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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the project was to conduct an in-depth examination of the evaluation function in the Canadian federal public service and to critically reflect on how the evaluation function relates to and responds to public service values, both traditional and new. The paper presents the results of a comprehensive examination linking evaluation to public service values and will contribute to a greater understanding of the importance of evaluation within the current federal government context.

After exploring public service values and ethics in general, the paper provides a description of the evaluation function within the context of the Canadian federal government. An analysis of government department websites, focusing on the evaluation function within departments, was conducted in order to draw conclusions as to the prominence of evaluation in the public service, its relation to the relevant public service values and its effectiveness vis-à-vis those values.
CHAPTER 1:

INTRODUCTION

“Accountability in democratic governance and public administration requires that those who exercise public authority be subject to scrutiny and evaluation by a senior public official or public body. Accountability imposes obligations: those who exercise authority must render accounts to superiors, and superiors must extract accounts and pass judgment on them.” (Aucoin and Jarvis, 2005, p. 7).

These days, whether you read the newspapers, listen to the local or national news reports or read the latest press releases being produced by the federal government, a strong theme always shines through. That theme is accountability and transparency. It is about the government dealing with the many mishaps that have occurred in the recent past. It is about a federal government that wants to present itself as innovative and responsive while at the same time touting itself as an open, transparent, accountable and ethical government. This is no small feat given the current opinions held by the Canadian public regarding the government and the way that the government has been governing.

Public service values are at the forefront of many Canadians’ minds, whether they recognize it as such or not. Why is that so? There was the uncovering of the former Human Resources Development Canada grants and contributions fiasco which pointed to the mismanagement of funds and inappropriate decisions taken by public servants. Canadians have learned of the contracting scandal that occurred in the Department of National Defence which cost Canadians millions of dollars. After that, the questionable actions within the Office of the Privacy Commissioner were brought to light, much to the chagrin of Canadians who were, quite frankly, getting tired of hearing about the gross negligence happening within the federal government. For over a year now, Canadians
have had to endure the lengthy inquiry into the Sponsorship Scandal, a scandal that has lead to criminal charges for some and the realization that our political parties are often far from honest in their dealings. Most recently, there have been questions surrounding certain expenses incurred and charged to Canadian Mint accounts.

It seems like the scandals are coming fast and furious, one on top of the other. Why is this happening? Were these types of scandals not present ten or twenty years ago because we certainly did not hear about them as often as we do now. Or, are we actually seeing some of the checks and balances that the government has introduced paying off? Have tighter controls and increased accountability lead to the easier detection of unscrupulous behaviour? What has been the impact of the new initiatives put in place by the government to counter this type of corrupt activity? The federal government has introduced the Public Service Code of Ethics, new policies on evaluation, internal audit and transfer payments and new reporting requirements all in the hopes of reestablishing Canadians’ confidence in the government and in the parties that govern. How do all of these initiatives link to the set of public service values that the government continually preaches must be upheld?

These are the types of questions that lead this researcher to explore the subject area in more depth. More specifically, the purpose of the research is to conduct a comprehensive examination of the evaluation function in the Canadian federal public service and to critically reflect on how the evaluation function relates to and responds to public service values, both traditional and new. Keeping in mind that the focus of the research is the Canadian federal government context, this paper will present the results of

---

1 The terms evaluation and program evaluation will be used interchangeably throughout this paper.
an in-depth examination linking evaluation to public service values and will contribute to a greater understanding of the importance of evaluation within the current federal government environment.

**Overview of the paper**

The introductory chapter of the paper is intended to open the floor for the discussion that will ensue in chapters two through five. It will include a brief section outlining the methodology used in the conduct of the research and preparation of the research paper.

Chapter Two will examine Canadian public service values. Traditional public service values will be explored as will the introduction of new values and principles as a result of New Public Management. Particular attention will be paid to the values of accountability and transparency since they are the values to which the evaluation function within the federal government is most closely linked. The chapter will provide a retrospective look at some of the more renowned scandals that have occurred in the past ten to fifteen years and will outline what the government has done in recent years to respond to those many scandals, including the implementation of the Evaluation Policy.

Chapter Three will look at the evaluation function within the context of the Canadian federal government. More specifically, the paper will provide historical background on evaluation in the federal public service. It will examine the evaluation function in today’s context and will then move on to link evaluation to public service values.

Chapter Four will present the results of an analysis of government department websites. Focusing on the evaluation function within departments, an analysis of a
sample of Government of Canada websites was conducted to determine the existence of an evaluation function sub-site and to explore the contents of any sites that were available. Inferences will be drawn as to the extent that the government departments included in the sample regard their evaluation function as an integral component of their work that enables them to uphold public service values.

The concluding chapter, Chapter Five, will summarize the prominence of evaluation in the public service, its relation to the relevant public service values and its effectiveness vis-à-vis those values. Conclusions will be formed as to the continuing use and usefulness of evaluation in the Canadian federal public service context.

**Methodology**

A significant body of documents relating to Canadian public service values and the evaluation function in Canada’s public service was examined in order to complete this project. The reading material provided the knowledge base required to conduct historical and comparative research on the relation of the evaluation function to public service values in Canada. The researcher drew on existing literature and data and drew conclusions as to how, if at all, the evaluation function has evolved over the past few decades in terms of its link to and relevance to specific public service values. Coding was developed in order to undertake a quantitative analysis of a random sample of Government of Canada websites. This data enabled the researcher to, in this final research paper, draw conclusions as to the importance of the evaluation function in today’s context.

A variety of data collection methods, resources and strategies was utilized in the completion of the project. A comprehensive literature review was conducted to locate
articles and sources on evaluation and public service values. The literature review included a search of library catalogues (Athabasca, Carleton University and University of Ottawa). An internet search was also conducted including a review of relevant Government of Canada websites relating to the evaluation function. Further, use was made of personally owned materials and of resources available through the researcher’s place of work.

A review of Athabasca University’s MAIS and GOV course materials also provided numerous resources particularly with respect to public service values. They further opened the doors, through their bibliographies, to additional resources.

A review of Government of Canada publications provided much of the information required to enable an in-depth examination of the evaluation function and public service values. Most of these publications are currently available on government department websites. Those that were not were requested through the Athabasca University library.

An analysis of government department websites, focusing on the evaluation function within departments, was conducted. Since, at first glance, evaluation seems to tie most closely to public service values of accountability and transparency, an analysis of a sample of Government of Canada websites was conducted to determine the existence of an evaluation function sub-site and to explore the contents of any sites that were available at the time of analysis. Other items explored included questions such as:

a. Does the department have an evaluation function?

b. If yes, is the evaluation function available on the website?

c. How easy is it to find the evaluation site on the departmental website?
d. What are the contents of the site?

e. Ease of finding information on the site, etc.

This analysis allowed the candidate to draw conclusions as to the prominence of evaluation in the public service and its relation to the relevant public service values. The resulting conclusions indicate that perhaps evaluation is a missing link that the government is currently overlooking.

CHAPTER 2:

CANADIAN PUBLIC SERVICE VALUES AND ETHICS

“Events, pressures and change have led to doubts, misunderstandings and even scepticism about values on the part of public servants throughout the public service. Some of these problems are natural at a time of change, and yet a clear focus on values is critical to coping with that change and is at the heart of the renewal of the public service” (Tait, 1996, p.1). This statement was made in the introduction to what is commonly known as the Tait Report, a report of the Task Force on Public Service Values and Ethics released in 1996. Nearly ten years have passed and if one were to begin writing on the topic of public service values and ethics, one could easily use the same words. This chapter will explore what has happened within the public service with respect to values and ethics since the Tait Report released its recommendations. It will describe several incidents that seem to point to the fact that perhaps our current efforts are simply not enough and will end off with a brief review of some of the most recent governmental attempts to prove to Canadians that it is on the right track when it comes to upholding public service values and ethics.
What are Public Service Values and Ethics?

“Ethics involves not only knowing the difference between right and wrong but also making a commitment to do the right thing once one figures out what that is. Ethics can be defined as standards and principles of right conduct. Values, however, are enduring beliefs that influence the choices we make from among available means and ends” (CCMD, 1994, p.35). Long before the introduction of the *Values and Ethics Code for the Public Service* in 2003, it was recognized and accepted that the public service is an organization at work for the good of Canadians and as such, is subject to greater constraints than would be the case in the private sector. Canadians want to know not only how their tax money is being spent and what they are getting back from those expenditures but also that public servants are upholding a certain set of values when distributing those funds. Even though the government has put in place numerous rules and regulations regarding how funds are spent, the “fact that all behaviour cannot be foreseen and controlled by rules leads to the placement of discretionary powers in the hands of public servants” (Dwivedi and Gow, 1999, 25). It is with this realization that the topic of values and ethics in the public service has continued throughout the years to be at the forefront of many minds. It is the values that people hold that “influence which tasks people will do with care, which they will do superficially, and which they will try to avoid. They are central, therefore, to our decisions and actions, both within and outside the workplace” (Kernaghan, Marson and Borins, 2000, p. 44).

“Historically, certain public service values have permeated the study and practice of Canadian public administration. Among these traditional values are integrity, accountability, efficiency, effectiveness, responsiveness, representativeness, neutrality,
fairness and equity” (Kernaghan, Marson and Borins, 2000, p. 46). Generally, when speaking about values in the public service, the terms democratic values, professional values and ethical values are the terms that are most often seen and heard. Table 1 below, reproduced from a 1997 article by Kenneth Kernaghan, lays out some of the main values that are placed in each of these categories.

**Table 1: Ethical, Democratic and Professional Values in the Public Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical values</th>
<th>Democratic values</th>
<th>Professional values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence</td>
<td>Neutrality</td>
<td><strong>Excellence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>Representativeness</td>
<td>Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness/equity</td>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Kernaghan, 1997, p. 49)

Certain values listed in the table above are in bold lettering to highlight the fact that they appear more than once across the categories. In particular, there is a recurrence the traditional public service values of accountability, loyalty and excellence. This implies that, if all of the values in the above table were to be prioritized, these three would likely be at the top of the list. With the introduction of the Values and Ethics Code also came the introduction of people values into mainstream literature within the Canadian context. In this category are found the values of respect, fairness and courtesy. In short, these four groupings encompass those values mentioned in the above paragraph and describe how public servants are expected to serve the public interest with competence, excellence, efficiency, objectivity and impartiality while at the same time upholding the public trust and demonstrating respect, fairness and courtesy in all their dealings.
New Public Management and Public Service Values

While the majority of the above values fall under the heading of traditional values, those like service, quality and innovation would be considered newer public service values. These have emerged more recently in conjunction with the introduction of new public management techniques within the federal public service. “During the 1980s, the context of Canadian public administration changed dramatically: globalization of markets, rising deficit and reduced margin of intervention for public decision-makers, dazzling development of information technologies, emergence of new players and power centres, loss of confidence in politicians and public institutions, better informed and increasingly demanding citizenry, questioning of the state’s size and activities, and so on” (Charih and Rouillard, 1997, p. 37). It was within this context that the calls came for “doing more with less” and using innovative solutions to tackle difficult problems without expending more funds. The government responded by changing the way it organized and delivered its programs and services. “These changes include deregulation, downsizing, increasing delegation of decision making to officials in the field, contracting out and entering into partnerships with the private sector” (OAG, 2000, p. 12-5).

With the acceptance of new public management techniques, the professional values of service, innovation and quality were added to the public service value list. At times, these values do clash with the more traditional values. For example, in recent years, there has been an increased focus on ensuring that public servants uphold the democratic values of accountability, openness and neutrality while at the same time being empowered to make innovative decisions and if necessary, take risks. This tug of war between the traditional and new public service values, between ministerial responsibility
and accountability on the one hand and innovation and reform on the other, are not necessarily irreconcilable. Rather, Kernaghan suggests that “cabinet ministers must be prepared to defend before Parliament and the public those public servants who engage in innovation and responsible risk taking” (1995, p. 483). No matter what cabinet ministers say or do, public servants are generally the ones who feel pulled in two different directions. However, when it comes to which values are most important within the public service, there “is no denying that while values associated with business management are highly visible in the new public management value set, those that are associated with democracy and government still form the basis of our political system” (Charih and Rouillard, 1997, p. 34). While the citizenry may have come to be more accepting of the new public service values, when it comes down to what is expected of our federal public service, the values like accountability, openness and neutrality will always top the list of priorities.

**Why is the public questioning the government’s values and ethics?**

Maintaining the trust of the public is a continuing challenge for government. In a large organization like the federal government, there are bound to be problems and failures, despite best efforts. Public trust in government erodes when there are actual or perceived significant problems in major governmental programs that could have been prevented or corrected. Over time, the cumulative impact of such events may lead Canadians to call into question the integrity of government as a whole. (OAG, 2003, Chp.2, p. 1)

The above situation has, in effect, become a self-fulfilling prophecy over the past few years. Although many examples precede those that follow, if one goes back only to the year 2000, the number of scandals that have been exposed linking both politicians and public servants to wrong-doing have been numerous. First, there was the billion dollar Human Resources and Development Canada (HRDC) boondoggle. In this instance, an
internal audit found that the government had failed to track grants worth one billion dollars to ensure that the money was spent in accordance with rules and regulations and that the program achieved its job creation objectives.

There were also numerous questions surrounding then Prime Minister Jean Chrétien’s connection to two properties in his riding. The Prime Minister had sold his shares in a resort and golf course prior to taking office but was only paid for the shares in 1999. The questions around this affair began when he took office and continued until the day he left office in 2003. Concerns were also expressed in this case about some phone calls placed by the Prime Minister to the Business Development Bank on behalf of the new owner of the resort with respect to a loan he was trying to secure.

Things in the Canadian government really started to heat up in the year 2002. In January of that year, the then Minister of Public Works, Alfonso Gagliano, resigned due to accusations that he inappropriately used his influence to get jobs for his friends and family. Interestingly enough, this scandal did not hurt Mr. Gagliano too much at that point as he was appointed Canada’s ambassador to Denmark soon after his resignation. He would later be implicated in the Sponsorship Scandal.

In May of 2002, the then Minister of Defence, Art Eggleton, resigned his post after it was revealed that he handed a contract to a former girlfriend. In that same month, it was revealed that Don Boudria spent a ski weekend with his family at the luxury country home of a firm that his ministry had dealings with. Boudria was demoted as a result. Still in May 2002, the Auditor General of Canada, Sheila Fraser, released a report slamming federal bureaucrats with respect to their dealings with the marketing firm
Groupaction. The month of May also saw Solicitor General Lawrence MacAulay resign after it was found that he directed government contracts to friends and family members.

The list goes on from there. There was the political bribing and taping scandal involving Prime Minister’s Office chief of staff Tim Murphy, Heath Minister Ujjal Dosanjh and Member of Parliament Gurmant Grewal. There were a myriad of other questionable activities involving dubious contracting practices, including the problems with the Department of National Defence’s contracts with Compaq Computers that may have cost taxpayers up to $159 million for work not performed. There was the mismanagement of the gun registry program, a program that should have cost the Canadian taxpayers approximately 1 million dollars but was at nearly eighty million of spending when the mismanagement was uncovered. And, who can forget the Radwanski affair? How can the public not be upset when they learn that the Privacy Commissioner of Canada is spending their tax dollars in ludicrous ways like paying for a seventeen thousand dollar lunch with Communication’s director?

The latest significant scandal that seems to have consumed the public and delivered a severe blow to the reputation of the public service relates back to the 2002 OAG report. That scandal is, of course, the Sponsorship Scandal. The sponsorship fund was established as a means of not only promoting sovereignty but also of raising the profile of the federal government within Quebec. Canadians’ learned that between 1994 and 2003 almost half of the federal program’s $332-million budget went to Quebec-based advertising and communications firms with ties to the Liberal Party of Canada’s Quebec wing. The scandal caused such uproar that a federal inquiry was launched. The following is a list of some of the major findings taken from the summary document of...
“Who is Responsible?” released Nov. 1, 2005 by the Commission of Inquiry into the Sponsorship Program and Advertising Activities. Of note to a discussion of values and ethics within the public service, the Commission of Inquiry found:

- Insufficient oversight at the very senior levels of the public service, which allowed program managers to circumvent proper contracting procedures and reporting lines.
- A veil of secrecy surrounding the administration of the Sponsorship Program and an absence of transparency in the contracting process.
- Reluctance, for fear of reprisal, by virtually all public servants to go against the will of a manager who was circumventing established policies and who had access to senior political officials.
- Deliberate actions to avoid compliance with federal legislation and policies, including the *Canada Elections Act*, *Lobbyists Registration Act*, *Access to Information Act* and *Financial Administration Act*, as well as federal contracting policy.
- A complex web of financial transactions among Public Works and Government Services Canada, Crown Corporations and communication agencies, involving kickbacks and illegal contributions to a political party in the context of the Sponsorship Program.
- The existence of a “culture of entitlement” among political officials and bureaucrats involved with the Sponsorship Program, including the receipt of monetary and non-monetary benefits.
- A pattern of activity whereby a public servant in retirement did extensive business with former recipients of Sponsorship Program contracts.
- The refusal of Ministers, senior officials in the Prime Minister’s Office and public servants to acknowledge their responsibility for the problems of mismanagement that occurred. (Commission of Inquiry, 2005)

Is it any wonder when reading these findings that the Canadian public’s trust in the public service has dropped dramatically? With examples such as those above, can the public be blamed for questioning whether or not the federal public service is acting according to a set of values and ethics? So, what has the government done to try and salvage the public’s perception of the public service? The next section will outline a few of the initiatives that are relevant to the present discussion.
Initiatives to Enhance Values and Ethics in the Federal Government

The theory with respect to regaining the public’s confidence and repairing the government’s image as one that is ethical and guided by a firm set of values is that by being open and transparent and by instituting policies, procedures and guidelines, then accountability will be ensured. The public wants to know that the government is taking all of these scandals and incidents seriously, learning from them and implementing policies that will provide assurances to the public that they will not happen again. This section of the paper will outline the many initiatives and policies that have been implemented in response to the scandals that have occurred. One problem is that the scandals keep coming so fast that instead of the government having the opportunity to really explain to the public how it is responding, it is instead always in a reactive mode trying to fix problems that have already happened.

In the past six years alone, many government initiatives have been developed either to bring values and ethics to the forefront or to respond to issues dealing with one value or another. The majority of those initiatives, while often touching upon more than one of the values, have been initiated to respond directly to public perception around the government’s ability to be accountable and transparent or open. Much of the effort centers on the notion of a government that is managing for results. For far too long it was recognized that the government could easily tell Canadians about what activities it was doing and could usually identify how much it was spending on those activities. But when asked the question “So what?”, meaning what was the impact of doing those activities and spending that money, the government as a whole was unable to adequately respond. Out of this realization came an increased interest in Results-Based Management (RBM).
The definition of RBM, provided by the Treasury Board (TB) Secretariat website, is “a comprehensive, life cycle approach to management that integrates business strategy, people, processes and measurements to improve decision-making and drive change. The approach focuses on getting the right design early in a process, implementing performance measurement, learning and changing, and reporting performance” (Retrieved from http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/rma/lex-lex_e.asp).

RBM, simply put, is about identifying key results that are expected to be achieved; measuring performance, learning and improving; and then reporting to Parliament and Canadians on what was achieved in a balanced and credible way. Various departments and agencies had begun experimenting with results-based management practices in the 1980s but it has only been in the past ten years or so that the concept has come to be accepted in a more widespread manner across the public service. In 1997, the Office of the Auditor General (OAG) examined the existing state of results-based management in the federal government. The findings at that time indicated that federal departments were not moving well toward a managing for results approach. Again in 2000, the OAG found that, in all but a few cases, progress towards managing for results was very slow. This lent some weight and perhaps even offered the momentum needed in order to obtain the necessary acceptance by government departments.

In March 2000, RBM became even more prominent when the President of the Treasury Board tabled Results for Canadians: A Management Framework for the Government of Canada. The purpose of this document was to set out an agenda for improving and modernizing management practices in federal departments and agencies. The document outlined four broad management commitments for the federal government:
citizen focus, values, results and responsible spending (see generally Results for Canadians). With Results for Canadians, one can see the government’s attempt to blend new public management values with traditional values. The document acknowledged that delegating authority to the front lines where initiative and creativity exist can help achieve gains in program performance and citizens’ quality of life. However, it also championed the necessity to ensure due diligence, proper stewardship, and accountability in the use of public funds.

To reinforce the commitments set out in Results for Canadians, the government released its Policy on Active Monitoring. Under this policy, “Departments are responsible for ensuring that their programs and activities are well managed, and that suitable management practices and controls are in place and working. To this end, they must actively monitor management practices and controls within the department, and take early and effective remedial action in areas where significant deficiencies are encountered or improvements are needed” (Retrieved from http://www.tbs-set.gc.ca/pubs_pol/dcgpubs/am-sa/am-sa1_e.asp#Policy%20Objective%20and%20).

The examples of initiatives where the public service values of accountability and transparency feature prominently do not stop there. Modern comptrollership builds further where Results for Canadians leaves off. It “supports the effective stewardship of resources of all types throughout the federal government with greater attention to results for Canadians” (Retrieved from http://www.tbs-set.gc.ca/cmo_mfc/Intro2/intro_e.asp). It links to the public service values of innovation and service through its focus on risk management and service delivery. It links to the value of accountability through its focus
on control systems. Finally, it focuses on better management overall through the promotion of a shared set of values and ethics.

The government’s Evaluation Policy and Internal Audit Policy are both policies that were designed to support the Results for Canadians and modern comptrollership commitments. They augment efforts within the government for better management of programs and policies, using information based on results that have been achieved. Both policies support accountability by requiring that evaluations and internal audits be conducted on programs and policies in all government departments. The results of the evaluations and audits should then be used as bases for improvement. The policies also require that completed audits and evaluations be made available to the public to ensure that transparency exists. The paper will explore the Evaluation Policy in more depth in Chapter Three.

In 2000, much a result of the aftermath of the HRDC fiasco, the government introduced the Policy on Transfer Payments “to ensure sound management of, control over and accountability for transfer payments” (Retrieved from http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pubs_pol/dcgpubs/tbm_142/ptp1_e.asp). The policy states that “all transfer payments are subject to public scrutiny and must be managed in a manner that is open and transparent to the public, and with due regard to economy, efficiency and effectiveness.” (Retrieved from http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pubs_pol/dcgpubs/tbm_142/ptp1_e.asp). With this policy came the requirement to develop Results-based Management and Accountability Frameworks and Risk-based Audit Frameworks for every grant and contribution program approved by TB. Key
words related to this policy include due diligence, accountability, transparency, results measurement, evaluation and reporting.

In 2003, again mainly in response to the various scandals as well as to the recommendations made in the Tait report, the government released the *Values and Ethics Code for the Public Service*. The objectives state that the Code “sets forth the values and ethics of public service to guide and support public servants in all their professional activities. It will serve to maintain and enhance public confidence in the integrity of the Public Service. The Code will also serve to strengthen respect for, and appreciation of, the role played by the Public Service within Canadian democracy” (retrieved from http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pubs_pol/hrpubs/TB_851/sec-cve1_e.asp#_Toc46202802).

While it is true that it sets out the public service values in one official code, whether it has or will maintain and enhance public confidence in the public service has yet to be determined. A Code in and of itself can do nothing; it is the actions of the politicians and the public service that will boost public perception. The Code did, however, serve to raise the overall level of awareness of values and ethics within the public service.

The Management Accountability Framework (MAF) was established in 2003 to add yet another level of accountability, transparency and integrity into the management process within the government. In basic terms, the MAF outlines a series of management expectations upon which public servants, in particular Deputy Ministers, will be judged. The MAF is comprised of ten elements including, most notably: Public Service Values; Citizen Focused Service; Risk Management; Stewardship; Accountability; and, Results and Performance. Departments are assessed against the ten elements on a yearly basis by TB and opportunities for management improvement are identified.
Following on the heels of the MAF, the Management, Results and Resources Structure Policy came into effect in April 2005. “The Management, Resources and Results Structure Policy supports the development of a common, government-wide approach to the collection, management, and reporting of financial and non-financial performance information. In providing a standard basis for reporting to citizens and Parliament on the alignment of resources, program activities and results, the policy reinforces the government’s commitment to strengthen public sector management and accountability” (Retrieved from http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pubs_pol/dcgpubs/mrrsp-psgrr/mrrsp-psgrr01_e.asp#_Toc90452627). Again, it is obvious that while the government is keeping all public service values in mind, the ones that are priorities are accountability and transparency.

The final example to be provided here of a federal government initiative aimed at increasing the government’s ability to uphold public service values is the Policy on Proactive Disclosure. “The Government of Canada has implemented a series of measures to strengthen public sector management by enhancing transparency and oversight of public resources in the federal government. One of these measures includes the proactive disclosure of financial- and human resources-related information by departments and agencies” (Retrieved from http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pd-dp/index_e.asp). Through this measure, all government departments must disclose all travel and hospitality expenses, all contracts over ten thousand dollars and all transfer payments over twenty-five thousand dollars on their websites. This initiative was largely in response to the scandals around contracts and the misuse of government hospitality and travel funds. It was a huge
undertaking for departments to make this information available but it was also a huge step forward in terms of a transparent public service.

As evidenced by the many examples above, the government has taken gigantic steps towards enhancing values and ethics within the federal government. These steps began with a theory – that increased transparency and accountability will lead to a Canadian public that is more confident in its government. From the theory sprang the numerous policies, guidelines and initiatives as mentioned earlier. The policies, in essence, give public service managers the authority they need to implement specific changes within government practice. In renewing practices based on what has been learned from these scandals and based on the results that have been achieved to date and in communicating those new practices to Canadians, hopefully, Canadians will be in a better position to understand that the public service is truly trying to learn from the mistakes of the past and improve the future.

Clearly, the “deliberations of the 1995-1996 federal Task Force on Public Service Values and Ethics led to the conclusion that several of the most important values in public service are ethical values, that is, they relate to considerations of right, wrong, good and bad” (Kernaghan, 1997, p.49). Arguably, these are the values that the Canadian public has been, and will continue to be, most interested in particularly when the past few years of scandals and improper conduct are taken into consideration. With this in mind, the next section of the paper will look at a function within the federal government that directly relates to the efforts to maintain a government that is fair, transparent and accountable. That function is evaluation.
CHAPTER 3:

THE EVALUATION FUNCTION IN THE CANADIAN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Evaluation is a form of analysis undertaken to help managers make decisions about current or future projects, programs or initiatives. Evaluation helps managers determine how well projects are working and to identify reasons for success or failure … uses accepted research techniques in a systematic way to compile, organize and analyze information about the impact and effects of activities … [and] differs from other forms of analysis in that it concentrates on the links between an organization’s mandate and the results achieved through its activities, rather than on financial or administrative systems and controls (Canadian Evaluation Society, 1989, p. 2).

The History of Evaluation in the Government of Canada

“Legitimation of a federal program evaluation capability came about through the reports of the Royal Commission on Government Organization in 1960-63, commonly referred to as the Glassco Commission” (Muller-Clemm and Barnes, 1997, p. 51). The Commission highlighted the importance of maintaining managerial accountability to the government. While the presence of evaluation within government can be traced back to the Glassco Commission in the 60s, the 1970s really marked the introduction of evaluation “as a centrally recognized and formal function of management in order to assist in decision-making on planning and designing programs, determining their respective priorities, ascertaining and assessing the extent to which existing programs were achieving their objectives with the resources provided, and considering cost-effective alternatives to existing programs” (Aucoin, 2005, p.6). 1973 saw the introduction of Operational Performance Measurement Systems highlighting the importance of measuring the performance of programs and policies. In 1975, the Cabinet
Evaluation Studies Program was conducted while in 1976 the Royal Commission on Financial Management and Accountability, otherwise known as the Lambert Commission, was formed. “The first formalized program evaluation policy in Canada, Policy 1977-47, was put forward by the Treasury Board. In this policy, managers were reminded that they were required to conduct periodic evaluations in carrying out their responsibilities for the management of their programs” (Treasury Board, 1977, p.2). In 1978, the Office of the Comptroller General was established to provide an oversight and accountability function for government and the Task Force on Program Evaluability looked at improvements in management practices and controls. Also in 1978, the Speech from the Throne made mention of a review by Parliament of evaluation of programs by the government. Between 1978 and 1981, there existed a Program Evaluation Branch within the Office of the Comptroller General. 1979 saw the release of the Lambert Commission report which, among other things, pointed to the need to improve program evaluation within the federal government and to review government programs every five years.

During the 1980s, several notable items stand out. First, the decision was made and then firmly entrenched in TB Policy 1982-8 to include performance information in the annual reports to Parliament. Evaluation played, and continues to play, a major role in the government’s ability to report on performance. Changes to the Financial Administration Act led to evaluation reforms and working standards were developed putting an even stronger emphasis on senior managers to evaluate their programs. The reforms in that decade included reforms aimed at improving evaluation products as well as reforms looking to improve quality assurance and develop evaluation standards.
Throughout that decade, the federal government, more specifically the Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS), had a strong evaluation function and provided a lot of support to government departments. Towards the end of the decade however, the focus on evaluation shifted to a focus on audit.

The 1990s brought with them a difficult time for government in general. Program Review brought major cutbacks and support for both the audit and evaluation functions waned. TBS support for evaluation basically ceased to exist. Where the two functions continued to subsist, it was articulated in the 1994 Review Policy that both audit and evaluation should be joined together so the majority of what groups were left were housed under one roof. However, in 2000, a study conducted on the Review Policy found “that to effectively support sound management practices internal audit and evaluation functions needed to be distinct and separate. It also recognized the increasing demand on evaluation to support management in the development of evaluation frameworks and performance measures” (TBS, 2004, p. 1).

With that realization and due to quality concerns that had arisen in the absence of a strong evaluation function in the government, TB released the 2001 Evaluation Policy. The Policy separated the internal audit function and evaluation function once again and also expanded the scope of evaluations to include not only programs, but policies and initiatives as well. The Evaluation Policy Statement declares that

“it is government policy that departments and agencies embed evaluation into their management practices:

- to help design policies, programs and initiatives that clearly define expected results and that embody sound performance management, reporting and accountability provisions at their outset; and
• to help to assess in a rigorous and objective manner the results of government policies, programs, and initiatives, including their impacts both intended and unintended, and alternative ways of achieving expected results” (TBS, 2001, p. 4).

The Evaluation Policy is the most recent attempt by TB to firmly embed the evaluation function in all departments and agencies in the federal government. Through the policy, Deputy Ministers are required to establish an evaluation capacity within their department. There must be a head of evaluation to oversee the conduct of evaluations and to promote evaluation and results-based management in the organization. There must be a senior level evaluation committee established to hear the results of all evaluations and to approve the findings and recommendations made within those evaluations. Also, each department must develop an annual evaluation plan clearly outlining, to TB and the public, what evaluations will be conducted on a yearly basis.

Perhaps even more importantly for this particular discussion, when evaluations have been completed and approved by the evaluation committee, they must be forwarded to TBS and then made available on departmental websites. Finally, TBS is strongly encouraging, in the interests of accountability and transparency, that departments also post their management responses or action plans on their websites. The reasoning behind this move, that of making reports accessible to the public via the Internet, is that in order to be accountable and transparent the government must get the results of the checks and balances it uses, in this case evaluation, out there for public scrutiny. If the

---

2 Management Responses or Action Plans are responses prepared by the managers being evaluated that lay out exactly how they will respond to the recommendations found in the evaluations in order to improve the management and outcomes of their programs, policies or initiatives.
evaluations are conducted but are not available to the public, then how will they know whether or not the government is accountable and/or achieving any results?

The chart below, reproduced from Evaluation Function in the Government of Canada, provides an excellent summary of how and where evaluation fits in the grander scheme of the federal government.

Chart 1: Evaluation Function within Government of Canada

(TBS-CEE, 2004, p.9)
Linking evaluation and public service values

“Program evaluation in federal departments and agencies should involve the systematic gathering of verifiable information on a program and demonstrable evidence on its results and cost-effectiveness. Its purpose should be to periodically produce credible, timely, useful and objective findings on programs appropriate for resource allocation, program improvement and accountability” (Program Evaluation Branch, 1981, p.3). In this statement alone, a solid link can be made between evaluation and the values of effectiveness, neutrality, integrity and, of course, accountability. The evaluation function in the federal government is linked in many ways to public service values and ethics. In fact, the systematic conduct of evaluations is one way for a government department to ensure that it is upholding several of those values.

Evaluation is one aspect of an “open, democratic process to construct the content of accountability – what accountability means, how it is measured, and to whom providers are accountable – [which] is no less than what citizens deserve and expect” (House, 2004, p.9). In examining policies, programs and initiatives and in exploring whether these have been successful, cost-effective and relevant endeavours, evaluations can provide the government with a great deal of information that can then be used to make improvements, to make resource allocation decisions or to provide Canadians with an objective view of how well the government is doing in providing the results that Canadians want. Indeed, among central agencies in government there is an “ongoing recognition that all balanced policy decisions can and should be based on results, with evaluation serving as a tool for getting there” (Gauthier, 2004, p. 153).
“Given the strong focus on results information in public sector management reform, evaluators have the theories, tools, knowledge, and skills needed to bring about a results-based public service. They are best placed, by a considerable degree, to play a leading role if a more activist agenda is pursued seeking to align evaluation more closely with the results-based agenda of governments” (Gauthier, 2004, p. 159). While the evaluation function might not be the first, nor even close to the first, thing that the public thinks about when it considers values and ethics in the government, it is coming to be more recognized as a strong tool in the government’s quest to achieve accountability and transparency. The status of the internal audit function has certainly grown in the past few years, particularly as a response to the Sponsorship Scandal, and this may have come at a cost to evaluation. When people think about accountability, they think about controls and systems and audits, not necessarily about evaluations. However, “evaluation can and will be used in many ways and at many levels to improve programs, influence resource allocation, guide policy development and enhance accountability” (Rayner, 1986, p. 10). In fact, “evaluation frameworks are in effect accountability frameworks for program performance and hence could be seen as cornerstones of an accountability regime” (Maxwell, 1986, p. 45).

It is interesting to note that “the words that are most frequently used to characterize evaluators and evaluation are objective, independent, rational, credible, and reliable” (Michalos, 1992, p. 67). Given the rather obvious linkages to public service values, it is important that we not set aside the evaluation function as just another thing the government does. Indeed, one would think that the government would be promoting those activities that are most responding to those values and ethics. The next chapter will
discuss just how much prominence government departments are giving their evaluation functions, as evidenced through their accessibility on the internet.

CHAPTER 4:

HOW PROMINENT IS THE EVALUATION FUNCTION?

A WEBSITE ANALYSIS

“The inexorable increase in the size of public expenditure budgets and the insatiable demand for more and better government-financed programs have contributed to a heightened political significance in the evaluation of those programs” (Knox, 1996, p.1). Given this, one would think that all government departments would be jumping at the chance to give some prominence to their evaluation functions, not only to serve their political masters but also to prove to Canadians that they are organizations which clearly have and uphold a strong sense of values and ethics.

To examine this issue more fully, the author decided to explore the public face of a sample of government departments. That public face is the website. Using the list of federal institutions found at http://canada.gc.ca/depts/major/depind_e.html, the author analyzed a total of 35 websites. The list used by the author, retrieved in October, 2005, contained a list of only 97 departments and agencies. The current list contained on this site has more than 97 listings due to the fact that it was updated on January 27, 2006. As of October 2005, the percentage of the total list that was analyzed is 36%.

However, according to a recent TBS Centre of Excellence for Evaluation (CEE) report, in 2004 87 departments and agencies fell within the definition of a department as prescribed through section 2 of the Financial Administration Act. “Of these, 42
report[ed] an evaluation function. The other 45 [were] typically small agencies with essentially no permanent, in house evaluation capacity” (TBS-CEE, 2004, p. 11). With this in mind, and hoping to find as many evaluation websites as possible so as to have some data to work with, the author attempted to include the majority of large government departments in the sample analyzed. Appendix A provides the list of which departments and agencies were included in the sample.

The first question to be researched was whether or not the evaluation function could be found using the search function on each website. Not expecting to see a link on the home page of each organization, the author surmised that if someone was specifically looking for the evaluation function, the search key would be a logical place to start. Using the information technology world’s three click standard, if the evaluation function was found within the first 2 returned results, it was given a rating of “Excellent”. If the evaluation function was found within the first 3 or 4 returned results, it was given a rating of “Average”. 5 to 8 returned results was rated “Below Average” while 9 to 20 was rated as “Poor”. There is also a “Results Not Found” rating for those instances where the author was unable to find the evaluation function using each method.

The author first searched for the term “evaluation”. Graph 1 shows the actual returned results for this particular search in terms of total values. In terms of the related percentages, 11.43% of the websites received a rating of “Excellent”, 0% was considered “Average”, 2.86% were “Below Average”, 5.71% were “Poor” and in 80% of the cases, the evaluation function could not be found using the search term “evaluation”. The fact that the search function failed to turn up anything in 80% of cases would suggest that it is
not prominent at all. However, it is more appropriate to examine the results in context with the others searches that were conducted.

**Graph 1: Results Using the Search Term “Evaluation”**

Using the same rating scale as above, the author then went on to search for the term “program evaluation”. In many contexts within the federal government, program evaluation and evaluation are used synonymously and it was necessary to search for both terms to ensure that accurate results were gathered. Graph 2 shows the actual returned results for this particular search in terms of total values. In terms of the related percentages, 11.43% of the websites received a rating of “Excellent”, 8.57% were considered “Average”, 5.71% were “Below Average”, 8.57% were “Poor” and in 65.71% of the cases, the evaluation function could not be found using the search term “program evaluation”. This suggests that government departments are still using the term program evaluation more frequently than simply the term evaluation. However, the results still indicate that 79.99% of the results are considered “below average” or worse.
Graph 2: Results Using the Search Term “Program Evaluation”

The next two searches again used the same rating scales. Using either the site map or the A-Z Index on the websites, the author searched once more for either “evaluation” or “program evaluation”. The bar charts that follow show the results of those probes.

Graph 3: Site Map or A-Z Index Using the Term “Evaluation”
In terms of percentages, 17.14% of cases received a rating of “excellent” when using either the site map or the A-Z Index. In no case was there a rating of either “average” or “below average”. In 2.86% of cases the rating was “poor” while, again, in 80% of cases, the evaluation function could not be found using this method.

**Graph 4: Site Map or A-Z Index Using the Term “Program Evaluation”**

Yet again, the percentages show a pattern. When searching the site map or the A-Z Index for the term “Program Evaluation”, both the “excellent” and “poor” ratings stand at 5.56% while the evaluation function could not be found in 88.89% of cases using this method.

The above four graphs show a rather disturbing trend. In the context within which we are living and within which the government is operating, it is astounding to realize that in only a limited number of cases can someone who is looking for it actually find the evaluation function of the sampled departments by using what would seem to be
the simplest methods available. It would seem, at first blush, that the federal government has an opportunity to advance its position with respect to values such as accountability and transparency by publicizing its evaluation function but it is clearly missing the link.

In only 2 of the 35 websites analyzed, Finance and Environment Canada, was there a prominent link to evaluation on the home page of the organization. In these cases, it was linked with audit and proactive disclosure which leads one to believe that those particular departments want to show the public how they are being transparent and accountable in their activities.

In those cases where the above searches did not yield any results, further exploration on the “About Us” page of the website did surrender some additional results. For example, when reviewing the websites of departments like Environment Canada, Transport Canada, Canada Revenue Agency and the Canadian Food Inspection Agency, the evaluation function was located either by looking for evaluation, audit and evaluation or by looking under the corporate services area. However, if someone was not familiar with the federal government and did not know that in many cases, the evaluation function is housed within the corporate services groups in departments, they would never have found the appropriate links.

In several cases, such as Social Development Canada, Parks Canada, Industry Canada, DIAND, HRSDC, Canadian Heritage and Correctional Service of Canada, although the searches above may have yielded a result, it was a false result because the link only took the reader to evaluation reports, not to a separate website devoted to the evaluation function. Also, in a few cases such as that of the Justice Canada website, while the yielded search results did not lead directly to the evaluation function, it did lead
to a product on the function’s website, making it relatively easy to track back to the actual website.

Although using the search function did not reveal as much data as was hoped, the author persisted in searching through the organizational charts and “About Us” pages in the hopes of finding more evaluation websites. Below is the list of questions upon which this portion of the website analysis was based:

1. Does the website provide a description of the evaluation function within the department?
2. Does the website mention in any way a link between evaluation and the public service values such as transparency and accountability?
3. Are evaluation reports available on the website?
4. Is there a management response or action plan available on the site?
5. Are there resources or links to relevant evaluation sources available on the site?

The results in Graph 5 below present a pictorial view of the results for each question.

As can be seen, only 13 of the 35 websites reviewed provided a description of the evaluation function within the department. Of those 13, 5 of the descriptions were extremely brief and would not provide a reader with any real content upon which they could rely to figure out what the function was really about.

12 of the 35 websites mentioned, in some way, a link between the work being done by the evaluators and public services values, most notably accountability. In many cases, this link was a cursory link; simply a brief mention that evaluation was a management tool used to assist managers in achieving results and being accountable for those results.

As a marker of transparency, the author explored each site, whether it was the department’s website or the evaluation function’s sub-site, to determine whether or not
department’s were making their evaluation reports available to the public via the internet.

It should be noted at this point that as per the Evaluation Policy, reports should be made available to the public in all cases. The results of this search were somewhat more agreeable. As can be seen in the graph below, 28 of the 35 (80%) sites did have evaluation reports available. The date ranges in terms of how far back the reports went varied from site to site, with some sites having reports back to 1995 and others only having reports beginning in 2004. Some sites had a combination of complete reports and simple summaries while others focused on providing the reports in their entirety. Since the number of sites carrying evaluation reports is much greater than the number of sub-sites that actually describe an evaluation function, it is quite obvious that some departments are at least making the minimal attempt to comply with the policy by getting the reports up on the internet. Unfortunately, by not having a separate sub-site that is given some prominence, those departments are yet again missing an opportunity to show the linkages between evaluation and public service values and ethics.

**Graph 5: Results of Further Site Analysis**

![Graph showing results of further site analysis](image)

When examining whether or not the reports were available, the author also explored whether departments were going that one step further by making management
responses or action plans available to the public. As mentioned earlier, these responses are the plans, developed by the managers who have just been evaluated, detailing how they intend to respond to the recommendations found in evaluation reports. They are, in effect, the managerial commitment to make changes or improvements as per the evaluation. While not as positive as the previous finding, the results still show that 65.71%, or 23 out of 35, of the sites did make management responses available on the web site. The fact that more departments are exhibiting a willingness to at least make these reports and responses accessible would suggest that there is some acceptance on the part of departments of the fact that in order to be seen as accountable and transparent, they must at least do this much.

The final question that was explored was whether or not the websites had any resources or links to relevant evaluation sources available. More specifically, did the website provide links to TBS Centre of Excellence for Evaluation or other relevant sources such and the Evaluation Policy or the Transfer Payments Policy, etc. The findings in this case were extremely disappointing. Only 5 of the 35 (14%) websites examined had any such resource. Again, this finding leads one to believe that the majority of the departments and agencies are doing the bare minimum required under the Policy when it comes to ensuring that their evaluation findings are accessible and that they are being transparent.

The above findings are not to suggest that the evaluation work is not actually being done in all of the departments, simply to suggest that the departments are not taking advantage of one of the easiest means available to reach the Canadian public and prove to them that they are accountable, spending responsibly and being transparent in their
dealings. More effective use of the website in all of these cases as a means of promoting the evaluation function would go a long way in this regard.

As a general comment, absolutely no consistency was found across departments or across the various evaluation functions in government in terms of whether a site exists, what content is on the site or whether evaluation reports should be separate from “other” publications on the sites. Furthermore, there was no consistency in terms of where the evaluation function was housed in departments. Some were found within the Corporate Services area of a department; some were located in a Performance and Information Management branch; others were located in the Policy area of a department and the list goes on. Perhaps some consideration should be given to not only standardizing the tools and methods used by evaluators, but also to standardizing where the evaluation function should rest within a department, what content the function should be making available on the internet and where on the departmental website that should be found.

CHAPTER 5:
CONCLUSION

“Evaluation operates in a complex environment that involves partnerships with other federal organizations, with other levels of government, with the private sector or with not-for-profit entities. In addition, as the delivery of programs is devolved to other jurisdictions, the evaluation of underlying policies increases in importance. Evaluation contributes to improvements in policy, as well as program design and delivery” (TBS, 2004, p. 8). This statement does a good job of describing the complex environment within which evaluation functions must operate. However, while it does point to the fact
that evaluation is, and should be seen as, a management tool, it does not adequately reflect the other ways in which it can assist a government department in achieving its objectives vis-à-vis values and ethics. It has been stated that “a sound basis of values and ethics is critical both to reduce the likelihood that there will be significant problems in programs and to ensure that when they do occur, problems will be dealt with properly” (OAG, 2003, p.1). These are exactly the types of issues that the evaluation function was designed to address.

“Canadians rightly expect a lot of their public sector. They expect the Government to pursue policies and programs that take into account and are responsive to public priorities. They expect the Government to operate in an open, transparent and accountable manner. They want to know that government programs and services are well managed. Above all, they want assurances that they are receiving good value for their tax dollars” (TBS, 2005b, p.1). This statement clearly depicts how the government begins with a theory – that accountability and transparency will breed good government – then follows up with policy in order to ensure that changes will be implemented and new practices established. These new practices will then provide the public with the assurances they are searching for. In terms of receiving good value for tax dollars, the government has followed this process to the letter. It recognized the need for an examination of the results being achieved and it developed the Evaluation Policy to solidify the requirement for evaluations and the communication of the evaluations results to the public. The policy led to the development of an evaluation capacity within government and it is hoped that in doing what is supposed to be done under the policy,
the evaluation function will in turn be a key element in the government’s ability to provide the kinds of assurances that the public seeks.

Chapters 2 and 3 dealt with public service values and ethics and how the evaluation function relates to those values and ethics. It has been shown, many times over, how evaluation relates to not one, but many values. However, it most directly relates to the values of accountability and transparency and the implementation of the Evaluation Policy is simply one measure that visibly demonstrates how evaluations can support an accountable and transparent government.

Chapter 4, in the examination of a sample of government websites, provided evidence to the fact that the government is currently missing the boat in terms of linking evaluation to values and ethics. The use of the website to communicate the existence of evaluation and what the evaluation function does and means can only be considered sub-standard. While there is more of a likelihood of finding evaluation reports and management responses on the sites, there is very little available to put these all into context. These findings have major implications in terms of the Canadian public having the ability to scrutinize the work being done by the government. All indications point to the fact that the public sector is making solid progress in terms of instituting appropriate policies and procedures to provide the checks and balances needed to ensure that our funds are being used in the right ways and that these expenditures are producing the desired results. What seems to be lacking is a coordinated set of mechanisms to ensure that the results are communicated to the public in an open and transparent way. Canadians have the right, based on solid evidence as provided through means such as evaluations, to decide for themselves whether or not public expenditures are useful and
warranted and whether or not they think the government, and the public service that serves it, are doing a good job. If the government as a whole, including everyone from politicians to public servants, is not willing to open itself up to this type of scrutiny, then it will never be able to profess itself as a government that is transparent and accountable to its voters.

These findings suggest that consideration should certainly be given to setting some type of a standard with respect to the existence and content of evaluation websites. This should include a clear description of the evaluation function and how it assists the government in its quest to uphold public service values and ethics, publication of all evaluation reports and management responses in a timely manner on the site as well as links to further resources on evaluation. Consideration should also be given to granting further prominence to the evaluation function on departmental websites or, at a minimum, ensuring that the evaluation function websites can be found in the same place on all departmental websites.

“The government recognizes that, ultimately, its success will be determined by how well its programs and services meets the needs of citizens; how satisfied Canadians are with the way it allocates its resources and accounts for its performance; and the pride public service employees have in their work and the trust Canadians have in them to do it well” (TBS, 2005c, p. 39). Evaluation has a big role to play in supporting this success. The next step for evaluation functions in the Government of Canada will be to ensure that Canadians understand that role by actively communicating the results of evaluations and the ways in which managers are continuously working to make management improvements.
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APPENDIX A: WEBSITE ANALYSIS
LIST OF FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES ANALYZED

1. Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada
2. Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA)
3. Canada Firearms Centre
4. Canada Revenue Agency (CRA)
5. Canada School of Public Service
6. Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency
7. Canadian Food Inspection Agency
8. Canadian Heritage
9. Canadian International Development Agency
10. Canadian Transportation Agency
11. Citizenship and Immigration Canada
12. Correctional Service Canada (CSC)
13. Environment Canada
14. Finance Canada, Department of
15. Fisheries and Oceans Canada
16. Foreign Affairs Canada (FAC)
17. Health Canada
18. Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (HRSDC)
19. Indian and Northern Affairs Canada
20. Industry Canada
21. Infrastructure Canada
22. Justice Canada, Department of
23. National Defence
24. Natural Resources Canada
25. Parks Canada
26. Passport Canada
27. Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada
28. Public Service Human Resources Management Agency of Canada
29. Public Works and Government Services Canada
30. Social Development Canada (SD)
31. Status of Women Canada
32. Statistics Canada
33. Transport Canada
34. Veterans Affairs Canada
35. Western Economic Diversification Canada
APPENDIX B: LIST OF ACRONYMS

CEE – Centre of Excellence for Evaluation
DIAND – Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
GOV – Governance
HRDC – Human Resources Development Canada
HRSDC – Human Resources and Skills Development Canada
MAF – Management Accountability Framework
MAIS – Master of Arts Integrated Studies
OAG – Office of the Auditor General
RBM – Results-based Management
TB – Treasury Board
TBS – Treasury Board Secretariat