flexibility in allowable expenses.

BCAH is aligned with government priorities, and it supports PCH strategic outcomes for arts and heritage, specifically citizen engagement. It took important steps to address equity, diversity, inclusion, and accessibility. The Program allocated resources to Indigenous and 2SLGBTQI+ projects and made some changes to its criteria to be more inclusive. Given their importance, there are opportunities to further address these priorities, as well as sustainable development, moving forward.

The Program achieved its immediate and intermediate outcomes, which contributed to the achievement of its longer-term outcome. The number of projects supported has increased since the previous evaluation, primarily because of increased resources allocated to the Local Festivals component. This increased support led to higher rates of attendance and participation overall. The COVID-19 pandemic had a negative impact on opportunities afforded to local artists, artisans and heritage performers, volunteers, and community partners. However, audiences were provided access to virtual programming, which drove attendance. Overall, the participation rates of artists, volunteers and community partners are comparable to the rates in the previous evaluation period, notwithstanding the pandemic.

The Program delivered ESF funding in a timely manner that was much appreciated by clients. The Program introduced a best practice of a streamlined application process whereby recipients were permitted to sign an attestation that they required this funding. The Program amended BCAH's Terms and Conditions in a timely manner, responding to the needs of clients to adapt their programming to the pandemic context, such as providing more virtual activities. Funding recipients were able to maintain their activities in a context where they had access to fewer volunteers and community partners were less able to participate financially or provide in-kind support.

Performance measurement processes are in place for the Program. However, there are areas for improvement including related to other sources of recipient funding and funding to priority groups. Better information on other sources of funding could provide intelligence on funding challenges faced by recipients while improved data on recipients would support improved funding to equity communities.

Overall, the Program has mechanisms in place to support efficient delivery. BCAH's best practices include its national and regional delivery model, allowing better service to clients located in communities across Canada. The Program has also taken steps to streamline operations, such as introducing batch processing for the Local Festivals and Community Anniversaries components which automated several activities.

The Program's administrative cost ratio continues to be higher than comparable PCH programs, a trend that has continued since the previous evaluation. However, the administrative ratio declined over the six years, to 15.3% in 2020-21, in part, due to the increase in Gs&Cs expenditures in the final two years from the supplementary funding and the ESF funding. It could indicate that if the Program would have comparable expenditures moving forward, similar yearly ratios could be maintained. The Program also experienced challenges in meeting its service standards for timely funding decisions. Many factors affected this service standard, however, particularly the increased workload due to the additional supplementary and ESF funding provided to local festivals. Possible considerations for improved efficiency include the introduction of multi-year funding agreements, re-examination of the funding formula, and stabilizing operational staffing capacity.

The additional $7 million in supplementary funding introduced in 2019-20 has helped the Program to provide more continuity in funding to the larger organizations with recurring festivals, respond to high funding demand and strong interest by Canadians to engage with arts and heritage activities. However, this supplementary funding is scheduled to end on March 31, 2024, which could negatively affect recipient organizations. The perception of the Program along with the Department and the Government could also be affected. An opportunity is for the Program to examine and adapt where appropriate the best practices of other PCH programs.

6. Recommendations, management response and action plan

Based on the findings, the evaluation makes three recommendations related to overall design and delivery, EDIA, and performance measurement. Actions on these recommendations will lead to program improvements and will strengthen the continued relevance and performance of BCAH going forward.

Recommendation 1
The evaluation recommends that the ADM, Community and Identity, in collaboration with the ADM, Official Languages, Heritage and Regions, examine ways to improve the efficiency of the Program.
Management response
The Community Building and Youth Branch accepts this recommendation.

The Building Communities through Arts and Heritage program (BCAH) recognizes the importance of delivering the program in an efficient manner and in reducing the administrative burden both from a program delivery and recipient-user perspective.

As part of its best practices to promote efficiency, the program continues to combine regional delivery with national coordination for its event-based components (Local Festivals and Community Anniversaries) and utilizes national delivery for its smaller, capital project component (Legacy Fund). The program has streamlined its application process by introducing an online platform for applicants to its high-volume Local Festivals component; establishing national review committees to ensure standardized regional approaches and implementing batched and automated processes for approvals and payments.

BCAH will build upon the success of the delivery of Covid-19 Emergency support funding, whereby simplified application processes significantly reduced processing time, and further examine funding strategies and administrative processes.

Table 11: Recommendation 1 – action plan

Action Plan Item	Deliverable	Timeline	Responsible
1.1. Explore alternate funding strategies through an in-depth data analysis of	1.1.1. Data and statistics on program demand.	October 2023	Manager & Policy Team, BCAH

program demand, an environmental scan, and feasibility assessments.	1.1.2. Environmental scan of funding strategies.	October 2023	Manager & Policy Team, BCAH
	1.1.3. Data trials of alternate funding strategies.	April 2024	Manager & Policy Team, BCAH
	1.1.4. Report with recommendations for funding strategies (if applicable).	October 2024	Director, Community Engagement Directorate
1.2. Undertake a simplification review of application and assessment processes.	1.2.1. Summary of findings from simplification review.	October 2023	Manager & Team Leaders, BCAH
	1.2.2. Drafts of revised tools.	April 2024	Manager & Team Leaders, BCAH
	1.2.3. Final versions of tools.	October 2024	Manager & Team Leaders, BCAH
1.3. Review practices related to administrative costs.	1.3.1. Analysis of available data, identifying data gaps.	October 2023	Manager & Policy Team, BCAH
	1.3.2. Recommendations for improving identified data gaps.	April 2024	Director, Community Engagement Directorate
Full implementation date: October 2024			

Recommendation 2
The evaluation recommends that the ADM, Community, and Identity, build on existing mechanisms to determine how the Program can further support EDIA priorities and ensure clear tracking of related performance indicators to support decision-making and reporting.
Management response
The Assistant Deputy Minister agrees with the recommendation. The program will continue to work to better address issues of accessibility of funding for equity-deserving groups. Towards this end, the program has already participated in Cohort Two of the Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) Review within Canadian Heritage. This review took place between February and June 2022 with the initial focus on challenges facing the Legacy Fund, while finding many observations applicable to all BCAH components. The program will use its EDI Report as a guide and further its development work towards improving accessibility for equity-deserving groups. Subsequent steps will include reconsidering the flexibility of program tools, processes and funding strategies and then implementing opportunities to improve accessibility. The program will also develop a means of collecting and tracking performance data as it pertains to EDIA, enabling the program to integrate regular analysis in support of decision making.

Table 12: Recommendation 2 – action plan

Action Plan Item	Deliverable	Timeline	Responsible
2.1. Finalize EDI Report and recommendations.	2.1.1. Final EDI Report.	January 2023	Manager & Policy Team, BCAH
2.2. Identify opportunities for improved accessibility and modify tools, processes and funding strategies, as required.	2.2.1. Outline of proposed EDI modifications.	October 2023	Manager & Policy Team, BCAH
	2.2.2. Draft modifications to program tools, as required.	April 2024	Manager & Team Leaders, BCAH
	2.2.3. Final revised program tools, as required.	October 2024	Manager & Team Leaders, BCAH

Action Plan Item	Deliverable	Timeline	Responsible
	2.2.4. Briefing note, summarizing implemented EDI modifications to administrative processes and funding strategies.	September 2025	Director, Community Engagement Directorate
2.3. Develop capacity within data-capture tools to enable tracking of EDIA performance data.	2.3.1. Environmental scan of EDIA data capture methods.	October 2023	Manager & BCAH Policy
	2.3.2. Draft EDIA data-capture modifications to existing tools or develop new tools, as required.	April 2024	Manager & BCAH Policy
	2.3.3. Final versions of revised/new data-capture tools, as required.	October 2024	Director, Community Engagement Directorate
Full implementation date: September 2025			

Recommendation 3
The evaluation recommends that the ADM, Community, and Identity, build on past efforts and review BCAH's logic model and performance measurement indicators to ensure strategic information is available for planning, decision-making and reporting while streamlining the effort required by recipients and by program administration.
Management response
The Assistant Deputy Minister, Community and Identity Sector, recognizes the benefits of a logic model and related performance measurement strategy and tools that support strategic planning, program decision-making, and reporting.
The program will review its logic model and performance measurement indicators to ensure data collection and analysis are as streamlined as possible while still making available strategic information to support planning, decision-making and reporting.

Table 13: Recommendation 3 – action plan

Action Plan Item	Deliverable	Timeline	Responsible
3.1. Review program logic model to streamline performance indicators.	3.1.1. Draft of proposed changes to logic model.	April 2023	Manager & Policy Team, BCAH
	3.1.2. Revised PIP tracker.	October 2023	Manager & Policy Team, BCAH
	3.1.3. Draft revisions to recipient Final Reports.	April 2024	Manager, Policy & Team Leads, BCAH
	3.1.4. Final versions of revised recipient Final Reports.	October 2024	Director, Community Engagement Directorate
3.2. Identify new measurement areas to support strategic program development and decision-making and implement data capture strategies.	3.2.1. Outline of proposed new measurement areas.	October 2023	Manager & Policy Team, BCAH
	3.2.2. Draft revisions to data capture tools, as required.	April 2024	Manager & Policy Team, BCAH
	3.2.3. Final revised data capture tools, as required.	October 2024	Director, Community Engagement Directorate
Full implementation date: October 2024			

Annex A: Evaluation matrix

Relevance – Question 1.1: To what extent is BCAH responding to current and changing needs?

Indicator	Literature review	Document Review	Review of Admin., Financial and Performance Data	Review of Project Files	Key Informant Interviews - Internal	Key Informant Interviews - External	Comparative Analysis
1.1.1. Views, trends, and issues facing community engagement through arts and heritage project/events	X	X	X	-	-	X	-
1.1.2. Views, trends, and issues facing local partners/local volunteers in their communities through arts and heritage project/events	X	X	X	-	-	X	-
1.1.3. Views, trends, and issues facing local artists, artisans and heritage performers in their communities through arts and heritage project/events	X	X	X	-	-	X	-
1.1.4. Trends in BCAH applications by component • Number of applications received, by component (PIP) • Number of grants and contributions awarded, by component (PIP) • Number of projects funded (PIP) and non-funded, by component • Number of communities in which funded projects take place	-	X	X	-	-	-	-
1.1.5. Evidence on importance of BCAH funding in addressing client/recipient needs	-	X	X	-	X	X	-
1.1.6. Proportion of funding of recipient from BCAH, GC and other government levels	-	X	X	-	-	X	-

Indicator	Literature review	Document Review	Review of Admin., Financial and Performance Data	Review of Project Files	Key Informant Interviews - Internal	Key Informant Interviews - External	Comparative Analysis
1.1.7. Evidence of complementarity and duplication with other programming and initiatives	-	X	X	-	X	X	X
1.1.8. Evidence that BCAH Program has been responsive to current and changing needs and growing demand (including COVID-19)	-	X	X	-	X	X	-
1.1.9. Suggested improvements to BCAH to better meet needs	-	X	X	-	X	X	X

Relevance – Question 1.2: To what extent is BCAH supporting government priorities, including those related to equity and reconciliation?

Indicator	Literature review	Document Review	Review of Admin., Financial and Performance Data	Review of Project Files	Key Informant Interviews - Internal	Key Informant Interviews - External	Comparative Analysis
1.2.1. Evidence that BCAH Program (projects/events) are supporting government priorities for arts and heritage	-	X	-	-	X	X	-
1.2.2. Evidence that BCAH Program projects/events are supporting government priorities for diversity and inclusion • Extent to which the Program guidelines, forms and reporting reflect priority groups	-	X	-	-	X	X	-
1.2.3. Number and description ofrecipients/projects pertaining to priority groups by component	-	X	X	-	-	-	-
1.2.4. Evidence of facilitators or/and barriers to the Program for priority groups	-	X	-	-	X	X	X
1.2.5. Evidence the Program is aware of sustainable development priorities and is making early efforts to addressthese priorities	-	X	-	-	X	X	-

Effectiveness – Question 2.1: To what extent did BCAH achieve its short, medium, and long-term outcomes?

Indicator	Literature review	Document Review	Review of Admin., Financial and Performance Data	Review of Project Files	Key Informant Interviews - Internal	Key Informant Interviews - External	Comparative Analysis
2.1.1. Evidence that BCAH funded recipients carry out local arts and heritage activities in their communities *(short-term outcome)* • Number of local festival / community anniversary / legacy projects funded • Number of communities inwhich local festival / community anniversary / legacy projects take place	-	X	X	-	-	-	-
2.1.2. Evidence local partners within the community provided support to funded local festival,community anniversary and/or legacy projects. *(medium-term outcome 1)* • Number of local partners, per project • Value of monetary support	-	X	X	-	-	X	-
2.1.3. Evidence that BCAH provided local citizens with opportunities (volunteer support) to engage in their communities through arts and heritage *(medium-term outcome 2)* • Number of volunteers, per project • Number of volunteer hours, per project • Type of volunteer involvement	-	X	X	-	-	X	-
2.1.4. Evidence that BCAH provided local artists, artisans and/or heritage performers with opportunities to engage in their communities	-	X	X	-	-	X	-

Indicator	Literature review	Document Review	Review of Admin., Financial and Performance Data	Review of Project Files	Key Informant Interviews - Internal	Key Informant Interviews - External	Comparative Analysis
through local arts and heritage *(medium-term outcome 3)* • Number of local artists, artisans, heritage/historical performers, per project • Number of funded activities that feature local artists, artisans and/or heritage/historical performers, per project • Proportion of total activities that comprise local artists, artisans and/or heritage performers							
2.1.5. Evidence that BCAH provided local citizens with opportunities to be exposed to local arts and heritage (medium-term outcome 4) • Number of visitors/attendees at funded events and activities (festivals, anniversaries and legacy projects) • Number of permanent and accessible spaces which serve as reminders of local anniversaries	-	X	-	X	-	X	-
2.1.6. Evidence that BCAH enabled citizens across the country to be engaged in their communities through arts and heritage *(long-term outcome)* • Percentage of Canadians engaged in their communities through local arts and heritage • Number of performers andvolunteers engaged in BCAH- funded arts and heritage	-	X	X	-	-	X	-

Indicator	Literature review	Document Review	Review of Admin., Financial and Performance Data	Review of Project Files	Key Informant Interviews - Internal	Key Informant Interviews - External	Comparative Analysis
projects each year • Total attendance for BCAH-funded arts and heritage projects each year • Average number of volunteer hours per project							
2.1.7. Evidence of unexpected results, outcomes or impacts of BCAH.	-	X	-	-	X	X	-
2.1.8. Evidence of factors, lessonslearned or best practices that facilitate or impede the achievement of outcomes of the Program	-	X	-	-	X	X	-
2.1.9. Evidence of lessons learned, and best practices used to measure diversity and inclusion through projects/events.	-	X	-	-	X	X	-
2.1.10. Evidence that the performance measurement framework is used for reportingand by senior management in decision-making	-	X	X	-	X	-	-

Effectiveness – Question 2.2.

a) What were the results from delivery of the Emergency Support Fund in 2020-21?

b) What were the best practices and lessons learned from the delivery of the ESF funding?

Indicator	Literature review	Document Review	Review of Admin., Financial and Performance Data	Review of Project Files	Key Informant Interviews - Internal	Key Informant Interviews - External	Comparative Analysis
2.2.1. Results stemming from the delivery of the ESF funding in 2020-21	-	X	X	X	X	X	-
2.2.2. Best practices and lessons learned from the delivery of the ESF funding	-	X	X	X	X	X	-

Efficiency – Question 3.1: To what extent is the programming delivered in an efficient manner?

Indicator	Literature review	Document Review	Review of Admin., Financial and Performance Data	Review of Project Files	Key Informant Interviews - Internal	Key Informant Interviews - External	Comparative Analysis
3.1.2. Trends in planned vs actual financial and human resources	-	X	X	-	X	-	-
3.1.3. Evidence that service standards have been achieved (by component)	-	X	X	-	X	X	X
3.1.4. Evidence that the clients/recipients are satisfied with the application, payment and other elements of programdelivery	-	X	X	-	X	X	-

Efficiency – Question 3.2. To what extend does the Program have mechanisms and best practices in place that promote efficient program delivery and clientele experience?

Indicator	Literature review	Document Review	Review of Admin., Financial and Performance Data	Review of Project Files	Key Informant Interviews - Internal	Key Informant Interviews - External	Comparative Analysis
3.1.5. Evidence on the efficiency of design and delivery, mechanisms in place and best practices of BCAH that promoteefficient program delivery and clientele experience	-	X	-	-	X	X	X
3.1.6. Evidence on design and delivery opportunities, effective mechanisms in place and best practices of other PCH programs (Canada Arts Presentation Fund (CAPF), Commemorate Canada Program (CCP) and Canada Cultural Spaces Fund (CCSF) that promote efficient program delivery	-	X	-	-	X	X	X

Annex B: Additional tables

Table B-1: Number of original* applications and funded projects, by year of application, 2015-16 to 2020-21

Program component	Total number of applications	Total number of funded projects	Ratio of funded projects to applications
Community Anniversaries	217	170	78%
Legacy Fund	176	110	63%
Local Arts and Heritage Festivals	5,410	4,432	82%
Total	**5,803**	**4,712**	**81%**

Source: BCAH Program data (GCIMS), provided by the Centre of Excellence (CoE)

* Applications to the program, excluding requests for supplemental funding

Table B-2: Number of original* applications by year of application, 2015-16 to 2020-21

Fiscal year	Community Anniversaries	Legacy Fund	Local Festivals	Total
2015-16	55	29	905	**989**
2016-17	29	37	892	**958**
2017-18	40	20	874	**934**
2018-19	35	40	902	**977**
2019-20	2**	31	959	**992**
2020-21	56	19	878	**953**
Total	**217**	**176**	**5,410**	**5,803**

Source: BCAH Program data, (GCIMS), provided by the Centre of Excellence (CoE)

* Applications to the program, excluding requests for supplemental funding

** Lower number of applications in 2019-20 is attributed to shifting the application intake date from January to April, effectively moving the intake period to the next fiscal year. Exceptions were made for some applications received before the shift, allowing 10 projects to be considered in 2019-20.

Table B-3: Dollar volume of applications by year of application, 2015-16 to 2020-21 ($)

Fiscal year	Community Anniversaries	Legacy Fund	Local Festivals	Total
2015-16	5,926,948	4,053,207	37,886,027	47,866,182
2016-17	2,482,352	7,792,247	42,777,466	53,052,065
2017-18	2,923,499	10,446,609	41,465,597	54,835,705
2018-19	2,638,134	6,532,152	43,889,942	53,060,228
2019-20	123,065*	7,134,332	49,866,945	57,124,342
2020-21	5,462,066	4,691,826	54,316,115	64,470,007
Total	19,556,064	40,650,373	270,202,092	330,408,529

Source: BCAH Program data (GCIMS), provided by CoE* Lower dollar volume of applications in 2019-20 is attributed to shifting the application intake date from January to April, effectively moving the intake period to the next fiscal year. Exceptions were made for some applications received before the shift, allowing 10 projects to be considered in 2019-20.

Table B-4: Number of applications received with requests for larger amounts, Local Festivals component, January intake, 2018 to 2021

Local Festivals Component	2018	2019	2020	2021
Festivals with larger requests ($75,001 to $200,000)	27	36	40	45

Source: BCAH Program (GCIMS), provided by CoE.

Table B-5: Number of grants and contributions awarded by year of application, 2015-16 to 2020-21

Fiscal year	Community Anniversaries	Legacy Fund	Local Festivals	Total
2015-16	46	13	706	765
2016-17	20	26	713	759
2017-18	32	14	721	767
2018-19	28	26	745	799
2019-20	2	19	779	800
2020-21	42	12	768	822
Total	170	110	4,432	4,712

Source: BCAH Program data (GCIMS), provided by CoE

Table B-6: Number of grants awarded by year of application, 2015-16 to 2020-21

Component	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Total
Community Anniversaries	27	18	29	19	2	34	129
Legacy Fund	3	8	8	9	4	3	35
Local Festivals	636	644	663	665	649	716	3,973
Total	666	670	700	693	655	753	4,137

Source: BCAH Program data (GCIMS), provided by CoE

Table B-7: Number of contributions awarded by year of application, 2015-16 to 2020-21

Component	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Total
Community Anniversaries	19	2	3	9	0	8	41
Legacy Fund	10	18	6	17	15	9	75
Local Festivals	70	69	58	80	130	52	459
Total	**99**	**89**	**67**	**106**	**145**	**69**	**575**

Source: BCAH Program data (GCIMS), provided by CoE

Table B-8: Number of funded projects by year of approval, 2015-16 to 2020-21

Fiscal year	Community Anniversaries	Legacy Fund	Local Festivals	Total
2015-16	n/a	7	510	517
2016-17	46	19	727	792
2017-18	21	19	701	741
2018-19	31	18	718	767
2019-20	28	27	746	801
2020-21	42	15	768	825
Total	**168**	**105**	**4,170**	**4,443**

Source: BCAH Program data (GCIMS), provided by CoE

Table B-9: Number of communities hosting BCAH projects, 2015-16 to 2020-21

Fiscal year	Number of communities
2015-16	465
2016-17	440
2017-18	441
2018-19	434
2019-20	445
2020-21	471
Average	**449**

Source: BCAH Program Performance Data Tracker

Table B-10: Average proportion (%) of project expenses covered by BCAH Program funding, by component and size of project expense, 2015-16 to 2020-21

Fiscal year and size of project	Local Festivals	Community Anniversaries	Legacy Fund	All Components
2015-16	**17%**	**NA***	**36%**	**19%**
Project cost over $1M	0%	NA*	23%	23%
Project cost under $1M	17%	NA*	43%	19%
2016-17	**15%**	**20%**	**36%**	**15%**
Project cost over $1M	5%	8%	19%	7%
Project cost under $1M	15%	21%	41%	16%
2017-18	**14%**	**23%**	**38%**	**14%**
Project cost over $1M	4%	0%	30%	7%
Project cost under $1M	14%	23%	39%	15%
2018-19	**13%**	**22%**	**38%**	**14%**
Project cost over $1M	4%	0%	22%	6%
Project cost under $1M	13%	22%	40%	14%
2019-20	**19%**	**35%**	**39%**	**20%**
Project cost over $1M	4%	0%	31%	9%
Project cost under $1M	20%	35%	45%	21%
2020-21	**20%**	**34%**	**42%**	**21%**
Project cost over $1M	5%	9%	36%	9%
Project cost under $1M	20%	34%	45%	21%

Source: BCAH Program (GCIMS), provided by CoE

*Data provided to ESD was based on application fiscal year starting in 2015-16. As such, data for the Community Anniversaries component in 2015-16 is absent as, applications were received and processed in the previous year.

Table B-11: Number of funded 2SLGBTQI+ Pride events, Local Festivals component, by year of project, for projects taking place from 2016-17 to 2020-21

Fiscal year of project	Number of Local Festivals applications funded
2016-17	8
2017-18	8
2018-19	12
2019-20	24
2020-21	39
2021-22	35
Total	**126**

Source: BCAH Program data (GCIMS), provided by CoE

Table B-12: Number of funded Indigenous community celebrations, all program components, by year of project, for projects taking place from 2016-17 to 2020-21

Fiscal year of event	Number of projects funded
2016-17	40
2017-18	41
2018-19	46
2019-20	69
2020-21	70
2021-22	57
Total	**323**

Source: BCAH Program data (GCIMS), provided by CoE.

Table B-13: Number of approved projects, by year of application, 2015-16 to 2020-21

Component	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Total
Community Anniversaries	46	20	32	28	2	42	**170**
Legacy Fund	13	26	14	26	19	12	**110**
Local Festivals	706	713	721	745	779	768	**4,432**
Total	**765**	**759**	**767**	**799**	**800**	**822**	**4,712**

Source: BCAH Program (GCIMS), provided by CoE

Table B-14: Support by local partners for arts and heritage in communities (per project), 2015-16 to 2019-20

Fiscal year	Average number of Local partners	Average monetary support	Average In-kind support
2015-16	31	$47,024	$59,141
2016-17	32	$60,670	$61,272
2017-18	34	$65,074	$68,154
2018-19	32	$70,848	$71,946
2019-20	34	$75,052	$72,055

Source: BCAH Program Performance Data Tracker

Table B-15: Volunteer support for local arts and heritage in communities, per project, 2015-16 to 2019-20

Fiscal Year	Average number of volunteers (per project)
2015-16	177
2016-17	182
2017-18	179
2018-19	169
2019-20	160

Source: BCAH Program Performance Data Tracker

Table B-16: Engagement of local artists, artisans and/or heritage/historical performers, per project, 2015-16 to 2019-20

Fiscal Year	Average number of local performers per project	Average number of funded activities featuring performers per project	Average number of performers per activity
2015-16	154	22	7
2016-17	145	27	5
2017-18	131	25	5
2018-19	172	32	5
2019-20	148	31	5

Source: BCAH Program Performance Data Tracker

Table B-17: Number of visitors/attendees at funded events and activities, per project, 2015-16 to 2019-20

Fiscal Year	Average number of visitors (per project)
2015-16	23,177
2016-17	21,633
2017-18	28,853
2018-19	29,415
2019-20	39,187

Source: BCAH Program Performance Data Tracker

Table B-18: Number of permanent and accessible spaces, 2015-16 to 2019-20

Fiscal Year	Number of permanent and accessible spaces annually
2015-16	88
2016-17	149
2017-18	63
2018-19	53
2019-20	42

Source: BCAH Program Performance Data Tracker

Table B-19: Percentage of Canadians engaged in their communities through local arts and heritage, 2015-16 to 2019-20

Fiscal Year	Percentage of Canadians engaged in their communities
2015-16	51%
2016-17	51%
2017-18	51%
2018-19	51%
2019-20	51%

Table B-20: Overall participation rates, 2018-19 to 2020-21

Category	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Target	Average
Number of performers and volunteers	190,855	204,698	181,413	173,674	192,322
Total attendance	21,207,443	20,295,082	23,221,181	18,088,538	21,574,569

Source: Canadian Heritage, *Departmental Results Report, 2021*

Table B-21: Average number of performers and volunteers engaged in BCAH funded arts and heritage projects, per project, 2015-16 to 2019-20

Fiscal Year	Average number of local artists, artisans, heritage/historical performers, per project	Average number of volunteers, per project	Total
2015-16	154	177	331
2016-17	145	182	327
2017-18	131	179	310
2018-19	172	169	341
2019-20	148	160	308

Source: BCAH Program Performance Data Tracker

Table B-22: Estimated total number of visitors/attendees, 2015-16 to 2019-20

Fiscal Year	Average number of visitors/attendees	Total number of funded projects	Estimated total number of visitors/attendees*
2015-16	23,177	790	18,309,830
2016-17	21,633	766	16,570,878
2017-18	28,853	756	21,812,868
2018-19	29,415	787	23,149,605
2019-20	39,187	782	30,644,234
Totals	**28,469**	**3,881**	**110,487,415**

Source: BCAH Program Performance Data Tracker

*Estimated total of visitors/attendees is the average number of visitors/attendees multiplied by the total number of projects.

Table B-23: Service standards performance for BCAH, CAPF and CCSF 2016-17

Program component	Ack. of receipt Application (Volume)	Ack. of receipt Standard (Weeks)	Ack. of receipt % Met	Funding decision Application (Volume)	Funding decision Standard (Weeks)	Funding decision % Met	Issuance of payments Application (Volume)	Issuance of payments Standard (Weeks)	Issuance of payments % Met
BCAH (Community Anniversaries)	26	2	96%	57	26	98%	26	4	96%
BCAH (Legacy Fund)	34	2	94%	35	26	80%	4	4	75%
BCAH (Local Festivals)	890	2	100%	918	26	96%	286	4	96%
CAPF (Development)	38	2	95%	43	24	84%	16	4	81%
CAPF (Programming)	451	2	97%	478	24	90%	64	4	61%
CCSF (Requests for Expansion/Construction or Renovation/Adaptive Re-use)	219	2	93%	191	36	91%	101	4	85%
CCSF (Requests for Feasibility Study or Specialized Equipment)	128	2	94%	107	36	97%	70	4	87%
CCP (Celebrate Canada)	1710	2	97%	1415	20	96%	969	4	99%
CCP (Commemorate Canada)	2531	2	95%	1893	26	84%	235	4	91%

Source: Service standards results for Canadian Heritage funding programs website

*Figures for BCAH (Local Festivals) include supplementary funding to existing recipients.

Table B-244: Service standards performance for BCAH, CAPF and CCSF 2017-18

Program component	Ack. of receipt Application (Volume)	Ack. of receipt Standard (Weeks)	Ack. of receipt % Met	Funding decision Application (Volume)	Funding decision Standard (Weeks)	Funding decision % Met	Issuance of payments Application (Volume)	Issuance of payments Standard (Weeks)	Issuance of payments % Met
BCAH (Community Anniversaries)	35	2	89%	29	24	97%	30	4	87%
BCAH (Legacy Fund)	20	2	90%	24	24	79%	14	4	71%
BCAH (Local Festivals)	875	2	99%	850	24	99%	698	4	81%
CAPF (Development)	37	2	97%	44	20	93%	39	4	92%
CAPF (Programming)	470	2	98%	476	22	89%	N/A	N/A	N/A
CCSF (Requests for Expansion/Construction or Renovation/Adaptive Re-use)	113	2	96%	128	30	91%	83	4	93%
CCSF (Requests for Feasibility Study or Specialized Equipment)	113	2	97%	135	30	94%	102	4	96%
CCP (Celebrate Canada)	1620	2	98%	1356	20	100%	1537	4	85%
CCP (Commemorate Canada)	544	2	99%	1348	26	85%	423	4	88%

Source: Service standards results for Canadian Heritage funding programs website

*Figures for BCAH (Local Festivals) include supplementary funding to existing recipients.

Table B-2525: Service standards performance for BCAH, CAPF and CCSF 2018-19

Program component	Ack. of receipt Application (Volume)	Ack. of receipt Standard (Weeks)	Ack. of receipt % Met	Funding decision Application (Volume)	Funding decision Standard (Weeks)	Funding decision % Met	Issuance of payments Application (Volume)	Issuance of payments Standard (Weeks)	Issuance of payments % Met
BCAH (Community Anniversaries)	25	2	100%	37	24	100%	24	4	100%
BCAH (Legacy Fund)	39	2	97%	27	24	85%	18	4	89%
BCAH (Local Festivals)	897	2	100%	860	24	97%	708	4	94%
CAPF (Development)	39	2	100%	41	20	88%	38	4	95%
CAPF (Programming)	393	2	98%	1	22	0%	393	4	89%
CCSF (Requests for Expansion/Construction or Renovation/Adaptive Re-use)	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	22	0%	1	4	100%
CCSF (Requests for Feasibility Study or Specialized Equipment)	92	2	97%	101	30	68%	47	4	87%
CCP (Celebrate Canada)	115	2	98%	106	30	93%	62	4	92%
CCP (Commemorate Canada)	1788	2	99%	2379	20	99%	1447	4	99%

Source: Service standards results for Canadian Heritage funding programs website

*Figures for BCAH (Local Festivals) include supplementary funding to existing recipients.

Table B-266: Service standards performance for BCAH, CAPF and CCSF 2019-20

Program component	Ack. of receipt Application (Volume)	Ack. of receipt Standard (Weeks)	Ack. of receipt % Met	Funding decision Application (Volume)	Funding decision Standard (Weeks)	Funding decision % Met	Issuance of payments Application (Volume)	Issuance of payments Standard (Weeks)	Issuance of payments % Met
BCAH (Community Anniversaries)	18	2	50%	56	24	63%	30	4	83%
BCAH (Legacy Fund)	31	2	100%	41	24	88%	12	4	100%
BCAH (Local Festivals)	1540*	2	99%	1438	24	93%	719	4	90%
CAPF (Development)	94	2	90%	83	20	93%	48	4	75%
CAPF (Programming)	1019	2	98%	981	22	86%	232	4	94%
CCSF (Requests for Expansion/Construction or Renovation/Adaptive Re-use)	122	2	96%	124	30	79%	54	4	93%
CCSF (Requests for Feasibility Study or Specialized Equipment)	112	2	95%	120	30	88%	52	4	98%
CCP (Celebrate Canada)	1782	2	100%	1924	20	84%	1600	4	99%
CCP (Commemorate Canada)	174	2	99%	108	26	97%	15	4	100%

Source: Service standards results for Canadian Heritage funding programs website

*Figures for BCAH (Local Festivals) include supplementary funding to existing recipients.

Table B-27: Service standards performance for BCAH, CAPF and CCSF 2020-21

Program component	Ack. of receipt Application (Volume)	Ack. of receipt Standard (Weeks)	Ack. of receipt % Met	Funding decision Application (Volume)	Funding decision Standard (Weeks)	Funding decision % Met	Issuance of payments Application (Volume)	Issuance of payments Standard (Weeks)	Issuance of payments % Met
BCAH (Community Anniversaries)	49	2	82%	53	24	47%	21	4	76%
BCAH (Legacy Fund)	19	2	100%	17	24	59%	10	4	80%
BCAH (Local Festivals)	1346*	2	99%	1326	24	66%	391	4	77%
CAPF (Development)	97	2	87%	109	20	71%	32	4	84%
CAPF (Programming)	876	2	98%	827	22	77%	202	4	92%
CCSF (Requests for Expansion/Construction or Renovation/Adaptive Re-use)	2	2	100%	1	22	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A
CCSF (Requests for Feasibility Study or Specialized Equipment)	146	2	92%	136	30	72%	43	4	95%
CCP (Celebrate Canada)	146	2	95%	141	30	88%	72	4	92%
CCP (Commemorate Canada)	1310	2	93%	1472	20	72%	1086	4	90%

Source: Service standards results for Canadian Heritage funding programs website

*Figures for BCAH (Local Festivals) include supplementary funding to existing recipients.

Annex C: Bibliography

Conference Board of Canada. (April 5, 2018). The Value of Volunteering in Canada. Briefing presented to Volunteer Canada.

Department of Canadian Heritage. (October 17, 2016). *Evaluation of Building Communities through Arts and Heritage for the period 2011-12 to 2014-15*. 36. Retrieved from https://www.canada.ca/en/canadian-heritage/corporate/publications/evaluations/building-communities-through-arts-heritage-period-2016.html

Department of Canadian Heritage. (2019). *Grouped Arts Evaluation: Canada Arts Presentation Fund, Canada Cultural Spaces Fund, and Canada Cultural Investment Fund, 2013-14 to 2017-18*. Retrieved from https://www.canada.ca/en/canadian-heritage/corporate/publications/evaluations/grouped-art-evaluation.html

Department of Canadian Heritage. (2021a). *Recipient survey – Emergency Support Fund for Cultural, Heritage and Sport Organizations*. Retrieved from: https://www.canada.ca/en/canadian-heritage/services/funding/information-covid-19/recipient-survey.html

Department of Canadian Heritage. (2021b). *Arts and Heritage Access and Availability Survey 2020-2021.* Prepared by Environics Research Group on behalf of Department of Canadian Heritage and Canada Council for the Arts. Retrieved from https://canadacouncil.ca/research/research-library/2021/12/2021-arts-and-heritage-access-and-availability-survey

Department of Finance Canada. *Budget 2019, Investing in the Middle Class*. 169. Retrieved from https://www.budget.gc.ca/2019/docs/plan/toc-tdm-en.html

Department of Finance Canada. *Supporting Canadians and Fighting COVID-19: Fall Economic Statement 2020*. 31. Retrieved from https://www.budget.gc.ca/fes-eea/2020/home-accueil-en.html

Department of Finance Canada. *Budget 2021*. 203. Retrieved from https://www.budget.gc.ca/2021/home-accueil-en.html

Kelly Hill, Hill Strategies Research Inc., (February 2021). *Canadians' Arts Participation, Health and Well-Being.* Statistical Insights on the Arts. Report 53. Retrieved from https://hillstrategies.com/resource/canadians-arts-participation-health-and-well-being/

Statistics Canada. (June 26, 2020). "Volunteering in Canada: Challenges and opportunities during the COVID-19 pandemic." Retrieved from https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/45-28-0001/2020001/article/00037-eng.htm