



Canadian
Heritage

Patrimoine
canadien

Canada



**Evaluation of the Canadian Studies Program/
Canada History Fund
2009-10 to 2013-14**

Evaluation Services Directorate

July 14, 2015



Cette publication est également disponible en français.

This publication is available in accessible PDF format
on the Internet at <http://www.pch.gc.ca>

© Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada,
Catalogue No. CH7-28/2015E-PDF
ISBN: 978-0-660-03085-2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	I
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. PROGRAM PROFILE.....	2
2.1 Background and Context	2
2.2 Objectives and Outcomes	2
2.3 Program Management, Governance, Target Groups, Key Stakeholders and Delivery Partners	2
2.4 Program Resources	3
2.5 Program Changes since Last Evaluation.....	3
3. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	4
3.1 Evaluation Scope, Timing and Quality Control.....	4
3.2 Evaluation Questions by Issue Area	4
3.3 Evaluation Methods	4
3.3.1 Preliminary Consultation	4
3.3.2 Lines of Evidence	5
3.3.3 Methodological Limitations.....	6
4. FINDINGS - RELEVANCE.....	7
4.1 Core Issue 1: Continued Need for the Program	7
4.2 Core Issue 2: Alignment with Government Priorities.....	10
4.3 Core Issue 3: Alignment with Federal Roles and Responsibilities.....	13
5. FINDINGS – PERFORMANCE	15
5.1 Core Issue 4: Achievement of Expected Outcomes.....	15
5.1.1 Achievement of Immediate Outcomes.....	15
5.1.2 Achievement of Intermediate Outcomes	18
5.1.3 Achievement of Ultimate Outcome	22
5.1.4 Unintended Impacts	23
5.1.5 Best Practices, Successes, Challenges, and Lessons Learned with Respect to Project Effectiveness.....	24
5.2 Core Issue 5: Demonstration of Efficiency and Economy.....	25
5.3 Performance Monitoring and Measurement	30

6.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	33
6.1	Conclusions.....	33
6.1.1	Relevance.....	33
6.1.2	Performance – Achievement of Expected Outcomes	33
6.1.3	Performance – Efficiency and Economy	34
6.1.4	Performance – Performance Measurement and Monitoring.....	35
6.2	Recommendations and Management Response.....	36
	APPENDIX A: LOGIC MODEL.....	40
	APPENDIX B: OVERVIEW OF ORGANIZATIONS FUNDED BY CSP/CHF	42
	APPENDIX C: REFERENCE LEVELS AND ACTUAL EXPENDITURES FOR CSP/CHF	44
	APPENDIX D: TBS CORE EVALUATION ISSUES	47
	APPENDIX E: EVALUATION FRAMEWORK.....	48
	APPENDIX F: NUMBER OF COPIES OF LEARNING MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED BY CSP/CHF PROJECTS, 2012-13 AND 2013-14.....	54
	APPENDIX G: NUMBER OF ACTIVITIES AS PART OF CSP/CHF PROJECTS, 2012-13 AND 2013-14	56
	APPENDIX H: TYPES OF FORMAL/INFORMAL NETWORKS MAINTAINED BY CSP/CHF PROJECTS, 2012-13 AND 2013-14	57
	APPENDIX I: SOCIAL MEDIA AND WEB STATISTICS FOR CSP/CHF PROJECTS, 2012-13 TO 2013-14	58
	APPENDIX J: PARTICIPATION IN LEARNING ACTIVITIES AND NUMBERS OF VISITORS ACCESSING ONLINE MATERIALS PRODUCED BY CSP/CHF PROJECTS, 2012-13 AND 2013-14 COMBINED	59
	APPENDIX K: TOTAL NUMBER OF EDUCATORS OR SPECIALISTS WHO ARE ACCESSING MATERIALS PRODUCED THROUGH CSP/CHF PROJECTS, 2012-13 AND 2013-14	60
	APPENDIX L: BIBLIOGRAPHY	61

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AANDC	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada
AC	Action Canada Foundation
ACS	Association for Canadian Studies
CIC	Citizenship and Immigration Canada
CNHS	Canada's National History Society
CSP/CHF	Canadian Studies Program/Canada History Fund
DCB	Dictionary of Canadian Biography (UofT/ULaval)
ESD	Evaluation Services Directorate
GGCLC	Governor General's Canadian Leadership Conference
HC	Historica Canada
LAC	Library and Archives Canada
LoP	Library of Parliament
MPSB	Memory Project Speakers Bureau
O&M	Operations and Maintenance
PCH	Department of Canadian Heritage
RCGS	Royal Canadian Geographical Society
RPP	Report on Plans and Priorities
TCE	The Canadian Encyclopedia / Encyclopedia of Music in Canada
UBC	University of British Columbia
UofT	University of Toronto
ULaval	Université Laval
VAC	Veterans Affairs Canada

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document constitutes the final report on the evaluation of the Canadian Studies Program/ Canada History Fund (CSP/CHF). The evaluation was conducted in fulfillment of requirements under the *Financial Administration Act* that states that all grants and contributions programs must be evaluated every five years.

Overview of the Program

CSP/CHF supports the development and/or enhancement of learning materials, the organization of learning and developmental experiences, and the establishment and maintenance of networks that give Canadians opportunities to enhance their understanding of Canada, thus building an informed and engaged citizenry. Its mandate is to encourage Canadians to learn about Canada's history, civics, and public policy.

The CSP/CHF functions as a grants and contributions program and is delivered through nationally significant, legally incorporated Canadian history and civics organizations and post-secondary educational institutions that develop teaching materials and learning activities aimed at increasing knowledge and understanding of Canadian history, culture, society, values, and public policy.

The CSP/CHF is managed by the Citizen Participation Branch, Citizenship, Heritage and Regions Sector, at Canadian Heritage and is housed under the Community Engagement Directorate. The Directorate is responsible for program coordination, governance, and expected results.

The program underwent significant changes since its last evaluation. These changes include the following:

- The target group of the ultimate outcome was refined to focus on “all Canadians”, rather than having a focus on youth;
- The program was streamlined from three components to one component only (Strategic Initiatives), which also decreased the number of eligible organizations supported by the program;
- The total staff complement was reduced to correspond with the reduction in program complexity and number of funding recipients; and
- The name of the program was changed from the Canadian Studies Program to the Canada History Fund in 2013.

Over the five fiscal years covered in the evaluation, the total budget (salary, O&M and Gs and Cs) for the CSP/CHF was \$17.7 million and actual expenditures were \$27.2 million.

Documentation shows that additional expenditure can be attributed to the following two factors: the transfer of responsibility for funding certain initiatives from other Departmental programs to

the CHF, including the Online Works of Reference projects and Action Canada; and, the reallocation of Departmental funding to the CHF to support governmental priorities such as the commemoration of the Bicentennial of the War of 1812.

Evaluation Approach and Methodology

Context and purpose

The evaluation of CSP/CHF covers the period from 2009-2010 through 2013-2014 and addresses the core evaluation issues of relevance and performance, including effectiveness, efficiency and economy, in accordance with the Treasury Board Secretariat Policy on Evaluation (2009). The evaluation also looked at the program's design and delivery, areas for improvement, and program performance measurement information. The evaluation was led by the Evaluation Services Directorate (ESD) of the Department of Canadian Heritage.

Methodological approach

The findings and conclusions in the report are based on more than one line of evidence, unless otherwise stated. The evaluation included a literature review, document and file review, administrative data review, key informant interviews with seven PCH staff and four funded organizations; and case studies of four funding recipients.

Because the program underwent significant changes early on in the evaluation period, the evaluation focuses mainly on the latter three years (2011-2012 and 2013-2014). Given implementation of the streamlined program in 2011 and challenges related to performance measurement data, administrative data on project outcomes were used for only the two most recent years (2012-2013 and 2013-2014).

Limitations

Limitations were mitigated by the use of a multi-method approach to generate evidence on the evaluation questions from more than one line of enquiry and from different (internal and external) perspectives. The methodological limitations encountered in this evaluation include absence of evidence from non-funded organizations; limited program-wide data on the program's intermediate and ultimate outcomes (e.g., missing data for some projects for some indicators and years; data from only a small number of projects to be able to address some indicators); and a bias, in documentation and interviews, in favour of discussing relevance and outcomes related to history (this is to the exclusion of discussion of the program's two other focus areas, civics and public policy). These limitations were taken into account when developing the findings, conclusions and recommendations put forward in this evaluation report.

Findings

Relevance

The continued need for the CSP/CHF is demonstrated through research showing that Canadians feel knowledge of history produces positive outcomes such as unity, identity, social cohesion and active citizenship; research with the public and youth that shows low knowledge of Canadian history; and perceptions of experts in the field show that this knowledge deficit is linked to gaps in provincial curricula. Need for the program is further demonstrated by demand for the activities and resources being created by the funded projects.

The CSP/CHF is aligned with both Government of Canada and departmental priorities, especially those related to history and sharing and expressing Canadian identity and heritage. The CSP/CHF is aligned with federal responsibilities for fostering Canadian identity and values and for undertaking initiatives that promote social cohesion, civic engagement, and national unity.

Performance – Achievement of Expected Outcomes

For the period covered by the evaluation, the CSP/CHF has funded projects that attained the program's immediate intended outcomes: namely, delivering activities, creating and disseminating materials, and supporting networks related to history, civics, and public policy. A total of nine organizations were funded through 19 separate contribution agreements. The projects demonstrate a variety of approaches to sharing knowledge about history, civics, and public policy, including tactile resources, digital/multimedia materials, experiential learning, and live, in-person knowledge sharing. Between 2012 and 2014, 902,664 copies of resources were distributed. These materials and resources include magazine issues, websites, e-newsletters, videos and films, reports, e-journals, articles, education guides, promotional brochures, an online game, giant maps, posters, and lesson plans. Between 2012 and 2014, 2,354 learning activities were held, including classroom visits, public dialogues, workshops, webinars, a contest, and conferences that spanned several days. Website engagement was notable with 8.9 million unique visitors in 2012-2013 and 6.1 million unique visitors in 2013-2014, to the websites of funding recipients, 92 percent of which was attributed to the Online Works of Reference, a project funded under the program, until the transfer to the Canadian Museum of History in 2014-2015. There were 178,001 participants in formal and informal networks maintained by project recipients in 2013-2014, and most funded organizations reported, qualitatively, growth in the number of participants as a result of their funded project. These networks are used to disseminate information about activities and materials, as well as to distribute content on Canadian history, civics, and public policy. Network participants include educators as well as history specialists and interested Canadians.

The program's intermediate outcomes have been achieved through the thousands of learning activities and resources that have been provided to youth, Canadians, educators, and specialists to learn about and access information on Canadian history, civics, and public policy. Students across the country were reached with materials and activities, particularly those made available through projects by Canada's National History Society (CNHS), the Royal Canadian

Geographical Society (RCGS), and Historica Canada's Memory Project Speakers Bureau (MPSB). For example, an estimated 16,000 students were exposed to the RCGS War of 1812 resources during the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 school years; lesson plans and education content posted to canadashistory.ca garnered thousands of views, potentially exposing hundreds of thousands of students to these ideas; and the MPSB reached hundreds of thousands, mainly students, through its classroom presentations. Furthermore, Historica Canada's Heritage Minutes – two of which were developed through CSP/CHF funds during the evaluation period – have been broadcast to millions of Canadians on television networks and movie screens and are available for viewing online. At least 60,000 educators and specialists have been reached by the funded projects, and their buy-in and participation in activities has been important in helping to disseminate some resources widely to students.

Leadership and collaboration in Canada's history, civics, and public policy sectors has been an outcome of some projects and was pointed out by some key informants as an area of opportunity for fostering collaboration and leadership between organizations. Some funded projects, like those undertaken by the Action Canada Foundation, the Governor General's Canadian Leadership Conference, and the Association for Canadian Studies, are explicitly connecting current and future leaders in the areas of history, civics, and public policy, and are maintaining networks of these individuals. Some funded recipients collaborated with other like-minded organizations to help distribute, develop, and deliver project learning materials and activities.

The program's current ultimate outcome is articulated as "Canadians enhance their understanding of Canada's history, civics, and public policy". The evaluation has identified difficulties in measuring this outcome, including the existence of other initiatives to enhance Canadians' knowledge – such as the initiatives of other federal government programs – which can make it difficult to attribute any increases in knowledge to the program. As a result, the indicator that has been developed to measure this is "percentage of Canadians reached by CHF who have enhanced their knowledge of Canadian history, civics, or public policy". This indicator focuses solely on measuring knowledge change among participants and end users of the materials and activities generated through funded projects. To date there have been some projects that have attempted to gather data to address this indicator, such as evidence showing that direct beneficiaries of the projects have increased their knowledge. However, collection of this information has been uneven across projects, and this information can be difficult to gather for projects whose end users are reached through intermediaries (e.g., teachers, specialists, leaders). To measure this indicator, the program has articulated the intention for standardized data collection, beginning with revising a reporting tool in 2015.

Performance – Efficiency and Economy

With an original allocation of \$17.7 million, the program expended \$27.2 million over five years covered by this evaluation. The variance between the reference levels and actual expenditures can be attributed to the two factors previously stated (i.e., the transfer of responsibility for funding certain initiatives from other departmental programs to the CHF and to reallocation of departmental funding to the CHF to support governmental priorities such as the commemoration of the Bicentennial of the War of 1812).

The administrative cost of the program to overall funding envelope was 14.5 percent over the evaluation period, but when considering only the most recent three-year period, this ratio is 5.5 percent. The lower administrative ratio can be attributed primarily to funding a smaller number of experienced organizations, streamlining the program to one component and the use of multi-year funding agreements.

The program is complementary to other federal government programs. There are initiatives undertaken by Parks Canada, Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC), Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC), Library and Archives Canada (LAC), Library of Parliament (LoP), Elections Canada (EC), and Veterans Affairs Canada (VAC) that complement those of CSP/CHF. CHF also complements provincial funding programs, such as those available in Alberta, Manitoba, and Newfoundland and Labrador, which are aimed at generating knowledge about events in provincial history or preserving the heritage of a particular region or group. Also, it complements work being undertaken by non-governmental groups, including those supported by the program and others. A review of funded projects shows that while the projects undertaken by funded organizations have a broader target reach than youth, some CHF project have an impact on youth which are deemed complementary to the youth programs (i.e. Youth Take Charge and Exchanges Canada) within the Department.

There is no evidence that an alternative model would lead to cost savings. All projects have leveraged funding from other sources, including other federal departments/agencies (e.g., Parks Canada, Citizenship and Immigration Canada), private donors, corporations, and foundations. Other sources of funding included funding recipients' own revenue. Some in-kind contributions have been made, such as donations of scholarly work, office space, and presenters.

There is strong satisfaction with elements of program design among staff and funding recipients. Administrative processes are clear and straightforward for recipients, and the governance of the program and its place within PCH are appropriate. There may be non-governmental organizations in Canada that deliver programming which aims to teach Canadians about history, civics, and public policy, including some that are not currently funded by CSP/CHF.

Performance – Performance Measurement and Monitoring

Measurement and monitoring is in place but is challenging to aggregate due to the great variety of projects, possible outputs, and potential interpretations of some indicators. There is a need for greater clarity in the information being collected from recipients and identification of indicators that can be consistently and meaningfully reported across all projects. The Program has articulated the intention for standardized data collection, beginning with revising a reporting tool in 2015.

Recommendations

In light of the findings of the evaluation, the following recommendations are put forward:

Recommendation #1

To make the program more accessible, the Assistant Deputy Minister of Citizenship, Heritage, and Regions should investigate opportunities for the program to fund, within the allocated budget, other organizations that conduct work in the areas of history, civics, and public policy.

The program currently funds a relatively small pool of organizations (nine unique national history and civics sector organizations between 2009 and 2014) that are generally well positioned to work with other government departments, government and the private sector. The literature review found that there may be a variety of other organizations conducting work in the area of history, civics, and public policy, and there is a perception that there may be other organizations not currently funded who are capable of undertaking innovative projects that could be eligible for CHF support. Therefore, the Program should:

- undertake an environmental scan to identify these organizations and projects that could be eligible for CHF funding; and
- conduct outreach with identified organizations to understand any barriers to accessing the CHF.

Recommendation #2

To effectively support evaluations and decision-making, the Assistant Deputy Minister of Citizenship, Heritage and Regions should improve performance measurement and monitoring so that there is more consistent, reliable data being collected to demonstrate program outcomes.

The evaluation had difficulty obtaining consistent, reliable quantitative evidence for several indicators in order to demonstrate achievement of the immediate, intermediate, and ultimate outcomes. While the CSP/CHF funds very few organizations, the activities of funded projects can differ greatly, which can challenge the ability or utility of aggregate data. However, there have been possible misinterpretations by recipients in the data being collected; some information is not consistently captured for each project; and in some cases the best data to measure certain outcomes are not captured. The program should undertake a review of its current performance measurement strategy, keeping in mind the actual activities and types of outcomes that have been realized by the CSP/CHF projects. Revisions to the performance measurement strategy may include:

- Standardized reporting tools for recipients that would allow for more efficient reporting and improvement in aggregate reporting across CHF, where appropriate; and
- Strategies and information to support project recipients in their performance measurement and data collection obligations (e.g., in understanding the nature of the data requested, in developing methodology for collecting data).

Recommendation #3

To increase program impact, the Assistant Deputy Minister of Citizenship, Heritage and Regions should investigate how PCH can encourage or support more opportunities for collaboration and sharing of the knowledge and expertise developed by CSP/CHF projects.

The CSP/CHF projects have produced numerous resources and supported networks to share these resources and information. Evidence from the evaluation indicates an appetite among recipients for greater collaboration and the opportunity for greater reach of recipients' resources through enhanced knowledge-sharing efforts. Most recipients are collaborating to some extent with other organizations (within CSP/CHF and beyond). Case studies showed benefits of sharing knowledge beyond the organization. Suggestions from funding recipients indicate appreciation for and openness to more opportunities for collaboration, especially to achieve wider reach/dissemination of their information, and to leverage expertise/contributions of other organizations. Given this, the program should consider how it can foster knowledge exchange among recipients; encourage collaborative projects that leverage the expertise of multiple players (e.g., content expertise plus dissemination); and disseminate knowledge to a wider community of practice (e.g., to reach educators). Actions may include:

- connecting recipients to stimulate collaboration (e.g. inter-projects);
- initiating a collaborative framework that focuses on bridging areas of expertise (e.g., content creators and content disseminators, like educators);
- allowing recipients to provide feedback that helps inform the priorities of the program; and
- coordinating leadership on a national scale in terms of strategy, planning, and research related to generating knowledge on history, civics, and public policy.

1. Introduction

This report presents the findings and recommendations emerging from the evaluation of the CSP/CHF. The evaluation report presents a program profile, the methodology used, the findings and conclusions for each core evaluation issue. The evaluation was included in the Departmental Evaluation Plan for 2013-2014 to 2017-2018 and was approved by the Departmental Evaluation Committee in June 2013. The project was managed and carried out by the Evaluation Services Directorate (ESD) at PCH.

Pursuant to the *Financial Administration Act*, the CHF must be evaluated every five years. The evaluation covers the fiscal years 2009-2010 to 2013-2014. In accordance with the Treasury Board Secretariat *Directive on the Evaluation Function (2009)*, the objectives of the evaluation are to assess:

- the continued relevance of the CHF;
- its performance in achieving immediate, intermediate and to the extent possible, ultimate outcomes; and
- its performance in terms of efficiency and economy.

The report is structured as follows:

- Section 2 presents an overview of the CHF;
- Section 3 presents the methodology employed for the evaluation and the associated limitations;
- Section 4 presents the findings related to the evaluation issue of relevance;
- Section 5 presents the findings for the performance, including those related to achievement of outcomes and efficiency and economy; and
- Section 6 presents the conclusions, recommendations and management response and action plan.

2. Program Profile

2.1 Background and Context

The Canadian Studies Program (CSP) was established in 1984 as an ongoing program in the Department of the Secretary of State, with a mandate to encourage Canadians to learn about Canada, and to address concerns about Canadians' lack of knowledge and interest in Canadian history, culture, society and politics. In April 2013, the Canadian Studies Program's name was changed to the Canada History Fund.¹

The CSP/CHF supports the development and/or enhancement of learning materials, the organization of learning and developmental experiences and the establishment and maintenance of networks that give Canadians opportunities to enhance their understanding of Canada, thus building an informed and engaged citizenry. Its mandate is to encourage Canadians to learn about Canada's history, civics and public policy.

2.2 Objectives and Outcomes

The CSP/CHF functions as a grants and contributions program and is delivered through nationally significant, legally incorporated Canadian history and civics organizations and post-secondary educational institutions that develop teaching materials and learning activities aimed at increasing knowledge and understanding of Canadian history, culture, society, values and public policy.

The CSP/CHF logic model (provided in Appendix A) identifies one ultimate outcome: that Canadians enhance their understanding of Canada's history, civics and public policy. This outcome has been refined and refocused since 2009 with the focus switching from knowledge change among youth to knowledge change among all Canadians.

2.3 Program Management, Governance, Target Groups, Key Stakeholders and Delivery Partners

The CSP/CHF is managed by the Citizen Participation Branch, Citizenship, Heritage and Regions Sector at Canadian Heritage and is housed under the Community Engagement Directorate. The Directorate is responsible for program coordination, governance and expected results.

National organizations that undertake work in the areas of history, civics and public policy are the recipients of contributions from CSP/CHF (see Appendix B). These organizations also collaborate with other organizations in these fields, including other federal government departments and agencies with an interest in supporting initiatives related to history, civics and public policy (e.g., Parks Canada and Veterans Affairs Canada). Primary beneficiaries of the

¹ Throughout this report, Canadian Studies Program/Canada History Fund (CSP/CHF) is used to refer to the program covered within the evaluation period.

program are the participants in the program's learning activities, including educators, history specialists, students, and adult learners. More broadly, all Canadians who have access to the resources and information developed through CSP/CHF projects are indirect beneficiaries of the program.

2.4 Program Resources

Over the five fiscal years covered in the evaluation, the total budget (salary, O&M and Gs and Cs) for the CSP/CHF was \$17.7 million and actual expenditures were \$27.2 million. Administrative data and documentation show that the increases in annual resources were a result of allocation due to emerging departmental priorities (e.g., commemoration of the Bicentennial of the War of 1812). It is important to note that following the transfer of the Online Works of Reference (OWR) in 2014-2015 (two projects funded under the CSP/CHF), CHF has an allocated budget of approximately \$4 million per year (a reduction of about \$2.1 million annually). Appendix C shows the Reference Levels and actual expenditures for the period covered by the evaluation.

2.5 Program Changes since Last Evaluation

The CSP/CHF undertook significant changes to its logic model after the 2010 evaluation of the CSP pointed out the difficulties in measuring the ultimate impact of funding on one of the target groups, namely, youth. The program's theory of change, shown in the program logic model, now articulates an ultimate outcome that seeks to benefit all Canadians, whether directly or indirectly.

Until 2010-2011, the CSP had been delivered through three components: Funding Competition, Strategic Initiatives and Strategic Partnerships. Following the evaluation of the CSP completed in 2010, CSP was renewed and the new Terms and Conditions were approved in March 2011. In April 2011, the program moved from a three component structure to a single funding component: the Strategic Initiatives component. The rationale for this was to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of CSP. While the overall number of organizations supported by the program decreased with this streamlining, this change doubled the number of organizations that were funded through Strategic Initiatives from four to eight.

On June 11, 2013, the Government of Canada announced a series of measures to promote Canadian history in line with the history priorities identified in the Federal Budget 2013 and building on the theme of celebrating major historical milestones begun in 2008. Building on the rebranding of the Canadian Museum of History, these measures included: naming the Canada History Fund, the creation of the first ever Government of Canada History Awards, Canada History Week, and enhancements to five other Canadian Heritage programs, all of which are intended to make Canadian history more accessible to Canadians, including youth.

3. Evaluation Methodology

3.1 Evaluation Scope, Timing and Quality Control

The evaluation of CSP/CHF covers the period from 2009-2010 through 2013-2014 and addresses the core evaluation issues of relevance and performance, including effectiveness, efficiency and economy, in accordance with the Treasury Board Secretariat *Directive on the Evaluation Function* (2009) (see Appendix D). The evaluation also looked at the program's design and delivery, areas for improvement and performance measurement practices. An Evaluation Framework, including Questions and Indicators Matrix was developed and is presented in Appendix E. Data collection for the evaluation began in September 2014 and was completed in February 2015.

The Online Works of Reference projects were funded under the CSP/CHF until 2014-2015. The federal government announced in Budget 2014 the transfer of funding and responsibility for the OWR to the Canadian Museum of History in fiscal year 2014-2015. Given this transfer, the evaluation places less effort on the relevance and performance of these particular projects.² The evaluation also does not look at the performance of program components that have been discontinued since the last evaluation (i.e. Funding Competition and Strategic Partnerships).

Because the program underwent significant changes in the earlier period of the evaluation timeline, the evaluation focuses mainly on the latter three years (2011-2012 to 2013-2014). Administrative data on project outcomes have been considered primarily for only the two most recent years (2012-2013 and 2013-2014); although, in some cases, data for earlier years have been reported where feasible. The evaluation was led by the Evaluation Services Directorate (ESD) of the Department of Canadian Heritage.

3.2 Evaluation Questions by Issue Area

The evaluation matrix identifies the evaluation questions, associated indicators as well as the lines of evidence to be used to respond to each question. Appendix E contains the evaluation matrix.

3.3 Evaluation Methods

3.3.1 Preliminary Consultation

Before undertaking the evaluation, preliminary discussions were held with CSP/CHF staff. This led to the development of the Terms of Reference for the evaluation, which contained a description of the program, the evaluation scope and issues, the methodological approach and a detailed evaluation framework.

² Although in some documentation the two OWR projects are referred to collectively as one project, throughout this report we refer to them in the plural, and as a single project when referring only to either DCB or TCE.

3.3.2 Lines of Evidence

The findings and conclusions in the report are always based on more than one line of evidence unless otherwise stated. The evaluation used the following data sources:

- **Literature review:** This included a review of recent domestic and international literature (e.g., academic articles) pertaining to the evaluation issues, particularly those related to the continuing need for the program;
- **Document and file review:** Documents reviewed included key governmental documents (e.g., Throne Speech and Federal Budget extracts), departmental documents (Departmental Performance Reports, Reports on Plans and Priorities), and program-related documents such as program guidelines and application forms. Project files, which included contribution agreements, correspondence, and interim and final reports, were also reviewed;
- **Review of administrative databases:** The program's databases of grant/contribution recipients and performance indicators were reviewed to obtain data on recipients and results and to assess current data collection and performance measurement tools;
- **Key informant interviews:** 15 interviews (7 PCH staff; 8 funding recipients) were conducted. In this report, statements made about the views of key informants are usually reported when the majority share this view unless otherwise stated. Four interviews were also conducted with four funded organizations as part of case studies. The following terms have typically been used throughout the report when more details on the level of key informants that share this view are deemed necessary:
 - “Few” is used when fewer than 20 percent of interviewees have responded with similar answers;
 - “Some” is used when 20 percent but fewer than 50 percent of interviewees responded with similar answers;
 - “Many” is used when 50 percent but fewer than 75 percent of interviewees responded with similar answers; and
 - “Most” is used when 75 percent of interviewees or more responded with similar answers.
- **Case studies:** Case studies were undertaken of four funding recipients that received CSP/CHF funding over the evaluation period. The case study methodology included document and file review, administrative data review, key informant interviews, and site visits and surveys in some cases. The case studies conducted and acronyms used to refer to these projects within this report, are shown below.

Organization	Project	Case Study Acronym
Action Canada Foundation	Building Leadership for Canada's Future	AC
Canada's National History Society	Online Academic Community Channel for Canadian History	CNHS
Historica Canada	Memory Project Speakers Bureau	MPSB
Royal Canadian Geographical Society	Canadian Educator Resources for the War of 1812 Bicentennial	RCGS

3.3.3 Methodological Limitations

Limitations were mitigated by the use of a multi-method approach to generate evidence on the evaluation questions from more than one line of enquiry and from different (internal and external) perspectives. The methodological limitations encountered in this evaluation include those typical of the lines of evidence used as well as the following:

- The design did not involve non-funded organizations conducting similar projects/activities as there were very few. Such an analysis would have permitted a comparison of results/effectiveness to understand whether the achievements of CSP/CHF could have been achieved through other means and this also would have expanded the resources needed for the evaluation. To a certain extent, this limitation was mitigated by using existing lines of evidence to learn about other funding sources and asking interviewees if project activities could have been achieved in the absence of CSP/CHF funding; and
- Quantitative data to demonstrate progress toward achievement of the program's outcomes were reviewed for the years in which the Strategic Initiatives was the sole component (2012-2013 to 2013-2014), but for some projects, information was incomplete. There was also limited aggregate program-wide data available on outcomes which is in part due to the wide a variety of projects and utility of such data.

These limitations were taken into account when developing the findings, conclusions and recommendations put forward in this evaluation report.

4. Findings - Relevance

This section examines the continuing need for informational resources and activities for the purposes of generating knowledge on history, civics and public policy, and the legitimacy of the federal government's role in funding national organizations to undertake work in these areas and assesses the alignment of CSP/CHF with federal and PCH priorities and objectives.

4.1 Core Issue 1: Continued Need for the Program

Evaluation Question 1

To what extent does the CSP/CHF continue to address a demonstrable need and is responsive to the needs of Canadians?

KEY FINDINGS

- Evidence for a continued need for the CSP/CHF comes from: research showing that Canadians feel knowledge of history produces positive outcomes such as unity, identity, social cohesion and active citizenship; research with the public and youth that shows low knowledge of Canadian history and democratic institutions or systems of government; perceptions of experts in the field that this knowledge deficit is linked to gaps in provincial curricula and from strong demand for materials, activities and knowledge created through CSP/CHF projects.
- Rationale for the program is rooted in evidence that there is a need for Canadians to know about their country's history. It is more difficult to ascertain whether there is a similar need for information/learning about Canadian civics and public policy.

The literature, documentation, and key informant interviews provide evidence of a strongly held view that an understanding of history is vital to the effective functioning of democratic states and collectively, this evidence points to a continuing need to foster understanding of Canada's history among Canadians. The literature argues that a knowledge of Canadian history and traditions helps to foster engagement in a nation's present and future society. As articulated by one, "Without history our children will know nothing of what made Parliament, our laws, our society the way they are. Without history and the techniques that study teaches us, the ability to read, write, reason can never be well taught"³.

In interviews, most PCH officials referred to research that has shown the Canadian provinces and territories, which have jurisdiction over education, adapt inconsistent approaches to the teaching of Canadian history.⁴ Further, most PCH officials and program documentation refer to recent

³ Jack L. Granatstein, "Who Killed Canadian History?" The Empire Club of Canada Addresses (Toronto, Canada), September 1998.

⁴ See Dominion Institute. The Canadian History Report Card: Curriculum Analysis of High Schools in Canada. 2009. It should be noted that the areas of civics and public policy (also target areas of the CSP/CHF) are not discussed as areas of need by the Dominion Institute report.

public opinion research illustrating that Canadians possess relatively low levels of knowledge with regard to some specific aspects of Canadian history. This research shows that, for example:

- “A sizeable portion of Canadians do not know major historical facts of Canadian history [*sic*].” For example, when asked what important events will occur in 2017, just over half (56 per cent) correctly say that Canada’s 150th birthday occurs in 2017;⁵
- Four out of five Canadians knew Vimy Ridge was a famous battle, but only 47 per cent of those surveyed knew it took place in the First World War;⁶
- Six in ten Canadians say most of what they know about history was learned in high school, and 47 per cent say they do not remember much about what they learned in their high school course on history;⁷ and
- The lack of knowledge on Canadian history is longstanding. In 1997, an exam, based on Canada’s Citizenship Examination, was administered to Canadian adults over the telephone. Only 55 per cent of Canadians passed; the failure rate was highest among 18 to 24 year olds (eight in ten).⁸ This study was repeated again in 2007 with 18 to 24 year olds and again, most (82 per cent) failed.

While these examples illustrate a lack of specific knowledge of Canadian history, the Association for Canadian Studies (ACS) found that Canadians’ self-assessment of their history knowledge is high.⁹ Despite the perception that they have an adequate understanding of Canadian history, it seems as though Canadians value more learning in this area. ACS has conducted research that suggests Canadians are likely to support initiatives that undertake to provide more information about their country and its history. ACS research has shown that Canadians “widely feel that knowledge of Canada and notably its history are elements of strong citizenship”.¹⁰ Further, Canadians say that learning about the history of Canada is more likely to strengthen their attachment to Canada more so than watching a Canadian singer or athlete enjoy international success.¹¹ Overall, 84 per cent of Canadians say that they are proud of Canada’s history,¹² revealing an interest in, and openness for, learning about Canada’s history.

⁵ Ipsos Reid, 2014.

⁶ Steve Merti, 2014.

⁷ Jack Jedwab and Julie Perrone, 2013.

⁸ Ipsos Reid, 1997.

⁹ Jack Jedwab, 2010.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Jack Jedwab and Julie Perrone, 2013.

The 2009-2010 PCH Departmental Performance Report asserted the need for “Canadians of all origins (as members of communities and society) to connect with one another, to better understand their country and its basic shared values, and to come together and celebrate as contributors to Canadian society; thereby strengthening their sense of Canadian identity”.¹³ To respond to these identified needs, the program entered into multi-year funding arrangements with nine unique national history and civics sector organizations between 2009 and 2014.¹⁴ The review of documentation indicates that these nine recipients are all national organizations or universities with a significant capability to reach the broader history, civics and public policy sectors, as well as the Canadian public.

Most PCH officials agree that the CHF is responsive to the needs of Canadians by funding organizations with the capacity and expertise to promote Canadian history to Canadians both directly – such as through viewing HC’s Heritage Minutes which are developed for a mass Canadian audience – as well as indirectly - such as students learning information that has been imparted through resources and information developed for educators. A few PCH officials and a few funding recipients also referred to these organizations as (though nationally significant organizations of considerable expertise) being financially “fragile” as a result of operating within fields that are typically dependent on public grants/contributions and private donations as a means of survival.

Funding recipients of CSP/CHF funding held a clear and strong belief that the work they do helps to satisfy a need among Canadians in general, and especially among educators and students, for knowledge about their history and opportunities to participate more actively in civic life. Most of these funding recipients point to the high rates of participation in their activities, strong uptake of their resources, and/or generally positive feedback about their resources and activities as demonstration that they are filling a void. There is also agreement that without government support for these organizations, much of the work they do would be severely impaired.

Speaking specifically about the projects undertaken with CSP/CHF funding, most of the funded organizations indicated that their project(s) either would not have been undertaken or would have been much smaller. While recipients have established partnerships and leveraged funding and in-kind contributions, Canadian organizations operating with these mandates do not typically have access to large endowments in the private sector (as is sometimes the case for non-profit organizations in other Western countries like the UK and the US), forcing these organizations to depend on public funding. Furthermore, with these organizations being nationally focused (i.e., focusing on history, civics and public policy related to Canada as a national entity, rather than particular regional, provincial or other niche interests), the federal government is regarded by most of these organizations as a likely funder.

¹³ Canadian Heritage. *Departmental Performance Report*. 2009-10, p. 43.

¹⁴ Presently the program funds eight organizations. The count of nine organizations represents Historica Canada and the Historica Foundation of Canada (prior to its merger with the Dominion Institute and subsequent name changes).

4.2 Core Issue 2: Alignment with Government Priorities

Evaluation Questions 2 and 3

To what extent is CSP/CHF aligned with federal government priorities?

To what extent is CSP/CHF aligned with the priorities of PCH and its strategic outcomes?

KEY FINDINGS

- The CSP/CHF is aligned with Government of Canada priorities, including its comprehensive approach to making history accessible to Canadians and the Road to 2017.
- Speeches from the Throne and Federal Budgets between 2009 and 2014 have documented federal commitments to promoting and celebrating history.
- The CSP/CHF is aligned with the following departmental strategic outcome and priority:
 - PCH Strategic Outcome 2: Canadians Share, Express and Appreciate Their Canadian Identity; and
 - Organizational Priority #1: Celebrating our History and Heritage.

Alignment with federal government priorities

Most PCH officials and some documentation confirm an alignment between the CSP/CHF and the broader federal government priorities. Speeches from the Throne delivered over the course of the evaluation period have alluded to the federal government's priorities for the celebration and commemoration of historical events (such as Confederation, the Queen's Diamond Jubilee Anniversary, and the bicentennial of the War of 1812) and the promotion of knowledge of Canadian history. For example:

- Speech from the Throne, March 3, 2010, made numerous references to the importance of history to Canadian identity and unity within a section entitled "Strengthening a United Canada in a Changing World":
 - "Our values as Canadians are rooted in our history and in our institutions."
 - "A shared understanding of Canadian history unites us as citizens. Two years ago, we celebrated the 400th anniversary of the founding of Quebec City. This year we mark the quadricentenary of the settling of Cupids, Newfoundland and Labrador. Two years hence, our Government will engage millions of citizens and strengthen knowledge and pride in Canada by commemorating the bicentennial of the War of 1812, an event that was key to shaping our identity as Canadians and ultimately our existence as a country. That year Canadians will also celebrate the 60th anniversary of the accession of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, Queen of Canada, and our Government has established a Diamond Jubilee Committee to prepare for this historic occasion."

- For Speech from the Throne, June 3, 2011, the Government linked contemporary efforts to defend Canada with historical efforts, notably the War of 1812. It also reiterated the emphasis that the government placed on history as a uniting force (i.e., “shared history”).
 - “Canadians are united by core values, a shared history and a sense of common purpose. Our Government will join Canadians in celebrating our heritage [...]”
 - “Beyond our natural heritage, Canadians also cherish our shared history. Anniversaries are an important part of how a society marks its collective progress and defines its goals for the future. A key milestone next year will be the bicentennial of the War of 1812. We will remember how those of diverse backgrounds and various regions came together to fight for Canada, ensuring the independent destiny of our country in North America. We will also celebrate the 200th anniversary of the Selkirk Settlement, which marks the founding of Manitoba and the early days of the modern West.”
 - “As Canadians, we take pride in our history.”
- In Speech from the Throne, October 16, 2013, the Government set forth its intention to pay tribute to Canada’s history and lists a number of activities which will mark the 150th anniversary of Confederation:
 - “As we look confidently to the future, we draw great strength from our past. Beginning with our Aboriginal peoples, Canada’s story is one of risk, sacrifice, and rugged determination. From the founding of New France, to the fight for Canada in the War of 1812; from the visionary achievement of Confederation, to our victory at Vimy Ridge, Canadians have repeatedly triumphed over long odds to forge a great country, united and free.”
 - “Canada’s Confederation is worth celebrating. As we approach our historic 150th anniversary in 2017, our Government will join with Canadians in honouring this momentous milestone [...]”.

Similarly, a number of Federal Budgets have identified spending, and supporting rationale, that is relevant to the CSP/CHF. For example:

- Federal Budget 2013 stated, “The Government believes strongly in the importance of promoting and celebrating Canada’s history. With Canada’s 150th birthday approaching in 2017, the Government is taking concrete steps to build a lasting legacy for this important milestone.”
- Federal Budget 2014 stated, “In 2014, through existing programs, the Government will offer Canadians opportunities to celebrate and learn more about these significant milestones in the creation of Canada.”

Alignment with PCH priorities

Most PCH officials describe the CSP/CHF as consistent with departmental priorities, pointing to RPPs as evidence. Presently, the CHF falls within the “Attachment to Canada” program area of PCH, one of seven program areas.¹⁵ Five other sub-programs currently fall within this program area.¹⁶ The program area (and CSP/CHF) is aligned with PCH strategic outcome 2 of 3:

- “Canadians share, express, and appreciate their Canadian identity.”¹⁷ For fiscal year 2010-2011, the PCH Strategic Outcome to which the CSP/CHF was linked in 2009-2010 evolved from Canadians “have a sense” of their identity, to Canadians “share, express and appreciate” their identity. The departmental priority to which the CSP/CHF has been linked was simplified over time, from “promoting greater knowledge and understanding of Canada, and increase Canadians’ pride and engagement in our country and its communities” in 2009-2010, to simply “Celebrating our history and heritage” from 2012 onwards.

The Canada History Fund is a sub-program of Canadian Heritage within Program 2.1, Attachment to Canada. This program is linked to Strategic Outcome 2: Canadians share, express and appreciate their Canadian identity. The program is also directly linked to one of four organizational priorities: “Celebrating our History and Heritage: The Road to 2017”. Departmental planning priorities for 2013-2014 and beyond will focus on highlighting historic milestones of national significance that will strengthen national identity and build momentum in the lead-up to Canada’s 150th Anniversary in 2017, working collaboratively with other departments, agencies, regions and stakeholders to create these opportunities. Other key activities are designed to encourage Canadians, including youth, to learn about and experience their country and to connect with one another through these programs and continuing to provide opportunities for Canadians to participate in and learn more about Canada’s history.

¹⁵ PCH’s other six program activity areas include arts, cultural industries, heritage, engagement and community participation, official languages, and sport.

¹⁶ The other five programs are the Celebration and Commemoration Program, Capital Experience, State Ceremonial and Protocol, Exchanges Canada Program, and Youth Take Charge.

¹⁷ The other departmental strategic outcomes are “Canadian artistic expressions and cultural content are created and accessible at home and abroad” and “Canadians participate and excel in sport”.

4.3 Core Issue 3: Alignment with Federal Roles and Responsibilities

Evaluation Question 4

To what extent is CSP/CHF aligned with departmental and federal roles and responsibilities?

KEY FINDINGS

- The CHF is aligned with federal responsibilities for the promotion of Canadian identity and values and for undertaking initiatives that promote social cohesion, civic engagement and national unity.
- The *Department of Canadian Heritage Act* accords the federal government the responsibility for promoting Canadian identity and values, as well as heritage, through national programs and projects that impact information to all Canadians.
- The federal government is seen as responsible for providing a “federal voice”, providing information on issues of national significance, including the promotion of national identity and unity, social cohesion and civic engagement. Providing information and enhancing knowledge of Canada’s history civic and public can contribute to these issues.

The *Department of Canadian Heritage Act* defines the federal government’s roles and responsibilities in matters related to heritage, which include initiating, recommending, coordinating, implementing and promoting national policies, projects and programs with respect to Canadian identity and values, cultural development and heritage.¹⁸ All PCH interview respondents agreed that the federal government has a responsibility for ensuring a pan-Canadian perspective in providing information and resources about history. They see the federal government as responsible for promoting national identity and unity, social cohesion and civic engagement, which knowledge of history, civics, and public policy can contribute to if it features a national perspective. A few key informants and some documentation support this rationale given Canada’s history as a country of immigrants. A 2010 article identified the need for the federal government to be involved in educating Canadians and newcomers to Canada about our history and political system to ensure all Canadians have a common understanding of the country.¹⁹

Responsibility for education is delegated to the provinces in Canada's *Constitution Act* of 1867. However, PCH officials see CSP/CHF as filling a void in producing publicly available information that can be accessed by all Canadians, especially educators who teach history as part of the provincial curriculum to complement their resources. The literature, documentation and key informant interviews point to perceptions of shortcomings with the way that students learn about history, civics and public policy in schools, which has been used as justification for a federal role in this area. Most PCH staff stated that the federal role in this area is to ensure that: a “federal voice” is included in history lessons and materials; information addresses issues of

¹⁸ Canada, *Department of Canadian Heritage Act*, section 5.

¹⁹ Brian Lilley, 2010.

national significance; all regions of Canada are represented and have access; and materials are available in both official languages.

Teaching history can be quite politically divisive, as several sources in the literature and key informants pointed out. For example, which aspects of history should be emphasized and whether the government should have any role at all in the teaching of history have been topics of debate and criticism. Nevertheless, there appears to be public support for a federal role in the area of history education. According to a 2013 Ipsos Reid poll (for Historica Canada) almost nine in ten (86 per cent) agree that Canada should be doing more to educate young people about our military history, while only one in ten (14 per cent) disagree.²⁰

Other federal departments and agencies also support initiatives that promote learning about history and civics (e.g., Veterans Affairs Canada, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Elections Canada, Library and Archives Canada, Parks Canada Agency and Library of Parliament), demonstrating that PCH does not have sole responsibility for all federal initiatives related to history. The objectives behind these other initiatives are usually quite distinct from those of PCH's, although they may be complementary.²¹

²⁰ Historica Canada, 2013.

²¹ These programs are discussed more in Section 5.2.

5. Findings – Performance

The following sections present the major evaluation findings related to performance: effectiveness, efficiency and economy, including assessment of progress toward expected outcomes (with reference to performance targets and program reach, program design, including the linkage and contribution of outputs to outcomes), and assessment of resource utilization in relation to the production of outputs.

5.1 Core Issue 4: Achievement of Expected Outcomes

5.1.1 Achievement of Immediate Outcomes

Evaluation Question 5

Is the program reaching its immediate outcomes?

- a. To what extent does CSP/CHF contribute to the development/enhancement of materials and activities organized on Canada's history, civics and public policy?
- b. To what extent does CSP/CHF support formal and informal history, civics and public policy networks?

KEY FINDINGS

- The CSP/CHF has funded projects that over the evaluation period attained the program's immediate intended outcomes: namely, delivering activities, creating and disseminating materials, and supporting networks related to history, civics and public policy.
- A total of nine organizations were funded through 19 separate contribution agreements from 2012-2014. The projects demonstrate a variety of approaches to sharing knowledge about history, civics and public policy, including: tactile resources; digital/multimedia materials; experiential learning and live, in-person knowledge sharing.
- Between 2012 and 2014, 902,664 copies of materials were distributed. These materials and resources include magazine issues, websites, e-newsletters, videos and films, reports, e-journals, articles, education guides, promotional brochures, an online game, giant maps, posters and lesson plans.
- Between 2012 and 2014, 2,354 learning activities were held including classroom visits, public dialogues, workshops, webinars, a contest, and conferences that spanned several days.
- There were 178,001 participants in formal and informal networks maintained by project recipients in 2012-2014, and most funded organizations reported, qualitatively, growth in the number of participants as a result of their funded project. These networks are used to disseminate information about activities and materials, as well as to distribute content on Canadian history, civics and public policy. Network participants include educators as well as history specialists and other interested Canadians.

Development and enhancement of materials and activities organized on Canada's history, civics and public policy

A total of nine organizations were funded through 19 separate contribution agreements from 2012-2014. Nine organizations include Historica Canada and Historica Foundation of Canada prior to its merger with the Dominion Institute in 2009. CSP/CHF-funded projects contribute to the Fund's immediate outcomes to varying degrees. For some, developing learning materials is a greater focus than developing learning activities, and vice versa. This reflects the nature of the particular project, and is reflective of that organization's strengths and expertise.

All of the projects funded through the CSP/CHF have led to the creation and distribution of new content and learning materials related to Canadian history, civics and public policy. Project files, interviews, and case studies show that a wide variety of materials and activities were produced, each with a strong focus on Canada's history. At least 902,664 copies of materials were distributed between 2012 and 2014. Materials produced and distributed by CNHS which include resources for educators, students, and specialists, account for 84 per cent of the materials distributed. These figures do not include digital/online views of resources produced by the OWR projects.²²

Among the types of learning materials counted in these numbers include magazine issues, websites, e-newsletters, videos and films, reports, e-journals, articles, education guides, promotional brochures, an online game, giant maps, posters, and lesson plans.²³ The projects reviewed as case studies demonstrate a variety of approaches to sharing knowledge about history, civics and public policy, including tactile resources, digital/multimedia materials, experiential learning, and live, in-person knowledge sharing. Recipients perceive these approaches as much needed and complementary to traditional educational approaches. There is evidence that demand has been high for resources produced by these projects. In the case of RCGS's War of 1812 educator resources, the high demand for resources and the level of coordination required was higher than anticipated in the proposal and planning stages. Over 500 requests were made by Canadian teachers for the War of 1812 resources in 2012-2013, followed by 263 in 2013-2014. Appendix F demonstrates the array of learning materials developed by CSP/CHF projects, and the number of copies distributed.

Information available from administrative data, project files, and case studies demonstrate that 2,354 learning activities were held between 2012 and 2014. These figures include classroom visits, public dialogues, workshops, webinars, a contest, and conferences that spanned several days. Conferences were typically aimed at educators, history specialists, and leaders/emerging leaders. Award programs and art challenges also engaged educators and youth to showcase their knowledge of Canada's history. The Memory Project Speaker's Bureau (MPSB) comprises the vast majority of activities undertaken, with over 3,000 speaking engagements. Excluding counts of these MPSB activities, CSP/CHF projects undertook at least 163 learning activities from

²² It is unclear from the administrative data whether other projects counted web downloads of materials in their distribution figures. These counts also include counts for UBC, although information from the file review and interview indicate an unknown number of materials were produced.

²³ Counts are not available of the individual types of materials.

2012-13 to 2013-14, with most of these undertaken by UBC's Historical Thinking Project. It should be noted that some CSP/CHF projects may have spurred activities that are not reflected in these numbers. For example, RCGS provides giant floor maps to educators, which are then used by teachers to organize classroom or school-wide activities. Furthermore, the projects that undertake conferences often count these as single activities, although one conference may consist of many learning sessions, workshops, tours. Appendix G provides a summary of the number and types of activities undertaken.

Supporting formal and informal history, civics and public policy networks

Project files and interviews suggest that building or maintaining networks is a primary focus for over half of the projects funded. In-person knowledge exchange appears to be a component of those projects for which networking is a primary focus. Network-focused projects include those conducted by the Action Canada Foundation, the Association of Canadian Studies, the Governor General's Canadian Leadership Conference, the University of British Columbia, and Canada's National History Society. To a certain extent, HC's MPSB is also largely a network project as much of their work aims to build up a network of volunteer classroom speakers. Projects by RCGS and the OWR projects also include networks, although these networks appear to function mainly to disseminate the materials/resources developed by these projects, rather than as a means for two-way information sharing.

Administrative data on the number of individuals participating in networks is incomplete but suggest that there were at least 178,001 participants in formal and informal networks maintained by project recipients in 2012-14 (data are available for only four projects). Most funded organizations reported qualitatively through key informant interviews and/or project files that they have seen growth in the number of participants in their networks as a result of their funded project. These networks are used to disseminate information about activities and materials, as well as to distribute content on Canadian history civics and public policy. Network members included educators as well as history specialists and some other interested Canadians. A few interviewees indicate that the formal networks have particularly positive results for participants, such as deeper understanding of their country and each other, and professional connections. See Appendix H for a summary of types of formal and informal networks maintained by CSP/CHF projects.

The division between formal and informal networks is not clear; however some projects are tracking their social media and web presence. In project documentation and some interviews social media was noted to have been used extensively in five of the projects to reach network participants. Four projects reported growth in their Twitter networks and two reported growth in their Facebook networks from 2012-13 to 2013-14.

5.1.2 Achievement of Intermediate Outcomes

Evaluation Question 6

Is the program reaching its intermediate outcomes?

- a. To what extent did CSP/CHF expose Canadians, particularly youth to knowledge on Canada's history, civics and public policy?
- b. To what extent did CSP/CHF provide opportunities for educators and specialists to use new knowledge to promote learning of Canada's history, civics and public policy?
- c. To what extent did CSP/CHF encourage leadership and collaboration in Canada's history, civic and public policy sectors?

KEY FINDINGS

- The program has achieved a relatively wide reach that includes tens of thousands of Canadians who have participated in learning activities and millions who have viewed web content.
- Students across the country were reached with materials and activities, particularly those made available through projects by CNHS, RCGS and HC's MPSB.
- Over 61,000 educators and specialists have accessed materials provided by five funded projects. More than half of the projects included conferences and/or workshops in which educators and specialists were given opportunities to learn about new topics, materials, activities and ways of teaching Canada's history. The remainder of projects have made resources accessible to educators and specialists, mainly through their websites but also through resource books, games and classroom presentations.
- Data showed that website engagement between 2012-13 and 2013-14 had a total of more than 15 million unique visitors to the websites of funding recipients; 92 percent of which was attributed to the OWR sites (Dictionary of Canadian Biography and The Canadian Encyclopedia. Removing the OWR sites, there were 1.28 million unique visitors.
- Some funded projects, like those undertaken by the Action Canada Foundation, the Governor General's Canadian Leadership Conference and the Association for Canadian Studies, have explicitly engaged current and future/emerging leaders in the areas of history, civics and public policy, and are maintaining networks of these individuals.
- Some projects featured elements of collaboration between organizations, including CSP/CHF-funded organizations, in order to leverage expertise to help distribute, develop, and deliver learning materials and activities.
- Leadership and collaboration in Canada's history, civics and public policy sectors was pointed to as an area for increased attention. Evidence suggests that the program could play a stronger role in fostering collaboration and leadership between organizations.

To what extent did CSP/CHF expose Canadians, particularly youth, to knowledge on Canada's history, civics and public policy?

Each of the nine organizations funded by CSP/CHF reached Canadians with information about Canada's history, civics and/or public policy, as demonstrated by participation in learning activities, website page views and downloads. Project documentation and interviews confirm that all projects are oriented to a pan-Canadian audience and that, aside from focusing on students, educators and specialists, the materials and activities are developed for general rather than niche audiences. With a Canadian audience in mind, materials and activities are developed to include or be accessed by both English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians.

Projects provided resources or information that was accessed directly by the public, educators, specialists, and/or students. Students across the country were reached with materials and activities, particularly those made available through projects by CNHS, the RCGS and HC's Memory Project Speakers Bureau. An estimated 16,000 students were exposed to the RCGS War of 1812 resources during the 2012-13 and 2013-2014 school years. Lesson plans and education content posted to canadashistory.ca garnered thousands of views, potentially exposing hundreds of thousands of students to these ideas. The MPSB reached hundreds of thousands, mainly students, through its classroom presentations. Millions of hits to the OWR sites, with marked spikes observed during the school terms, indicate mass use of that content, particular by students and teachers. Outside of the classroom, HC's Heritage Minutes, which PCH officials describe as an engaging and effective way of reaching Canadians en masse, have been broadcast to millions of Canadians in theatres, on television networks and are available on YouTube.

Some funded projects reach wider audiences more indirectly, with the expectation that target groups or participants in learning activities will take the learning back to their professional lives and into classrooms (e.g., GGCLC, Action Canada, UBC, and ACS). For example:

- Action Canada is providing training to emerging leaders that will allow them to effectively engage their communities in public policy issues; one of their reports was tabled in the legislature of the Northwest Territories and propelled policy-makers to institute an increase in contributions to a territorial heritage fund;
- GGCLC provides an intensive learning experience for established leaders to learn from one another and gain exposure to different parts of Canada, with the intention that this will make them better leaders in their communities; and
- UBC's Historical Thinking Project has seen the adoption of new ways of thinking about history in major textbooks that are read by students and educators.

Exposure to the learning generated through these projects is significantly more difficult to quantify than for projects that have direct dissemination to end users.

Two indicators from the administrative data: total participation in learning activities and total web visitors accessing materials show that each of the nine organizations has exposed Canadians to information on Canada's history, civics and public policy.

Analysis of website engagement showed more than 8.9 and 6.1 million unique visitors during 2012-13 and 2013-14 respectively, 92 per cent of which was to OWR sites. Removing the OWR sites, there were 1.28 million unique visitors over these two years to project web pages (see Appendix I). There was an average of 30 per cent repeat visitors among those projects reporting.

The administrative data show 195,632 recorded participation in learning activities from 2012-13 to 2013-14. The number of visitors accessing learning materials online in 2012-13 and 2013-14 combined is 752,722; excluding the OWR projects (see Appendix J).

To what extent did CSP/CHF provide opportunities for educators and specialists to use new knowledge to promote learning of Canada's history, civics and public policy?

Administrative data, project files, and key informant interviews provide evidence that thousands of educators and specialists have accessed new materials and activities. Administrative data shows that over 61,000 educators and specialists accessed materials provided by five funded projects (RCGS, Action Canada, ACS, CNHS, and GGCLC). The majority of these educators, 92 per cent, were reached through CNHS. Not counted among these are hundreds and potentially thousands more who have booked classroom presentations with the MPSB, accessed articles on the TCE or DCB, viewed HC's War of 1812 Heritage Minutes and accompanying resources online, and accessed textbooks or resources where ideas developed through the UBC HTP are incorporated.

More than half of the projects (undertaken by ACS, AC, UBC, GGCLC, CNHS) included conferences and/or workshops in which educators and specialists were given opportunities to learn about new topics, materials, activities and ways of teaching Canada's history. For example, the ACS 2010 biennial history conference brought together organizations, secondary and elementary teachers with university academics, researchers, government officials, historians, authors, multimedia producers and others from across Canada to share information and resources involved in communicating and teaching Canadian history. The Governor General's Canadian Leadership Conference brought together 250 leaders from business, labour, government, non-governmental organizations and Aboriginal communities for its 2012 Conference (and receives 15 to 20 times as many applicants to its program). Appendix K shows the number of educators and specialists accessing materials produced through CSP/CHF projects (although the reported numbers do not distinguish between accessing material and attending conferences or workshops).

The remainder of projects have made resources accessible to educators and specialists, mainly through their websites but also through resource books, games and classroom presentations (TCE, DCB, MPSB, and RCGS). Some project files showed that resources are indeed being used by educators to teach students. For example, the DCB project reports says there is considerable indication of educators and specialists using their knowledge of the DCB/DBC Online to promote learning of Canada's history. Scholars have used the DCB and provide positive feedback on the listings. As another example, uptake of RCGS's resources was sufficiently strong, (its giant tactile maps visualizing the War of 1812 were fully reserved) that the organization developed an entire business line of other educator resources to be made available to teachers on a range of topics related to Canadian identity, civics and public policy.

To what extent did CSP/CHF encourage leadership and collaboration in Canada's history, civic and public policy sectors?

Some projects funded by CFP are explicitly designed to develop leaders (e.g., GGCLC and Action Canada), while others may also encourage leadership (e.g., the Government of Canada History Awards). The document and file review, case studies and key informant interviews provide evidence that the promotion of leadership in Canada's history, civics and public policy sectors is realized in projects that bring together specialists and leaders, or emerging leaders, such as projects undertaken by ACS, AC, GGCLC, and UBC. AC, for example, helps develop future leaders through its 11-month fellowship program. GGCLC brings established leaders together for a two-week conference that allows them to connect and share experiences from their various vantage points. ACS promotes knowledge exchange through its annual conferences and academic journal. UBC's Historical Thinking Project brings educators together to discuss and learn about new methods for thinking about history.

A few PCH officials say that the networks supported by projects are stimulating collaboration and encouraging leadership. Each of the four projects that were reviewed as case studies involved some sort of collaboration or connection with like-minded organizations, as did a few of the other funded projects. These connections were used to help access, share, and develop knowledge and learning materials. For example:

- ACS involved individuals from Historica Dominion Institute, UBC's Benchmarks of Historical Thinking Project and the Centre for the Study of Historical Consciousness in the development of sessions for its 2010 biennial national history conference;
- AC collaborated with public and private sector partners in Canada's history, civic education and public policy sectors in order to augment AC's programming, including the Institute for Canadian Citizenship (ICC), the Walter and Duncan Gordon Foundation (WDGF), MaRS Discovery District, Harris Centre, Canadian Federation of Independent Business and the Canadian Council of Chief Executives, as well as international networks like the White House Fellows;
- CNHS worked with the Vimy Foundation which used a component of the website platform to create an application process for their organization's Pilgrimage Awards; and
- The Memory Project Speakers Bureau involved outreach activities in order to build awareness of the program. MPSB staff attended educators' conferences and connected with Canadian Hockey League teams to show images and information about the Memory Project during hockey games.

Some key informants said that there is a role for PCH to play in stimulating collaboration and knowledge-sharing among the funded organizations. A few reported that knowledge-sharing has become more of a focus since changes to the program were introduced in 2011. Conference calls to discuss projects were mentioned as a good way to connect the organizations and understand what other initiatives were being undertaken. While a few key informants feel that the funded organizations already know each other well, a few others mentioned that more efforts to connect

project recipients to stimulate collaboration would be beneficial. It is within this intended outcome that the desire for leadership on a national scale in terms of strategy, planning and research related to generating knowledge on history, civics and public policy. Other suggestions included: bringing together funded organizations for more inter-project collaborations; initiating a collaborative grant that could be created that focuses on bridging areas of expertise (e.g., content creators and content disseminators, like educators); and allowing recipients to provide feedback that helps determine the priorities of the program.

5.1.3 Achievement of Ultimate Outcome

Evaluation Question 7

Is the program reaching its ultimate outcome? To what extent did CSP/CHF enhance Canadians' understanding/knowledge of Canada's history, civic and public policy?

KEY FINDINGS

- Some projects have demonstrated enhancement of knowledge of program participants. At least three projects have exceeded the program's target of 75 percent of participants having enhanced their knowledge of Canadian history, civics and public policy. Funding recipients have also demonstrated strong satisfaction with project activities and resources.
- Standardized data collection to address the indicator of knowledge change among Canadians reached by the program will help to provide evidence for this outcome across all projects in the future.

Funding recipients provide evidence of achievement of immediate and intermediate outcomes in their reports, and appear well designed to make incremental progress toward the ultimate outcome. Project reports also document media attention they have received, indicating that these projects are garnering public awareness.

According to some project recipients interviewed and information contained in project files, it can be difficult to measure the ultimate impact of the project activities, especially for those whose activities ultimately intend to achieve a broader impact beyond direct participants. Key informants mentioned challenges such as attributing change to the CSP/CHF, particularly given the government's broad approach to making history more accessible, with many programs undertaking separate efforts to celebrate and acknowledge Canada's history. The program has focused on the reach of activities and provides a measure of knowledge change among only Canadians directly reached by CSP/CHF (i.e., project participants or users of resources).²⁴

Project recipients are using a variety of measures to understand the impact of their projects, such as the level of satisfaction of users/participants, the likelihood of using the resources again, and the effectiveness of the experience/resources at enhancing their understanding. The four case studies provided the following findings for their respective projects which suggest increased

²⁴ Canadian Heritage. *Departmental Performance Report 2013-14*.

knowledge among users for three of the projects as well as high satisfaction across all four of the projects.

<p style="text-align: center;">Royal Canadian Geographical Society War of 1812 Teacher Resources</p> <p>99% said it had an impact on stimulating interest and engagement in Canadian history</p> <p>99% said it had an impact on learning about the events of the War of 1812</p> <p>88% said it was a more valuable learning experience than more traditional learning materials</p> <p>83% were satisfied with the quality of the materials</p> <p>80% were satisfied with the relevance of the material</p> <p><i>Source: survey of teachers who used RCGS resources</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Historica Canada Memory Project Speakers Bureau</p> <p>94% said the presentation had an impact on stimulating interest in Canadian history</p> <p>74% said the presentation had an impact on learning about Canada's institutions, foreign policy and civic life</p> <p>94% of hosts would make another request to the Memory Project Speakers' Bureau in the future</p> <p>94% were satisfied with the speaker's presentation/talk</p> <p>88% say the presentation was a more valuable experience than traditional learning approaches</p> <p><i>Source: survey of MPSB hosts who requested a MPSB speaker presentation</i></p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Canada's National History Society Community Initiatives</p> <p>97% of members (those who are registered for free with CanadasHistory.ca) are satisfied with the website</p> <p>88% agree website content is interesting and well written</p> <p><i>Source: Fall 2013 survey of CanadasHistory.ca registered members</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Action Canada Foundation Action Canada Fellowship Program</p> <p>100% of fellows said the program has built on their commitment to making a difference within Canada</p> <p>76% of fellows rated the fellowship program as very effective</p> <p>88% of fellows agree the working conferences enhanced their understanding of Canada's history or public policy</p> <p><i>Source: survey of 2013-14 fellowship participants</i></p>

The program has set a benchmark target of 75 percent of people reached by the program having enhanced their knowledge of Canadian history, civics and public policy. It is expected that following the implementation of standardized data collection and the establishment of baseline data this benchmark will be reassessed to determine whether it is a reasonable target going forward. The above data collected by case study recipients suggests that at least three CSP/CHF projects are exceeding this target. The achievement of this target by other projects recipients is unknown.

5.1.4 Unintended Impacts

<p>Evaluation Question 8</p>
<p>8. What, if any, unintended outcomes (positive or negative) have occurred as a result of CSP/CHF?</p>
<p>KEY FINDING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is evidence of some unintended outcomes, such as: greater stability among funded organizations; increased profile of organizations within the history milieu; positive outcomes for volunteers and interest in careers associated with a funded project.

There have been some unintended outcomes of CSP/CHF, which are predominately positive. A few PCH officials noted that stakeholders/organizations that promote Canadian history on a pan-Canadian basis are more stable today than from what they observed around 2008 and 2009, given the improved economy, a less fragmented program and the implementation of multi-year agreements. Some organizations have launched innovative projects positively influencing the organization's future. For example, the RCGS case study revealed that RCGS's War of 1812 resources proved popular enough to lead to the creation of new resources on seven more themes, and the organization is currently creating more product lines to assist educators in teaching Canadian studies in Kindergarten to 12 classrooms.

Other positive unintended outcomes include:

- **Increased profile/reputation of an organization in the history community:** the DCB-University Laval Dictionary of Canadian Biography received the Pierre Breton Award in 2012 (awarded by CNHS) for “an extraordinary combination of scholarship and accessibility, making it our country's most reliable biographical source of information on the great names of our shared past.”²⁵;
- **Positive impact on volunteer participants:** The HC case study found evidence that Canadian Armed Forces members who participated as volunteer speakers for the MPSB have provided feedback that their participation is having social and mental benefits like decreased isolation and loneliness, and a feeling of being valued and contributing to the community; and
- **Generating interest in careers:** Also a finding from the HC case study, a survey of speaker hosts indicated that 70 per cent of hosts feel that the MPSB had an impact on generating interest in careers with the Canadian Armed Forces.

There have been few, if any, negative outcomes of the CSP/CHF. One potential outcome noted by one PCH key informant and a few funding recipients is that the fund has become quite narrow in its focus, in terms of organizations funded and the focus on history. According to one of these key informants, this narrowing may be resulting in less creative approaches/projects proposed.

5.1.5 Best Practices, Successes, Challenges, and Lessons Learned with Respect to Project Effectiveness

The best practices or lessons learned of the projects assessed through the four case studies are varied, but primarily involve strong project planning and working with stakeholders. Two of the organizations noted elements of the program design that helped make their project achieve their expected outcomes. This includes responding to demand for resources while developing projects appropriate to the learning styles of the target audience, and ensuring the project is conducted using the best tools possible even if it results in a project delay. Two of the organizations also noted areas of working with other stakeholders that helped contribute to the projects' objectives. This includes using previous participants in the program, expanding the breadth of stakeholders and partnering on events for efficiency and cooperation.

²⁵ Canada's History, Past Winners.

5.2 Core Issue 5: Demonstration of Efficiency and Economy

Evaluation Questions 9-10

Is CSP/CHF delivered in an efficient/cost-effective manner?

Did CSP/CHF operate within budget? What are the reasons for variances, if any?

KEY FINDINGS

- The administrative cost of the program to overall funding envelope was 14.5 percent over the evaluation period, but when considering only the most recent three-year period (following significant streamlining of the program), this ratio is 5.5 percent. The lower administrative ratio can be attributed primarily to funding a smaller number of experienced organizations, streamlining the program to one component and the use of multi-year contribution agreements.
- There is no evidence that an alternative delivery model would lead to cost savings.

A total of \$17.7 million was budgeted for the CSP/CHF over the five-year period from. The actual expenditures during the same period totaled \$27.2 million. Administrative data and documentation show that this additional expenditure can be attributed to the following two factors: the transfer of responsibility for funding certain initiatives from other Departmental programs to the CHF, including the Online Works of Reference projects and Action Canada; and, the reallocation of Departmental funding to the CHF to support governmental priorities (such as the commemoration of the Bicentennial of the War of 1812).

The current program design has also led to the need for fewer human resources and lower operating costs for CSP/CHF. Operating costs decreased from over \$1 million in each of 2009-10 and 2010-11 to under \$400,000 in each of the following years, while the total value of grants and contributions increased from \$1.2 million to over \$5 million for subsequent years as a result of transfers of certain initiatives and reallocation of departmental funding to government priorities (see Appendix C).

The administrative cost of the program to overall funding envelope was 14.5 percent over the evaluation period. When considering only the most recent three-year period (2011-12 to 2013-14), the administrative ratio is 5.5 percent. The lower administrative ratio can be attributed primarily to funding a smaller number of experienced organizations, streamlining the program to one component and use of multi-year contribution agreements.

According to PCH staff interviewed, the reach of the program is broader as a result of the program redesign in 2011. The streamlining of the program led to fewer organizations being supported, but these organizations now receive a greater amount of funding in order to undertake larger-scale projects.

There is no evidence that an alternative delivery model would lead to cost savings. The program design has been viewed by some key informants as more efficient and effective than the previous

design, which included three components. The current design focuses on funding a smaller number of organizations whom the program has determined are sufficiently stable and have a broad national reach in order to reach many Canadians. Administrative data and program documentation show that the streamlining of the program to one component allowed the program to double the number of organizations and projects receiving strategic funding and to increase the amount of funding through this component by 10 times what it was previously. The program also funds projects through two- or three-year contribution agreements, which, according to key informants from PCH and client organizations, is an efficient element that lessens administrative burden and provides some stability to funding recipients, allowing them to focus on the delivery of their projects. Some departmental officials pointed out that as the program eases into a design that works and if no major changes occur in the next several years, more efficiencies may be realized.

Evaluation Question 11, 12, 14, 15

To what extent does CSP/CHF complement or duplicate existing programs/initiatives which support the enhancement of Canadians understanding/knowledge of Canada's history, civic and public policy sectors?

Are there alternative approaches to the CHF that could be more cost effective for promoting learning about Canada's history, civics and public policy?

Is the right governance in place to deliver the CSP/CHF effectively?

Is the current administrative model and delivery mechanism effective?

KEY FINDINGS

- The program is complementary to other federal government programs and does not duplicate what is being done elsewhere. The focus on the development of learning materials and learning activities related to history, civics and public policy differentiates the program from other initiatives undertaken by federal departments and agencies. The program also complements the work being undertaken by non-governmental groups, including those supported by the program and others.
- While the projects undertaken by the funded organizations have a broader target reach than youth, some CHF projects have an impact on youth and are deemed complementary to the youth programs (i.e. Youth Take Charge and Exchanges Canada) within the Department.
- Evidence shows that funding recipients are using efficient approaches (e.g., developing the skills and knowledge of intermediaries such as educators and specialists; using on-line technology including websites, social media, and video conferencing) to reach Canadians.
- The literature review shows that initiatives to improve understanding of history, civics and public policy are being undertaken in other countries (e.g., USA, UK and Australia), whether through the education system or externally.
- Funding recipients noted that the program was sufficiently flexible, relevant and responsive to meet the needs of their organizations.
- There may be other non-governmental organizations in Canada that deliver programming which aims to teach Canadians about history, civics and public policy, including some that are not currently funded by CSP/CHF.

To what extent does CSP/CHF complement or duplicate existing programs/initiatives which support to enhance Canadians understanding/knowledge of Canada's history, civic and public policy sectors?

A few PCH officials mentioned various other programs that might be similar to CSP/CHF. These include PCH's Celebration and Commemoration Program and programs under the Youth Participation Directorate (i.e. Youth Take Charge and Exchanges Canada). It was noted that programs within PCH Program Area 2.2: Engagement and Community Participation (Human Rights Program, Building Communities through Arts and Heritage, and the Aboriginal Peoples' Program) complement the work of CSP/CHF, as these programs involve community participation in an effort to increase attachment to one's country. However, key informants indicated there is no other PCH program that focuses exclusively on learning materials and learning activities.

The document review shows that while the projects undertaken by funded organizations have a broader target reach than youth, some CHF projects have an impact on youth and are deemed complementary to the youth programs (i.e. Youth Take Charge and Exchanges Canada) within the department.

There are also initiatives undertaken by Parks Canada, Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC), Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC), Library and Archives Canada (LAC), Library of Parliament (LoP), Elections Canada (EC), and Veterans Affairs Canada (VAC) that also promote history and civic engagement. However, these programs complement PCH programs rather than duplicate the activities and outcomes of other departments and agencies. The literature suggests that some of these programs are funding the development of informational resources and learning materials for target populations that are in line with the priorities of the respective departments and agencies.

A few key informants also mentioned, and the literature also suggests that, CHF complements provincial funding programs, such as those available in Alberta, Manitoba, and Newfoundland and Labrador, which are aimed at generating knowledge about events in provincial history or preserving the heritage of a particular region or group. In contrast, CSP/CHF fosters knowledge that pertains to Canada as a whole.

Funding recipients also see their organizations as complementing the work of CSP/CHF. There may be other non-governmental organizations in Canada that deliver programming that aims to teach Canadians about history, civics and public policy, including some that are not currently funded by CSP/CHF.

Are there alternative approaches to the CHF that could be more cost effective for promoting learning about Canada's history, civics and public policy?

The literature review found that the approach of CSP/CHF may be similar to other approaches to developing citizens' knowledge of history that are being undertaken in the US, UK, and Australia. It is not easy to draw comparisons between Canada and these countries given many differences in governance, government priorities and responsibilities for education. The literature

review shows that initiatives to improve understanding of history, civics and public policy are being undertaken in other countries, whether alongside the education system or apart from it. For example:

- In the US, many foundations and private organizations – as many as 100 – appear to be involved in history/civics education. The US government contributes to some of these programs, which include Learn and Serve America and the Teaching American History Program which are funded through the Department of Education;
- In the UK, there are many youth civic engagement programs that are carried out by civil society organizations. The government cooperates with many of these organizations and financially supports their efforts; and
- The Australian government, through its Department of Education, provides some subsidies, prizes and programs related to teaching and learning history.

Key informants, file review and case studies confirm that funding recipients are using efficient approaches to reaching Canadians. These approaches include: the focus on developing the knowledge and skills of intermediaries (e.g., educators, specialists) in order to reach Canadians and youth more broadly; and online technologies, including sophisticated websites that provide easy access to information. For projects where networking is an important component, online portals, e-newsletters and social media are used to keep participants engaged, and recipients cut costs where they can on accommodations and travel. For example, the Memory Project Speakers Bureau is using Skype and videoconferencing in order to connect remote communities with speakers and to provide an alternative when their volunteers encounter mobility challenges.

Is the right governance in place to deliver the CSP/CHF effectively?

The current program governance is viewed as appropriate by most staff who say it is appropriately situated within the Citizen Participation Branch, alongside, but separate from, programs in the Youth Participation Branch. PCH officials indicated this is appropriate given the broad focus of the program that includes developing materials and activities for access by all Canadians, not only youth (or students). A few PCH officials noted that there may be opportunities for the program to align with the Youth Directorate programs or the Canadian Museum of History, although concerns were also raised about introducing further change to the program before results have been realized.

Is the current administrative model and delivery mechanism effective?

Each of the case studies and interviews with funding recipients indicate positive working relationships with CSP/CHF staff and satisfaction with most elements of program design. Funding recipients speak of the program as being sufficiently flexible, relevant and responsive to the needs of their organizations. One exception to this is regarding budgeting and financial reporting. A few funding recipients indicated that the requirements for budgeting and financial reporting can be inflexible. It was also noted that the financial reporting requirements may not be as sensitive to the realities of non-profit organizations as they could be. A key informant mentioned that obtaining financial information retroactively can be difficult for non-profit

organizations. A few funding recipients also remarked that the time taken up by reporting makes it more difficult for recipient staff to focus on undertaking their project activities.

CSP/CHF has service standards for the timely delivery of the acknowledgement of receipt, funding decision and payment processes. As of June 2013, these service standards were as follows:

- Acknowledgement of receipt of application within 15 calendar days;
- Issuance of official written notification of the funding decision within 24 weeks of the date application was received;
- Issuance of payments within 28 calendar days of the successful fulfillment of requirements outlined in the contribution agreement; and
- To meet these standards for the majority of files.

Data on service standards indicates that the program has met or exceeded its standards for acknowledging receipt of applications and issuing notice of decision for every application received since 2010. However, a few project recipients stated that they encountered delays at some point in the application process, which made it difficult for at least one of these projects to meet their deadlines.

Evaluation Question 13

From what other sources have funding recipients leveraged funds?

KEY FINDINGS

- All projects have leveraged funding from other sources, including other federal departments/agencies (e.g., Parks Canada, Citizenship and Immigration Canada), private donors, corporations, and foundations. Other sources of funding included funding recipients' own revenue.
- Some volunteer and in-kind contributions have been made, such as donations of scholarly work, office space, and presenters.

The terms and conditions for CSP/CHF stipulate that PCH's contribution to an individual project will not exceed 75 percent of total eligible expenses, except in the case of the OWR projects where PCH contributions will not exceed 100 percent of total eligible expenses. There is also a stacking limit on 100 percent on total government assistance from all federal, provincial and municipal sources. Recipients are required to disclose their confirmed and potential funding sources at the start of a project.

Most CSP/CHF funding recipients who were interviewed indicated that CSP/CHF is never the sole funding source for these projects, as organizations are required to find other financial sources. Funding recipients for at least five of the projects acknowledged in interviews that

CSP/CHF funding was vital to their projects and that these projects would not have gone ahead without this commitment. For the remainder of organizations, it seems likely that CSP/CHF funding has been essential to undertaking their activities.²⁶

Aside from federal funding, major sources of funding include recipients' own revenue (such as magazine subscriptions), and funding from private donations (individuals, foundations, corporations). Other federal funding has been accessed in limited cases (e.g., Parks Canada, CIC). Project recipients (one each) noted contributions from provincial government, unions and a history network. Volunteer and in-kind contributions have also been made, such as donations of scholarly work, office space and presenters.

5.3 Performance Monitoring and Measurement

Evaluation Questions 16-18

Is the current performance measurement framework effective at capturing the results of the program?

What if any, changes to performance measurement are required?

Can any improvements be made to the existing performance measurement?

KEY FINDINGS

- Evidence shows that some challenges with performance measurement data exists. Measurement of program outcomes is challenging due to the great variety of projects, possible outputs, and potential interpretations of some indicators. Measuring progress toward the ultimate outcome presents a challenge because of the breadth of the ultimate outcome. A few funding recipients mentioned that they lack capacity to be able to measure how their projects have had an impact and because project outcomes are often qualitative and difficult to measure.
- There is a need for greater clarity in the information being collected from recipients and identification of indicators that can be consistently and meaningfully reported across all projects.

In relation to performance measurement, it is important to note that administrative data on project outcomes have been considered for only the two most recent years (2012-13 and 2013-14) for the purposes of the evaluation. This is due to the significant program changes in the earlier period of the evaluation timeline. Findings in this section focus on the performance data collection activities for this recent two year period.

Administrative data review, document and file review, and some key informant interviews with PCH staff and recipients showed that some challenges with performance measurement exist. The type of performance measurement data available varies by project. At the program level, the great variation in the different objectives of projects means that not all indicators are relevant to

²⁶ The only project where this is not completely clear is the project co-funded by CSP/CHF and VAC. Although CSP/CHF makes the major contribution, the VAC contribution is also significant. In this case, CSP/CHF has contributed to a discrete component of the Memory Project (the Speaker's Bureau, as opposed to other activities funded by VAC), which suggests that PCH funding is critical to maintaining this component.

each project, or may be more difficult for some projects to address than others. For some indicators, the majority of data provided is from one or two projects, and data for some projects is not available at all. For example:

- Copies of materials printed/distributed: 84 percent of copies are attributed to CNHS; no data are available in some years for three projects;
- Number of learning activities: 95 percent of activities are attributed to MPSB. If MPSB is excluded, 63 percent of results are attributed to UBC. No activities were recorded for two projects;
- Number of visitors accessing online materials: 95 percent of figures are attributed to OWR projects. No data are available in some years for six projects; and
- Number of educators and specialists accessing materials: 95 percent of figures are attributed to CNHS. No data was available for 5 projects.

There is a notable divide between projects that have wide reach to mass audiences, versus those that have very narrow audiences. While number of website visitors, downloads, and copies printed and distributed can be useful to show the uptake of a project geared towards a mass audience, such as CNHS, these may be less relevant to projects with a prescribed audience, like those undertaken by GGCLC, AC, ACS, and UBC, for whom distribution might be steady year over year because of a very focused project design. One case study highlighted that sheer numbers may not capture more meaningful outcomes of these projects.

Also, at the level of measuring immediate outcomes, it appears from the administrative data review, project files and key informant interviews that there may be different interpretations of what is being measured by some indicators. For example:

- number of copies of materials printed/produced: whether recipients are counting digital products/visual impressions in these figures;
- number of copies distributed: It is unclear how online distribution is captured, whether recipients are reporting all distribution or only access figures, and whether recipients are including copies printed/produced outside the same timeframe; and
- total numbers of web visitors, Facebook Likes, Twitters followers: It is unclear whether recipients report this cumulatively or only as new figures within the timeframe.

The variation of project outcomes logically means that all projects are not equally designed to meet each of the program's intermediate outcomes. For instance, network building is more of a focus for some projects that are specifically designed to build leadership capacity for other projects, this is not a core outcome, which again means that only a few projects may be sources of data to address these outcomes. A further challenge observed in measuring intermediate outcomes is that some outcomes are difficult to measure quantitatively (e.g., whether educators/specialists are using new knowledge; whether projects led to leadership and collaboration). Although recipients have been asked to provide quantitative indicators to measure

these, some projects have been better suited to measure this than others (e.g., projects with direct rather than indirect interaction with teachers).

As discussed in Section 5.1.3, measuring progress toward the ultimate outcome presents a challenge because of the breadth of the ultimate outcome. A few funding recipients mentioned that they lack capacity to be able to measure how their projects have had an impact and because project outcomes are often qualitative and difficult to measure. As mentioned, an indicator has been developed that requires projects to show enhancement of knowledge only among those directly reached by their activities, rather than Canadians broadly.

Both PCH staff and recipients indicate that the program has made progress since 2011 in developing common surveys and other forms of feedback mechanisms to gauge the impact that CHF-funded activities have on participants and on participants' level of satisfaction. Some PCH officials also say new tools for data collection are being developed with the goal to make these available to funding recipients to help measure results.

6. Conclusions and Recommendations

6.1 Conclusions

6.1.1 Relevance

The continued need for the CSP/CHF is demonstrated through research showing that Canadians feel knowledge of history produces positive outcomes like unity, identity, social cohesion and active citizenship; research with the public and youth that shows low knowledge of Canadian history; and perceptions of thought leaders that this knowledge deficit is linked to gaps in provincial curricula. Need for the program is further demonstrated by demand for the activities and resources being created by the funded projects.

The CSP/CHF is aligned with both Government of Canada and departmental priorities, especially those related to history and sharing and expressing Canadian identity and heritage. The CSP/CHF is aligned with federal responsibilities for fostering Canadian identity and values and for undertaking initiatives that promote social cohesion, civic engagement and national unity.

6.1.2 Performance – Achievement of Expected Outcomes

The CSP/CHF has funded projects that over the evaluation period attained the program's immediate intended outcomes, namely: delivering activities, creating and disseminating materials, and supporting networks related to history, civics and public policy. A total of nine organizations were funded through 19 separate contribution agreements. The projects demonstrate a variety of approaches to sharing knowledge about history, civics and public policy, including tactile resources, digital/multimedia materials, experiential learning and live, in-person knowledge sharing. Between 2012 and 2014, at least 902,664 copies of materials were distributed. These materials and resources include magazine issues, websites, e-newsletters, videos and films, reports, e-journals, articles, education guides, promotional brochures, an online game, giant maps, posters and lesson plans. Between 2012 and 2014, 2,354 learning activities were held, including classroom visits, public dialogues, workshops, webinars, a contest and conferences that spanned several days. Website engagement was also notable with 8.9 million unique visitors in 2012-13 and 6.1 million unique visitors in 2013-14, to the websites of funding recipients, 92 percent of which was attributed to the Online Works of Reference, two projects funded under the program, until the transfer to the Canadian Museum of History in 2014-15. There were 178,001 participants in formal and informal networks maintained by project recipients in 2013-14, and most funded organizations reported, qualitatively, growth in the number of participants as a result of their funded project. These networks are used to disseminate information about activities and materials, as well as to distribute content on Canadian history, civics and public policy. Network participants include educators as well as history specialists and interested Canadians.

The program's intermediate outcomes have been achieved through the thousands of learning activities and resources that have been provided to youth, Canadians, educators and specialists to learn about, and access information on, Canadian history, civics and public policy. Students

across the country were reached with materials and activities, particularly those made available through projects by Canada's National History Society, the Royal Canadian Geographical Society and Historica Canada's Memory Project Speakers Bureau. For example, an estimated 16,000 students were exposed to the RCGS War of 1812 resources during the 2012-13 and 2013-2014 school years. Lesson plans and education content posted to canadashistory.ca garnered thousands of views, potentially exposing hundreds of thousands of students to these ideas. The MPSB reached hundreds of thousands, mainly students, through its classroom presentations. Furthermore, Historica Canada's Heritage Minutes – two of which were developed through CSP/CHF funds during the evaluation period – have been broadcast to millions of Canadians on television networks and movie screen and are available for viewing online. Over 61,000 educators and specialists have been reached by the funded projects, and their buy-in and participation in activities has been important to helping to disseminate some resources widely to students (and thus to more Canadians).

Leadership and collaboration in Canada's history, civics, and public policy sectors has been an outcome for some projects but was also pointed by some key informants as an area of opportunity for fostering collaboration and leadership between organizations. Some funded projects, like those undertaken by Action Canada, the Governor General's Canadian Leadership Conference and the Association for Canadian Studies, are explicitly connecting current and future leaders in the areas of history, civics and public policy, and are maintaining networks of these individuals. Some organizations collaborated with other like-minded organizations to help distribute, develop and deliver learning materials and activities.

The current ultimate outcome is articulated as "Canadians enhance their understanding of Canada's history, civics and public policy". The evaluation has identified difficulties in measuring this outcome, including the existence of other initiatives to enhance Canadians' knowledge – such as the initiatives of other federal government programs – which can make it difficult to attribute any increases in knowledge to the program. As a result, the indicator that has been developed to measure this is "percentage of Canadians reached by CHF who have enhanced their knowledge of Canadian history, civics or public policy". This indicator focuses solely on measuring knowledge change among participants and end users of the materials and activities generated through funded projects. To date, there have been some projects that have attempted to gather data to address this indicator, such as evidence showing that direct beneficiaries of the projects have increased their knowledge. However, collection of this information has been uneven across projects and this information can be difficult to gather for projects whose end users are reached through intermediaries (e.g., teachers, specialists, leaders). To measure this indicator, the program has articulated the intention for standardized data collection to be in place, beginning with revising a reporting tool in 2015.

6.1.3 Performance – Efficiency and Economy

The program expended \$27.2 million over five years, reaching millions of Canadians through the resources and information produced by CSP/CHF projects, and many of these resources remain easily accessible to Canadians online. The administrative cost of the program to overall funding envelope was 14.5 percent over the evaluation period, but when considering only the most recent three-year period, this ratio is 5.5 percent. The lower administrative ratio can be attributed

primarily to funding a smaller number of experienced organizations, streamlining the program to one component and the use of multi-year contribution agreements.

The program is complementary to other federal government programs. While the projects undertaken by the funded organizations have a broader target reach than youth, some CHF project have an impact on youth which are deemed complementary to the youth programs (i.e. Youth Take Charge and Exchanges Canada) within the Department. There are initiatives undertaken by Parks Canada, Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada, Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC), Library and Archives Canada (LAC), Library of Parliament (LoP), Elections Canada (EC), and Veterans Affairs Canada (VAC) that may complement CSP/CHF. However, in terms of funding activities and fostering networks and collaboration, it appears that CSP/CHF takes a role that is unique among other federal organizations. CHF also complements provincial funding programs, such as those available in Alberta, Manitoba, and Newfoundland and Labrador, which are aimed at generating knowledge about events in provincial history or preserving the heritage of a particular region or group, and it complements work being undertaken by non-governmental groups, including those supported by the program and others.

All projects have leveraged funding from other sources, including other federal departments/agencies (Parks Canada, Citizenship and Immigration Canada), private donors, corporations and foundations. Other sources of funding included funding recipients' own revenue. Some volunteer and in-kind contributions have been made, such as donations of scholarly work, office space and presenters.

There is no evidence that an alternative delivery model would lead to cost savings. There is strong satisfaction with elements of program design among staff and funding recipients. Administrative processes are clear and straightforward for recipients, and the governance of the program and its place within PCH are appropriate. There may be other non-governmental organizations in Canada that deliver programming which aims to teach Canadians about history, civics and public policy, including some that are not currently funded by CSP/CHF.

6.1.4 Performance – Performance Measurement and Monitoring

Measurement and monitoring are in place but are challenging due to the great variety of projects, possible outputs and potential interpretations of some indicators. There is a need for greater clarity in the information being collected from recipients and identification of indicators that can be consistently and meaningfully reported across all projects. The program has articulated the intention for standardized data collection and reporting to address the ultimate outcome, beginning with revising a reporting tool in 2015.

6.2 Recommendations and Management Response

Below are three recommendations stemming from the evaluation, as well as the management and action plan.

Recommendation 1		
<i>To make the program more accessible, the Assistant Deputy Minister of Citizenship, Heritage, and Regions should investigate opportunities for the program to fund, within the allocated budget, other organizations that conduct work in the areas of history, civics and public policy.</i>		
Statement of Agreement /Disagreement		
Management agrees with this recommendation.		
Management Response		
<p>Since the CHF has a modest budget and several multiyear agreements, almost all of its funding is already committed for the next fiscal year. Nevertheless, the CHF will engage current funding recipients to obtain names and contact information of nationally significant, legally incorporated Canadian history and civic organizations with which the current funding recipients are, or have recently been, partnered. The program will then perform independent research to identify additional organizations of national scope that have demonstrated capacity to develop learning materials and activities aimed at increasing knowledge and understanding of Canadian history, civics and public policy. This will allow the program to expand its base of possible applicants. That being said, CHF will continue to focus on a small number of projects with significant reach and the administration of multi-year agreements, in order to retain the efficiencies achieved in the last redesign of the administration of the program.</p>		
Deliverable(s)	Timelines	OPI
Outreach activities with current funding recipients (records of outreach such as e-mail messages, meeting minutes or records of telephone conversation)	July 31, 2015	Director General, Citizen Participation
Independent research (Report)	October 31, 2015	Director General, Citizen Participation
Recommendation 2		
<i>To effectively support evaluations and decision-making, the Assistant Deputy Minister of Citizenship, Heritage and Regions should improve performance measurement and monitoring so that there is more consistent, reliable data being collected to demonstrate program outcomes.</i>		


Statement of Agreement /Disagreement		
Management agrees with this recommendation.		
Management Response		
It has been a challenge for the program to aggregate data because of the recent changes to its structure and means of operating coupled with the wide variety of activities undertaken and the various types of data gathered by recipients. The program will make necessary revisions to its tools to support funding recipients in producing uniform performance measurement and data collection. The program will also update and finalize its Performance Measurement, Evaluation and Risk Strategy (PMERS), in light of the findings and recommendations contained within the evaluation.		
Deliverable(s)	Timelines	OPI
CHF is revising its reporting tool for funding recipients with standardized questions. (Tool or tools developed)	November 30, 2015	Director General, Citizen Participation
The program will evaluate the data collected and make additional revisions to the tool as needed to continue to improve reporting and to support funding recipients in producing uniform performance measurement and data collection. (Revised tools, if any)	June 30, 2017	Director General, Citizen Participation
Update and finalize CHF PMERS (Copy of PMERS)	November 30, 2015	Director General, Citizen Participation
Recommendation 3		
<i>To increase program impact, the Assistant Deputy Minister of Citizenship, Heritage and Regions should investigate how PCH can encourage or support more opportunities for collaboration and sharing of the knowledge and expertise developed by CSP/CHF projects.</i>		
Statement of Agreement /Disagreement		
Management agrees with this recommendation.		
Management Response		
As was noted in the evaluation, most CHF funding recipients are already collaborating with other organizations within CHF and beyond. Knowledge is being shared beyond the organizations and organizations are collaborating on projects. The CHF will continue to encourage this collaboration.		

Deliverable(s)	Timelines	OPI
<p>Continue holding and documenting discussions with CHF funding recipients to encourage them to continue and expand collaborations with other organizations within the program and beyond. Discussions will be held following the announcement of any Canada 150 funding, in advance of Canada History Week and on an ongoing basis. (Meeting minutes, notes to file, e-mails or agendas)</p>	<p>May 2015 July 2015 Ongoing</p>	<p>Director General, Citizen Participation</p>


APPENDICES

ANNEX A: LOGIC MODEL

Canadian Studies Program Logic Model
(In effect from April 2009 to March 2011)



Canadian Studies Program Logic Model
(In effect from April 2011 to June 2013)



APPENDIX B: OVERVIEW OF ORGANIZATIONS FUNDED BY CSP/CHF

Organization	Summary of Organization Mandate & Core Activities	Projects Funded Through CSP/CHF	Duration of Projects
The Action Canada Foundation	Action Canada offers an annual fellowship to up to 20 emerging leaders from varied career paths to hone leadership and teamwork skills, examine historical and current Canadian issues and present and publish a public policy report.	Building Leadership for Canada's Future	2009-10
		Building Leadership for Canada's Future	2010-11 to 2012-13
		Action Canada	2013-14
Association for Canadian Studies	Initiates and supports activities in the areas of research, teaching, communications, and the training of students in the field of Canadian Studies, especially in interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary perspectives.	Engaging Canadians: Enhancing our Knowledge about Canada in the Info Age	2010-11 to 2011-12
		Canada: Towards 150: Making our past relevant to our present	2012-13 to 2013-14
Canada's National History Society (CNHS)	Seeks to make the discovery of our nation's past relevant, engaging, empowering and accessible to all Canadians. This is done through magazines, awards, and community building.	Online Academic Community Channel for Canadian History	2009-10 to 2010-11
		Canada's National History Awards	2009-10 to 2011-12
		Canadian History Community Network Building Initiative	2013-14
		Canada's History Community Initiatives	2011-12 to 2012-13
Governor General's Canadian Leadership Conference	The conference was created to broaden the perspectives of future leaders in business, unions and public administration so that their decisions are based on a practical understanding of the influence of their organizations on the general welfare of the community.	The Governor General's Canadian Leadership Conference	2011-12 to 2012-13
Historica Foundation of Canada	Historica Canada is devoted to enhancing awareness of Canadian history and citizenship. Programs are aimed at appealing to all Canadians, although several specifically focus on youth.	Benchmarks of Historical Thinking – Implementation Planning	2009-10 to 2010-11
Historica Canada (formerly known as The Historica Dominion Institute) ²⁷		Heritage Minutes	2013-14
		War of 1812 Bicentennial Commemoration Education Campaign	2011-12 to 2013-14
		The Canadian Encyclopedia (Mobile Web Site and iPhone/iPad app)	2010-11
		The Canadian Encyclopedia – Encyclopedia of Music in Canada	2011-12 to 2013-14

²⁷ Responsibility for the Memory Project Speakers Bureau was transferred to VAC. In June 2014, a new memorandum of understanding between VAC and PCH was signed in order to support a 2014-2017 three-year contribution agreement with Historica Canada.

Organization	Summary of Organization Mandate & Core Activities	Projects Funded Through CSP/CHF	Duration of Projects
Governing Council of the University of Toronto and Université Laval	Initiated through the University of Toronto. Project now transferred to Canadian Museum of History	Dictionary of Canadian Biography	2011-12 to 2013-14
The Royal Canadian Geographical Society	Society has the mandate of making Canada better known to Canadians and to the world through fostering a deeper appreciation of Canada's natural, cultural and social heritage. Activities include: publications such as Canadian Geographic magazine, Geographical and Canadian Geographic Travel; supports Canadian geographical expeditions and provides grants and scholarships for cutting-edge geographical research.	Canadian Educator Resources for the War of 1812 Bicentennial	2011-12 to 2013-14
University of British Columbia – Centre for the Study of Historical Consciousness	Dedicated to facilitating research on the understanding and teaching of history. Sponsors research in the field of historical consciousness, serves as a base for Canadian and international scholars. The Centre also establishes links with schools, museums, and the broader community for discussion and dissemination of research projects.	The Historical Thinking Project	2011-12 to 2012-13
		The Historical Thinking Project	2013-14

Source: Administrative data (amounts per year.xls, Clients and projects – summary.xls. Comments based on review of documentation and files, key informant interviews, case studies. Note that separate projects represent separate contribution agreements. Actual project activities sometimes carry over from previous contribution agreements.

APPENDIX C: REFERENCE LEVELS AND ACTUAL EXPENDITURES FOR CSP/CHF

Reference Levels for CSP/CHF for the Period Covered in the Evaluation

	Reference Level							Total
	Vote 1				Vote 5			
	<u>Salary</u>	<u>EBP</u>	<u>O&M</u>	<u>Sub-total</u>	<u>Grants</u>	<u>Contributions</u>	<u>Sub-total</u>	
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
2009-10	536,973	107,395	151,291	795,659	200,000	190,000	390,000	1,185,659
2010-11	662,973	132,595	1,171,802	1,967,370	1,150,060	315,040	1,465,100	3,432,470
2011-12	713,217	142,643	1,128,452	1,984,312	1,150,060	362,330	1,512,390	3,496,702
2012-13	649,503	129,901	-	779,404	1,150,060	3,312,330	4,462,390	5,241,794
2013-14	93,902	18,780	184,311	296,993	1,150,060	2,937,330	4,087,390	4,384,383
Total	2,656,568	531,314	2,635,856	5,823,738	4,800,240	7,117,030	11,917,270	17,741,008

Source: Program.

Actual Spending for CSP/CHF for Period Covered by Evaluation

	Actuals							<u>Total</u>
	Vote 1				Vote 5			
	<u>Salary</u>	<u>EBP</u>	<u>O&M</u>	<u>Sub-total</u>	<u>Grants</u>	<u>Contributions</u>	<u>Sub-total</u>	
2009-10	590,344	118,069	329,546	1,037,959	-	1,214,254	1,214,254	2,252,213
2010-11	546,239	109,248	1,275,166	1,930,653	3,065,925	2,258,025	5,323,950	7,254,603
2011-12	277,317	55,463	42,862	375,642	210,660	5,333,600	5,544,260	5,919,902
2012-13	179,764	35,953	182	215,899	557,232	4,898,042	5,455,274	5,671,173
2013-14	298,621	59,724	20,564	378,909	654,395	5,115,737	5,770,132	6,149,041
Total	1,892,285	378,457	1,668,320	3,939,062	4,488,212	18,819,658	23,307,870	27,246,932

Source: Program.

Variance for CSP/CHF for Period Covered by Evaluation

	Variances							<u>Total</u>
	Vote 1				Vote 5			
	<u>Salary</u>	<u>EBP</u>	<u>O&M</u>	<u>Sub-total</u>	<u>Grants</u>	<u>Contributions</u>	<u>Sub-total</u>	
2009-10	-53,371	- 10,674	- 178,255	- 242,300	200,000	-1,024,254	- 824,254	- 1,066,554
2010-11	116,734	23,347	- 103,364	36,717	-1,915,865	-1,942,985	-3,858,850	- 3,822,133
2011-12	435,900	87,180	1,085,590	1,608,670	939,400	-4,971,270	- 4,031,870	- 2,423,200
2012-13	469,739	93,948	- 182	563,505	592,828	-1,585,712	- 992,884	- 429,379
2013-14	204,719	- 40,944	163,747	- 81,916	495,665	-2,178,407	-1,682,742	- 1,764,658
Total	1,173,721	152,857	967,536	1,884,676	312,028	-11,702,628	-11,390,600	-9,505,924

APPENDIX D: TBS CORE EVALUATION ISSUES

The Government of Canada requires that evaluations support the following:

- Accountability, through public reporting on results
- Expenditure management
- Management for results
- Policy and program improvement

The core evaluation issues used to guide this evaluation are:

Relevance	
Issue #1: Continued Need for program	Assessment of the extent to which the program continues to address a demonstrable need and is responsive to the needs of Canadians
Issue #2: Alignment with Government Priorities	Assessment of the linkages between program objectives and (i) federal government priorities and (ii) departmental strategic outcomes
Issue #3: Alignment with Federal Roles and Responsibilities	Assessment of the role and responsibilities for the federal government in delivering the program
Performance (effectiveness, efficiency and economy)	
Issue #4: Achievement of Expected Outcomes	Assessment of progress toward expected outcomes (incl. immediate, intermediate and ultimate outcomes) with reference to performance targets and program reach, program design, including the linkage and contribution of outputs to outcomes
Issue #5: Demonstration of Efficiency and Economy	Assessment of resource utilization in relation to the production of outputs and progress toward expected outcomes

APPENDIX E – EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

Evaluation Core Issues	Evaluation Questions	Indicators	Data sources	Methods of collection
Relevance				
Issue #1: Continued need for program				
<p>Assessment of the extent to which the Program continues to address a demonstrable need and is responsive to the needs of Canadians</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ To what extent does the CSP/CHF continue to address a demonstrable need and is responsive to the needs of Canadians? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Perceptions on the extent to which the Program continues to address a demonstrable need and is responsive to the needs of Canadians ➤ Number of signed contribution agreements or memorandum of understandings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ TB submissions ➤ Terms and Conditions ➤ Throne speeches ➤ Departmental reports ➤ Federal budgets ➤ Existing research on Canadians' knowledge of Canada, including The Historical-Dominion Institute and Association for Canadian Studies or other survey results (particularly knowledge-level questions and ways of learning) ➤ PCH officials ➤ CSP/CHF funded recipients and end users 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Document review ➤ Literature review ➤ Key informant interviews ➤ Case studies

Issue #2: Alignment with Government Priorities				
Assessment of the linkages between program objectives and (i) federal government priorities and (ii) departmental strategic outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ To what extent is CSP/CHF aligned with federal government priorities? ➤ To what extent is CSP/CHF aligned with the priorities of PCH and its strategic outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Perceptions on the extent to which CSP/CHF is aligned with priorities of PCH and its strategic outcomes ➤ Perceptions on the extent to which CSP/CHF is aligned with federal government priorities ➤ Evidence on the extent to which CSP/CHF is aligned with priorities of PCH and its strategic outcomes ➤ Evidence on the extent to which CSP/CHF is aligned with federal government priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ PCH officials, CSP/CHF funded recipients ➤ TB submissions ➤ Terms and Conditions ➤ Throne speeches ➤ Departmental reports ➤ Federal budgets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Key informant interviews ➤ Document review ➤ Case Studies
Issue #3: Alignment with Federal Roles and Responsibilities				
Assessment of the roles and responsibilities of the federal government in delivering the program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ To what extent is CSP/CHF aligned with departmental and federal roles and responsibilities? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Perceptions on the extent to which CSP/CHF is aligned with departmental and federal roles and responsibilities ➤ Evidence on the extent to which CSP/CHF is aligned with the roles and responsibilities of the federal government in delivering the program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ PCH officials ➤ Speech from the Thrones ➤ Federal budgets ➤ Departmental reports ➤ CSP/CHF Terms and Conditions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Key informant interviews ➤ Document review ➤ Case studies

Performance (effectiveness, efficiency and economy)				
Issue #4: Achievement of Expected Outcomes				
Assessment of progress towards expected outcomes (i.e. immediate, intermediate and ultimate outcomes) with reference to performance targets, program reach, and program design, including the linkage between outputs and outcomes	Is the program reaching its immediate outcomes?			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ To what extent does CSP/CHF develop/enhance materials and activities organized on Canada's history, civics and public policy? ➤ To what extent does CSP/CHF support formal and informal history, civics and public policy networks? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Number and type of learning materials developed/enhanced ➤ Number of activities organized on Canada's history, civics and public policy ➤ Number of formal history, civics and public policy networks supported by CSP/CHF ➤ Number of informal history, civics and public policy networks supported by CSP/CHF ➤ Perceptions on the extent to which CSP/CHF develop/enhance materials and activities organized on Canada's history, civics and public policy ➤ Perceptions on the extent to which CSP/CHF support formal and informal history, civics and public policy networks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Program documents such as final reports of funded recipients and survey conducted of end users ➤ PCH officials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Administrative data review ➤ Key informant interviews ➤ Document review ➤ Case studies
	Is the program reaching its intermediate outcomes?			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ To what extent did CSP/CHF expose Canadians, particularly youth to knowledge on Canada's history, civics and public policy? ➤ To what extent did CSP/CHF provide opportunities for educators and specialists to use new knowledge to promote learning of Canada's 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ % of Canadians exposed to knowledge on Canada's history, civics and public policy ➤ Number/quantity of learning materials, activities offered and distributed in both official languages as a result of CSP/CHF ➤ Number of educators and specialists reached by CSP/CHF having access to learning materials and/or learning or developmental activities ➤ Number of educators and specialists reached by CSP/CHF applying new 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ GCIMS ➤ Project final report from CSP/CHF funded recipients ➤ Participant questionnaires ➤ PCH officials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Administrative data review ➤ Key informant interviews ➤ Document review ➤ Case studies

	<p>history, civics and public policy?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ To what extent did CSP/CHF encourage leadership and collaboration in Canada's history, civic and public policy sectors? 	<p>knowledge gained through the Program</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Perceptions of educators and specialists on new knowledge in promoting learning of Canada's history, civics and public policy ➤ Evidence of use of new knowledge to promote learning of Canada's history, civics and public policy ➤ Perceptions on level of leadership and collaboration within the history, civics, and public policy sectors 		
Is the program reaching its ultimate outcomes?				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ To what extent did CSP/CHF enhance Canadians understanding/knowledge of Canada's history, civic, and public policy? <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ What, if any, unintended outcomes (positive or negative) have occurred as a result of CSP/CHF? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Percentage of Canadians reached by CSP/CHF who have enhanced their knowledge of Canada's history, civics, and/or public policy ➤ Perceived impacts of the CSP/CHF on knowledge level of Canadians reached ➤ Evidence of unintended outcomes (negative or positive) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Program documents ➤ GCIMS ➤ Final reports of funded recipients ➤ PCH officials, funded program recipients 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Key informant interviews ➤ Document review ➤ Literature review ➤ Case studies
Issue #5: Demonstration of Efficiency and Economy				
<p>Assessment of resource utilization in relation to the production of outputs and progress toward expected outcomes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Is CSP/CHF delivered in an efficient/cost-effective manner? ➤ Did CSP/CHF operate within budget? What are the reasons for variances, if any? ➤ To what extent does 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Evidence and view of key informants regarding the efficiency of CSP/CHF in achieving its outcomes in comparison to other government programs or similar delivery mechanisms ➤ Year over year trends in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Total annual revenues of the CSP/CHF - Administrative costs - Ratio of administrative costs to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Program documents ➤ PCH officials ➤ Program financial data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Administrative data analysis ➤ Key informant interviews ➤ Document review ➤ Literature review ➤ Case Studies

	<p>CSP/CHF complement or duplicate existing programs/initiatives which support to enhance Canadians understanding/knowledge of Canada's history, civic, and public policy sectors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Are there alternative approaches to the CHF that could be more cost effective for promoting learning about Canada's history, civics and public policy? ➤ From what other sources has CSP/CHF managed to leverage funds? ➤ Is the right governance in place to deliver the CSP/CHF effectively? ➤ Is the current administrative model and delivery mechanism effective? 	<p>total annual resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of FTE - Salary costs - Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Relationship between resources consumed and outcomes ➤ Extent to which CSP/CHF complements or overlaps with other provincial, federal or non-governmental programs and initiatives ➤ Extent to which CSP/CHF is the appropriate means and efficient ways to reach its goals ➤ Perception of clients and PCH officials on alternative governance and delivery structures which would be more efficient and effective ➤ Identification of alternative mechanisms or approaches to the CHF ➤ Extent to which resources are perceived to be used as cost-effectively as possible to obtain Program outputs and outcomes ➤ Views of key informants regarding the effectiveness of the current arrangements ➤ Evidence and views of key informants regarding the feasibility and relative value of alternate models ➤ Type and amount of funds leveraged 		
--	---	---	--	--

Performance Monitoring and Measurement			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Is the current performance measurement framework effective at capturing the results of the program? ➤ What if any, changes to performance measurement are required? ➤ Can any improvements be made to the existing performance measurement? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Perceptions of key informants on the extent to which performance monitoring and measurement activities were sufficient and supported result reporting and evaluation ➤ Perceptions of key informants on possible improvements to the performance monitoring and measurement activities ➤ Current monitoring processes ➤ Identification of potential changes and improvements to CHF performance measurement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Guidelines of the CSP/CHF ➤ Information from PCH officials ➤ Administrative Data
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Document review ➤ Key informant interviews

APPENDIX F: Number of Copies of Learning Materials Distributed by CSP/CHF Projects, 2012-13 and 2013-14

Organization Name - Project Name	Number of copies distributed	Types of learning materials
AC	1,350	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Task Force Projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Three task force projects a year. ○ Presentations are delivered in person and written papers are disseminated › Op-ed articles (distributed online and submitted to media outlets for publication)
ACS	6,660	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Quarterly magazine called <i>Canadian Issues</i> with topics like Federalism, the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Teaching in the Canadian North › an e-journal (Canadian Journal for Social Research)
UBC	12,614	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Historical thinking professional development book for teachers › curriculum guidelines for Ontario social studies grades 1 to 6 and history, geography grades 7 and 8 Canadian and world studies grades 9 and 10 › classroom posters › Sam Steele online exhibit with digital images and artifacts › War of 1812 activity series (25 lessons + activities) › “Take 2” videos and history docs that encourage critical thinking
CNHS	717,445	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Community Channel Portal (a website Community channel dedicated to small and mid-sized Canadian museums, archives, historic sites, and teachers) › e-newsletters › videos of award recipients › awards information and profiles of recipients › Kayak: Canada’s History Magazine for Kids › travel stories › Calendar of events highlighting activities across Canada (museums, etc.) › Parks Canada stories › special section on War of 1812: videos

Organization Name - Project Name	Number of copies distributed	Types of learning materials
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › live blog › exhibit reviews › reading list › A Field Guide to the War of 1812 (video series with interviews with museum experts, historians, re-enactors) › podcasts (30, featuring award recipients) › lesson plans submitted by GG award finalists
HC -TCE	0	› The Canadian Encyclopaedia website with study guides and other learning resources, and promotional brochures
HC - MPSB	0	› N/a (results for this project are counted as activities)
U of T - DCB	46	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Biographies of Canadians published online › Revisions to already published biographies
GGCLC	3,350	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Conference participants' binder › final report of the conference › conference prospectus (promotes the conference)
HC - 1812	56,144	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Thematic bilingual education guide › Microsite to complement the guides › Two Heritage Minutes (Richard Pierpoint, Queenston Heights)
RCGS - 1812	105,055	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Mega-maps (giant floor maps) › 3D standing timelines › portrait cards › poster maps › guides for secondary school students › cartoon ships › online trivia game
Total	902,664	

Sources: Administrative data file review, case studies.

The Historica-Dominion Institute of Canada, launched in September 2009, is an amalgamation of the Historica Foundation of Canada and the Dominion Institute. In September 2013, the Institute was renamed Historica Canada.

APPENDIX G: Number of Activities as Part of CSP/CHF Projects, 2012-13 and 2013-14

Organization Name - Project Name	Types of activities	Total Activities 2012-13 to 2013-14
AC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Working conferences (including tours, learning sessions) (5 per year) › Public dialogues (4 per year) 	26
ACS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › History Conference, including pre-conference forums 	4
UBC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › UBC Centre for Study of Historical Consciousness: summer institutes and workshops across Canada › a conference in 2012-13 (a 2013-14 conference was planned but was not held) › a workshop series in Saskatchewan › 10 keynote plenaries. 	103*
CNHS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Webinars › Governor General's History Awards › National History Forums › recordings of forum presentations 	28
HC -TCE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › No activities 	0
HC - MPSB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › speaking engagements (940 in 2012-13 and 1,243 in 2013-14); › community events and commemorative events across Canada. › Only the speaking engagements were funded by PCH and are counted here. 	2,183
U of T - DCB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Art of Biography Conference, Colloque de l'ACFAS, collaborations with the Swiss Dictionary and Musée de la Mémoire vivante. 	5
GGCLC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › conference events (opening plenary, orientation, study tours, closing plenary) 	4
HC - 1812	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Historica Canada 1812: National essay and art challenge 	1
RCGS - 1812	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › No activities counted; however, their maps are used by teachers to hold classroom/school-based activities. 	0
Total		2,354

Sources: data rep template.xls, provided by program; project files, case studies

*Figure likely under-reports actual. Accounts for at least one workshop in six provinces in 2012-13; the exact number was not recorded.

APPENDIX H: TYPES OF FORMAL/INFORMAL NETWORKS MAINTAINED BY CSP/CHF PROJECTS, 2012-13 AND 2013-14

Organization Name - Project Name	2012-13	2013-14	Types of Networks
AC	188	187	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Action Canada network of past fellows › Fellows Speakers Bureau › Action Canada Healthcare Network
ACS	2,890	4,941	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Networks of national history conference attendees representing individuals/organizations with an interest in history; Sub-network of history teachers (English and French) › history “intervenants” from different disciplines
UBC	n/a	3,210	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Classroom teachers, museum educators and archivists, academics, history/heritage organizations (through direct collaborations) › Attendees at summer institutes
CNHS	8,494	15,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Canada’s History network (e-newsletter subscribers) › e-newsletters for primary/secondary school teachers and for community organizations (in Eng and Fr)
HC -TCE	n/a	73,542	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Teachers network › Attendance at teachers’ conferences
HC - MPSB	62,363	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Volunteer recruitment, teachers, community groups (all are email based lists)
U of T - DCB	n/a	1,258	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › members registered on the DCB website, registered email subscribers
GGCLC	3,152	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › conference participants (communicate in-person at meetings and by emails and social media); › conference alumni, › conference news subscribers (prospective participants); › Facebook group for conference members › formal partnerships (Aboriginal Business Council, Council of Canadian CEOs, Privy Council Office)
HC - 1812	n/a	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › No information
RCGS - 1812	7,500	10,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> › Educational Network of Geography, History, and Social Studies Teachers
Total	69,863	108,138	

Source: Project files, data rep template.xls (provided by program); interviews (RCGS)

APPENDIX I: Social Media and Web Statistics for CSP/CHF Projects, 2012-13 to 2013-14

	Twitter Followers		Facebook Likes		Unique Web Visitors		Web Page Views	
	2012-13	2013-14	2012-13	2013-14	2012-13	2013-14	2012-13	2013-14
AC	1,013	1,083	314	602	32,344	30,325	129,530	112,204
ACS	800	973	-	-	96,929	23,686	128,732	95,982
UBC	-	-	-	-	45,485	55,722	188,482	214,845
CNHS	650	5,200	1,000	1,624	419,214	261,495	1,528,801	835,970
HC -TCE	2,369	3,382	-	-	7,046,774	4,737,143	10,501,642	8,579,277
HC - MPSB	2,809	3,784	3,245	1,294	110,049	148,486	-	-
U of T - DCB	-	245	-	558	1,164,341	866,678	3,040,732	2,993,383
GGCLC	-	-	-	-	27,427	30,325	231,121	-
HC - 1812	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
RCGS - 1812	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	7,641	14,667	4,559	4,078	8,942,563	6,153,860	15,749,040	12,831,661

Source: data rep template.xls, provided by program; case studies (MPSB)

APPENDIX J: PARTICIPATION IN LEARNING ACTIVITIES AND NUMBERS OF VISITORS ACCESSING ONLINE MATERIALS PRODUCED BY CSP/CHF PROJECTS, 2012-13 AND 2013-14 COMBINED

	Total Actual Participation in Learning Activities	Total Number of Visitors Accessing Materials Online to Date*	Target Groups
AC	1,006	2,199	Emerging and established public policy specialists, general public
ACS	853	242	Educators, leaders in history field
UBC	8,114	3,239	Educators, leaders in history field
CNHS	1,482	566,827	Educators, students, general public, youth
HC -TCE	n/a	11,744,478**	Students, youth, educators, general public
HC - MPSB	183,171	n/a	Students, educators
U of T - DCB	n/a	2,031,019**	Students, educators
GGCLC	822	10,000	Leaders/specialists in various fields of civic life, public policy, education, NGOs, business
HC - 1812	184	170,215	General public, educators, students
RCGS - 1812	n/a (participation is counted as number of educators accessing materials)	n/a	Educators, students, history specialists
Total	195,632	14,528,219	

Sources: data rep template.xls (provided by program); project files.

Disaggregated data by target group are not available. *The admin data suggest some projects may have counted this figure cumulatively over 2012-13, while others recorded a new count each year. **Number of unique page visitors

APPENDIX K: Total Number of Educators or Specialists Who Are Accessing Materials Produced Through CSP/CHF Projects, 2012-13 and 2013-14

	Total number of educators or specialists who are accessing materials
AC	813
ACS	2,637
UBC	0
CNHS	56,521
HC -TCE	n/a
HC - MPSB	n/a
U of T - DCB	n/a
GGCLC	250
HC - 1812	n/a
RCGS - 1812	1,000*
Total	61,221

Source: data rep template.xls, provided by program; case studies

* Case study information for RCGS indicates “hundreds” of teachers and educators.

APPENDIX L: BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Canada. *Department of Canadian Heritage Act (S.C. 1995, c. 11)*. Statutes of Canada. Accessed November 2014 at <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-17.3/>
- Canada's History. Past Winners. Accessed January 2015 at <http://www.canadashistory.ca/Awards/Popular-Media/Past-Pierre-Berton-Award-Winners>
- Canadian Heritage. *Departmental Performance Report*. 2009-10. Accessed October 2014 at <http://www.pch.gc.ca/eng/1312568647473>
- Canadian Heritage. *Departmental Performance Report*. 2013-14. Accessed October 2014 at <http://www.pch.gc.ca/eng/1312568647473>
- Chalifoux, Marc, and J.D.M. Stewart. The Canadian History Report Card: Curriculum Analysis of High Schools in Canada. The Dominion Institute, 2009. Accessed November 2014 at <http://historyontrial.ca/Louis%20Riel/media/Dominion%20Institute%20High%20School%20Study.pdf>.
- Dominion Institute. The Canadian History Report Card: Curriculum Analysis of High Schools in Canada. 2009. Accessed October 2014 at <http://www.dominion.ca/release15062009.pdf>
- Historica Canada. New poll aimed to measure knowledge and attitudes of Canadians related to what has long been referred to as the 'The Forgotten War'. Historica Canada, November 11, 2013. Accessed November 6, 2014. <https://www.historicacanada.ca/node/3574>.
- Ipsos Reid. The Dominion Institute National Citizenship Exam Survey of 1997. November 10, 1997. Accessed October 2014 at <http://www.ipsos-na.com/news-polls/pressrelease.aspx?id=993>
- Ipsos Reid. The Heritage Minutes are back! - National Poll Measures Top Minutes of All Time. 2012. Accessed October 2014 at <https://www.historicacanada.ca/content/heritage-minutes-are-back-national-poll-measures-top-minutes-all-time-foretells-next-chapter>
- Ipsos Reid. On the Verge of Canada Day, Four in Five (81%) Canadians Believe Compatriots Should Show More Patriotism. June 30, 2014. Accessed November 6, 2014. <https://www.historicacanada.ca/sites/default/files/PDF/polls/Historica%20Canada%20Day%20Factum%20%20Final%20-%20release%20June%2030.pdf>.
- Jedwab, Jack. Searching for Canadian History. Presentation for the Association for Canadian Studies. April 2010.
- Jedwab, Jack and Julie Perrone. Remembering our Canadian History: Learning, Knowledge, and Pride. Presentation. Association for Canadian Studies. June 2, 2013. Accessed November

2014 at

http://www.google.ca/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0CB0QFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.acs-aec.ca%2Fpdf%2Fpolls%2FCanada%2520History%2520Week.ppt&ei=XRzmVMDTBvSLsQTRtIHADA&usg=AFQjCNHVapmKGtK4_jx6qsSCVFqSuF6zNQ&sig2=suKcgl4mXQyGk8YZnm8vpQ&bvm=bv.85970519,d.cWc

Lilley, Brian. Lack of historical knowledge threatens Canada's future: Minister. Toronto Sun, November 18, 2010. Accessed November 2014.

<http://www.torontosun.com/news/canada/2010/11/18/16204626.html>.

Merti, Steve. Most Canadians don't know Vimy Ridge was WWI battle, new poll shows. April 7th 2014. Accessed October 2014 at <https://ca.news.yahoo.com/blogs/dailybrew/poll-shows-most-canadians-don-t-know-vimy-203558446.html>

<https://ca.news.yahoo.com/blogs/dailybrew/poll-shows-most-canadians-don-t-know-vimy-203558446.html>

Moore, James. Speech Given by the Honourable James Moore, Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages on the occasion of an Announcement About Canadian History. Gatineau, Quebec, June 11, 2013. Accessed November 2014.