Public Safety Canada | Sécurité publique Canada

ARCHIVED - Archiving Content

ARCHIVÉE - Contenu archivé

Archived Content

Information identified as archived is provided for reference, research or recordkeeping purposes. It is not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards and has not been altered or updated since it was archived. Please contact us to request a format other than those available.

Contenu archivé

L'information dont il est indiqué qu'elle est archivée est fournie à des fins de référence, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Elle n'est pas assujettie aux normes Web du gouvernement du Canada et elle n'a pas été modifiée ou mise à jour depuis son archivage. Pour obtenir cette information dans un autre format, veuillez communiquer avec nous.

This document is archival in nature and is intended for those who wish to consult archival documents made available from the collection of Public Safety Canada.

Some of these documents are available in only one official language. Translation, to be provided by Public Safety Canada, is available upon request.

Le présent document a une valeur archivistique et fait partie des documents d'archives rendus disponibles par Sécurité publique Canada à ceux qui souhaitent consulter ces documents issus de sa collection.

Certains de ces documents ne sont disponibles que dans une langue officielle. Sécurité publique Canada fournira une traduction sur demande.

Canada

EVALUATION STUDY
NATIONAL VOLUNTRARY ORGANIZATIONS

JL
103
.86
B6
1992

JL
103
.56
H6
1992

PREPARED FOR

Management Review Division
The Solicitor General Secretariat

EVALUATION STUDY

National Voluntary Organizations

Copyright of this document does not belong to the Crown. Proper authorization must be obtained from the author for any intended use.

Les droits d'auteur du présent document n'appartiennent pas à l'État. Toute utilisation du contenu du présent document doit être approuvée préalablement par l'auteur.

LIBRARY
SOLICITOR GENERAL CANADA
JAN 26 1995
BIBLIOTHÈQUE
SOLLICITEUR GENERAL CANADA
OTTAWA (ONTARIO)
K1A 0P8

PREPARED BY

Ben Hoffman, President & CEO
Concórde Inc.,
The Dispute Resolution Professionals

OTTAWA, CANADA

SEPTEMBER 22, 1992

EVALUATION STUDY
National Voluntary Organizations

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1

TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE EVALUATION 6

METHODOLOGY 9

FINDINGS 11

A. Consider the Historical and Policy Development Context 11
1. Sharing Responsibility for Criminal Justice Services 11
2. Stressed Corporate Environments 14
3. A Strained Relationship 19

B. Accountability: A Need for Program Rationality 20

1. The Goal of Accountability 20

2. Towards Program Rationality 22

(a) Elements of the Ministry's Policy on Relations with the Voluntary Sector 22
(i) Consultation with the Voluntary Sector 22
(ii) Information sharing 23
(iii) Exchange of expertise and knowledge 23
(iv) Provision of resources 23
(v) Accountability measures 27

C. Economies and Efficiencies 27

1. The Historical Account 27

2. A Current Assessment of Economies and Efficiencies 29
(a) Limitations on obtaining an assessment of economies and efficiencies 29
(b) Descriptive and Analytical Matrix of NVOs 31
(c) Individual Profiles 40
(d) Analytical observations 41

PROGRAM RELEVANCE, PROGRAM PERFORMANCE, PROGRAM MANAGEMENT: CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 49

ENDNOTES 56

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Evaluation Study: National Voluntary Organizations: Terms of Reference

APPENDIX B: Interview Protocol and List of Key Respondents

APPENDIX C: A Chronology of Non-Governmental Landmarks

APPENDIX D: Individual Profile of Each NVO

APPENDIX E: Brief Critique of Eligibility Criteria

APPENDIX F: Descriptive and Analytical Matrix of NVOs

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This evaluation was produced in response to a requirement of the Ministry of the Solicitor General and Treasury Board to evaluate the National Voluntary Organization program to determine whether the Sustaining Funding Program is meeting its stated objectives. In essence, three important questions were examined using a utilization-focused methodology. The questions were:

1. Should the Ministry maintain its NVO Sustaining Funding Program?

2. Is the NVO Sustaining Funding Program effective in meeting its stated objectives?

3. Is the NVO Sustaining Funding Program managed in a way to ensure the survival of what is appropriate and best, consistent with Government priorities, the Ministry's mandate and mission, its Policy on Relations with the Voluntary Sector, and the changes that influence and shape these from time-to-time?

Data were collected on the basis of semi-structured interviews held in confidence with thirty-nine key individuals in government and in the voluntary sector; a review of Ministry documentation; search of files; and background reading of historical texts. Analysis included an attempt to identify the primary functions that the NVOs fulfil, their presence or impact in the community, and the contribution of sustaining funding support from the Ministry to this.

The findings include a strong endorsement of the need to consider the present situation in an historical and policy development context: history shed light on the fact that the government and the voluntary sector have always shared responsibility for criminal justice services in Canada; that a difficult decade of policy development, failed expectations, reduced budgets, and an increasing divergence on some philosophical matters has produced a strained relationship. This strained relationship, however, has considerable strength and both sectors wish to move forward in sharing responsibility for criminal justice services.

Moving forward constructively calls for greater accountability and improved Program rationality. Regular reviews of applications for funding, assessment and review of the Sustaining Funding Program eligibility criteria and review of individual performance of NVOs in the context of funding support have not occurred since the program was consolidated in the Secretariat in 1983-1984, except on the most pro forma basis.

This was due, in part, to the ongoing period of fiscal restraint.

The Ministry's 1991 Policy on Relations with the Voluntary Sector, sets out the five elements that provide a basis upon which the rationality of the NVO Sustaining Funding Program may be established. These elements are: consultation with the voluntary sector; information sharing; exchange of expertise and knowledge; provision of resources; and accountability measures.

This evaluation determined that the Ministry expects accountability on the part of the NVOs with respect to the funding they receive and how the NVO Program relates to the Ministry's mandate and mission; NVOs expect accountability from the Ministry by expressing clearly the requirements and expectations associated with funding support, in the context of a reliable government funding policy. Both recognize that in doing so the conditions will exist in which NVOs can act responsibly in pursuit of their objectives, which by receipt of funding support are seen to be in concert with the mandate and mission of the Ministry of the Solicitor General.

The economies, efficiencies and effectiveness of NVOs in adding value to government objectives and interests and to Canadian society have been demonstrated.

The finding of this evaluation shows that NVOs as a whole are efficient operations, many of which draw on the sustaining funding received from the Ministry to offset core operating expenses which in turn support a range of activities which add value to the government and the Canadian public.

Four primary functions which NVOs fulfil were identified in this evaluation: direct services; public education; advocacy/reform; and professional-organizational. Virtually all fourteen (14) recipients of sustaining funding fulfil all four functions,

among others. Through voluntary service with funding support from non-governmental sources, such as the United Way, many NVOs are clearly demonstrating a multiplier effect with respect to the Ministry's financial support through the Sustaining Funding Program.

At the same time, some NVOs rely extensively on the Sustaining Funding Program to support their core operating expenses, which in effect, are the same as their total operating (or program) expenses. These NVOs tend to fulfil policy and reform functions, as well as public education and they provide professional-organizational support to their respective constituency. The utility of retaining the Sustaining Funding Program, with improvements, has been underlined.

Certain inconsistencies, however, in the voluntary sector, some duplication of effort, and lack of synergies that would strengthen the contribution of the NVOs and in turn reinforce the value of the Sustaining Funding Program must be addressed. Similarly, program management issues within the Ministry also require attention.

The various functions NVOs perform, the willingness of all parties to improve their working relationships, and the policy, political, and service costs associated with a failure to restore the program suggest that actions be taken to move forward, productively.

To this end, a number of recommendations are made in this report, including the following:

- Continue the NVO Sustaining Funding Program, with improvements

- Confirm and notify all relevant parties that the NVO Sustaining Funding Program of the Ministry of the Solicitor General will continue to be managed by Executive Services, Ministry Secretariat

- Establish, within fiscal capabilities, a three-year cycle for the Sustaining Funding Program grants and contributions. This cycle should commence April 1, 1993 and eight (8) of the fourteen (14) presently funded NVOs should be notified immediately that they are on the cycle. The eight NVOs are:

  - John Howard Society of Canada
  - Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies
  - St. Leonard's Society of Canada
  - Salvation Army Correctional and Justice Services Department
  - Prison Arts Foundation
  - Church Council on Justice and Corrections
  - Block Parents Program of Canada Inc.
  - The Seventh Step Society of Canada

- Give Ministerial consideration to the appropriateness of the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police being recipient of support under the Sustaining Funding Program, notwithstanding the direct relevance of its activities to the policing and security mandate of the Ministry of the Solicitor General and the Association's merit for funding support.

- Give Ministerial consideration to the appropriateness of the Association des services de réhabilitation sociale being recipient of support under the Sustaining Funding Program, notwithstanding its merit for funding support.

- Effect the transfer in funding support for Network: Interaction for Conflict Resolution to Justice Canada.

- In order to preserve, enhance and make more cost-effective at the sectoral level: the advocacy-reform role of NVOs, generally; their applied research and information-sharing functions; their networking capability; and their professional-organizational service; offer to convene a process of multi-party discussion among the following NVOs to explore creative alternative means by which those functions that are relevant to the Ministry may be preserved,

refined and presented to the Ministry for ongoing support within the Sustaining Funding Program:

- Canadian Criminal Justice Association
- National Associations Active in Criminal Justice
- Canadian Training Institute; and
- Network: Interaction for Conflict Resolution (as appropriate)

- Within Executive Services, take steps to ensure program, purpose, authority and resources for the day-to-day operation of the NVO Sustaining Funding Program.

- Review individual performance of NVOs regularly against the Sustaining Funding Program eligibility criteria, which should be revised.

- Evaluate, by objective evaluation, the Ministry Sustaining Funding Program every five (5) years.

TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE EVALUATION

The full **Terms of Reference** for this evaluation appear in Appendix A.

SCOPE OF WORK

The Scope of Work, as set forth in the Terms of Reference, was given some specificity in the stated Objectives; at the same time the scope remained sufficiently broad and flexible so that comment is deserved.

Objectives:

The specific objectives as set forth in the Terms of Reference were:

The Ministry of the Solicitor General and Treasury Board requires an evaluation of the NVO program to determine whether the sustaining funding program is meeting its stated objectives. The study was to review the program mandate, policy and objectives, program structure, funding criteria, application assessment, yearly reviews, communication and program output.

The Terms of Reference, scope and focus of this evaluation changed from time to time as a result of the decision-making requirements of those within the Ministry who commissioned the evaluation. This is consistent with an utilization-focused evaluation, the methodology selected from the outset for this study.

Study Questions and/or Issues to be Addressed:

Furthermore, the Terms of Reference are for an "Evaluation Study National Voluntary Organizations", and they make reference to an NVO program, and a sustaining funding program, and a Sustaining Funding Program. A Ministry NVO program, as such, does not formally exist. The Ministry does have an NVO Sustaining Funding Program. This evaluation treats the term NVO program as a

set of relationships and activities between the Ministry and the voluntary sector and particularly, as these relate to the Ministry's NVO Sustaining Funding Program.

The reader will find therefore, that the terms NVO Program and Sustaining Funding Program are used throughout this report, with an emphasis on the NVO Sustaining Funding Program, the principal subject of this evaluation.

Three issue areas were under particular examination in this evaluation, although the nature of the issues, the study questions therein, and the overall objectives of the evaluation took the study into a broad course of inquiry. The three issue areas are:

- Program Relevance: the evaluation sought to answer the fundamental question of whether the NVO Sustaining Funding Program should be continued by the Ministry, based on the programs' goals and objectives; essentially a policy issue.

- Program Performance: the evaluation sought to assess the degree to which the program is effective in meeting its stated objectives; essentially a test of performance-policy fit.

- Program Management: the evaluation sought to determine how effectively and efficiently the Program is managed. Particular attention was addressed to the issue of the flexibility and responsivity of the NVO program to the pressures from within government for relevancy and accountability and to the changing reality in which the NVOs strive to be relevant, responsive, and accountable; essentially a question of program adaptability and survival.

Ultimately, in examining these issue areas, a distinction arose among many interrelated issues and considerations: on the one hand it became apparent that a critical concern to government is the nature, merit, and operational features of the Sustaining Funding Program; on the other hand, the underlying crucial issue for the NVOs concerns their individual survival as it relates to the sustaining funding they receive and the survival of grants and contributions generally.

Our methodology was capable of raising and exploring these distinctions, both of which are serious levels of consideration. To the extent possible within the evaluation's mandate, methodology, and the time available to conduct the study, this report and its recommendations addresses both levels.

METHODOLOGY

A UTILIZATION-FOCUSED EVALUATION:

The broad terms of reference of this evaluation, the nature of the NVOs, including their history, organizational structure, program activities, and funding could well have taxed any methodology designed to run either a "process" or "outcome" study across the field of inquiry and down the organizations from the Secretariat of the Ministry of the Solicitor General through the national offices of the NVOs on to provincial offices and to the front lines of those NVOs with direct service at the community level.

This evaluation, in view of the short turn around to produce a report, and in view of the issues to be addressed, was designed as a utilization-focused evaluation. As such, it was conducted in a manner to obtain findings that would assist in rendering incisive recommendations, deliverables that decision-makers may act upon.

In utilization-focused evaluation two fundamental requirements must be considered:

1. relevant decision-makers and information users must be identified and organized; and

2. the evaluator must work actively, reactively, and adaptively with these identified decision-makers and information users to make all relevant decisions about the evaluation - decisions about research focus, design, methods, analyses, interpretation, and dissemination.

This methodology was given considerable support by the Ministry's Secretariat: a Steering Committee offered insights, gave feedback and guided the evaluator; people within the Ministry of the Solicitor General made themselves available to the evaluator; there was complete access to all files and materials in an open and timely manner. Likewise, representatives of the NVOs attended lengthy interviews, shared documentation openly, and were most cooperative with our requests.

Through a series of information gathering, analyses and requests for more information, the evaluation sought to respond to the needs of decision-makers and information users.[1]

The techniques of data collection employed in this evaluation were:

- semi-structured interviews held in confidence with thirty-nine (39) key individuals in government and in the voluntary sector (for interview protocol and a list of key respondents see Appendix B);
- a review of recent documentation in the Ministry on the NVO Program, including the Policy on Relations with the Voluntary Sector and related background documents such as the Policy Framework for Ministry of the Solicitor General Sustaining Funding Program;
- a search of Ministry files on NVOs;
- a review of annual reports, profiles, publications, and related documents provided by the NVOs;
- a reading of selected historical texts of relevance, including Community Involvement in Criminal Justice, the 1977 "Report of the Task Force on the Role of the Private Sector in Criminal Justice", commissioned by the Continuing Committee of Deputy Ministers responsible for Corrections; and The Legacy and the Practice: The John Howard Society in Newfoundland, described as a testimony to the involvement of the voluntary sector in the provision of correctional services, and to the evolution of sound correctional policy.

In addition, the evaluator consulted Ms. Marie Nadeau, Director, Audit and Evaluation, on a weekly basis, who supported the methodological approach taken here and managed logistics in a manner to ensure that this evaluation was impartial and objective. Throughout, the evaluator strove to deliver an independent view within the Terms of Reference.

FINDINGS

A. CONSIDER THE HISTORICAL AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

1. **Shared responsibility for criminal justice services**
2. **Stressed Corporate Environments**
3. **A Strained Relationship**

Consistently throughout this evaluation, the issues at hand were placed in an historical and policy development context, whether the person being interviewed was a government employee or a representative of an NVO.

It was emphasized by virtually all respondents that the particular, practical and technical matters under study, such as program management or levels of funding and use of those resources, would be better appraised in the context of the history of the voluntary sector in criminal justice in Canada. Furthermore the NVO Program and the Sustaining Funding Program were placed in the context of more than a decade of policy development which was finalized in 1991 in the Ministry's present Policy on Relations with the Voluntary Sector.

1. Shared responsibility for criminal justice services

It is the case that the rise of NVOs, the establishment of a Sustaining Funding Program in the Ministry of the Solicitor General, and the Ministry's Policy on its relations with the voluntary sector is based, in historical reality, on a commitment to honour a shared responsibility between citizen groups in Canada and the Ministry in the provision of services to inmates and ex-offenders throughout Canada. (see Appendix C for A Chronology of Non-Governmental Landmarks)

This functional relationship, evolving, maturing up to 1977 with the work of the Task Force on the Role of the Private Sector in Criminal Justice, and into the early years of the 1980s, when it reached an apex of dynamic cooperation in the joint policy work on the relationship of the Ministry and the NVOs, began to falter, stall, and enter what may be now described as a state of suspended animation.

The history and dynamics of this relationship shape the attitudes and expectations each sector has toward the other. The present hiatus, notwithstanding year-to-year funding, has had a critical impact on the performance of the NVOs and on the relevance and effectiveness of the Sustaining Funding Program to the Ministry of the Solicitor General.

This history, especially the early years for the NVOs (when growth and influence ran high) and the recent decade for the Government (when cost cutting and conservative policy has dominated), has influenced each sector's perception of individual and shared responsibilities with respect to program and service delivery. The degree of innovation and risk-taking together has been reduced, the management of the inherent tension that comes with the advocacy and reform role that NVOs naturally play is less effective, the quality of communication and the effectiveness of solving problems together have been taxed; the willingness and the ability to agree to disagree on certain issues is strained.

Nevertheless, what always was, generally continues to be a functional relationship. NVOs assist the government in carrying out its responsibilities; the government assists the community in its efforts to respond to need.

Sometimes in the history of this relationship the Ministry of the Solicitor General, its policy branches, its service agencies and their line level operational people in corrections, policing, and parole have lead the way, encouraging voluntary organizations to take a new initiative, to establish a program, to test an idea, to build a corporate infrastructure to support service delivery by citizen volunteers and paid staff of community-based organizations.

Often, usually with expressed or tacit support from its government "confederates" in the task of corrections, policing, and parole a voluntary, community-based group or a national non-governmental advocacy and reform group has pushed the limits of conventional practice. Voluntary organizations and Ministry staff have collaborated to expand the role and effectiveness of corrections, policing, and parole in a constructive way, for example: in adding a new dimension to offender treatment, such as anger management or alcohol and drug treatment programs; in pressing for services for released offenders to reduce the probability of recidivism; in pioneering victim-offender reconciliation programs to address the needs of victims while holding offenders accountable for the actual harm they have done in committing a criminal offence; in bringing the community closer to the police and vice versa through volunteers working in conjunction with the police to increase safety on the streets and to prevent crime; and in addressing at the national level tough and often politically sensitive policy questions such as the best means by which to deal with victims of AIDS in prison, and how to manage the dangerous offender, and the terms of conditional release.

This functional collaboration began years ago, and ever since, the role of these two collaborators has been a fact of life in the way Canadians and the Government of Canada have chosen to do the work of criminal justice, in particular, corrections, policing and parole.

The reasons for this choice, and the forms it has taken over the years are many.

The current rationale for the NVO Program and, more immediately, for the Sustaining Funding Program of the Ministry of the Solicitor General are contained in the Ministry's Policy on Relations with the Voluntary Sector released in 1991.

The Ministry's Policy on Relations with the Voluntary Sector, in and of itself, reflects a high degree of historical veracity. While it may not represent an ideal in the view of the NVOs, it states the contemporary disposition of government in a clear and responsible manner; it explicates

the government's understanding and expression of the relationship as one of shared responsibility and collaboration, consistent with the view taken in the 1977 Task Force Report on the Role of the Private Sector in Criminal Justice.

Furthermore, the Policy specifies five elements that operationalize the relationship and which may serve to gauge the relationship, the relative contribution of the parties to it, and the degree of success in implementation.

The history and policy development context of the NVO Program and the Sustaining Funding Program are thus particularly well defined. They are more acutely known to the representatives of NVOs than to most of the government employees interviewed, in part because there has simply been much more employee turnover in the Ministry of the Solicitor General in recent years, especially in the Secretariat. A significant degree of institutional memory has been lost.

The history and policy development context must be considered in any evaluation of the NVO Program and the Sustaining Funding Program. To ignore these would be to ignore the essence of a relationship that has just recently been concretized in policy and which is struggling to find itself "in the '90s".

2. *Stressed Corporate Environments:*

In 1977 the Task Force on the Role of the Private Sector in Criminal Justice began its discussion of "historical perspectives" with the following quotation taken from L.A. Edmison's 1964 "Prisoners' Aid Profiles - Past and Present":

> To read over what records remain of prisoner-aid agencies in Canada before the end of World War I is a lesson in futility. Frustration, discouragement, lack of public appreciation, and constant financial troubles crowd the pages.

> Enlightened members of society, the sort of people who involved themselves with penal reform, shared the same concerns in 1849 as they do now, and had much the same goals. The differences lie, over the century and quarter, very largely in techniques of accomplishing these goals.[2]

The findings of this evaluation in 1992 show an improvement in the situation since 1964, and then again in 1977. The improvement lies in the fact that the government, in response to the Task Force's Report, established the Sustaining Funding Program because the role and work of the voluntary sector in Canada was seen to be of value to the Government of Canada and Canadians.

In its current state of hiatus, uncertainty, and stress, however, despite efforts by the Ministry Secretariat to support what they see as a valuable program, the findings of this evaluation in 1992 are not altogether unlike those of the Task Force.[3]

In fact, frustration, discouragement, and a lack of public appreciation as observed in the general public's and private sector's lack of financial support for NVOs active in criminal justice are characteristics of many NVOs today. NVOs, especially those whose primary function is to provide direct service to offenders and parolees, almost categorically are unable to find funding support for their work except from the government agencies whose mandate is criminal justice.[4]

To a real extent, a similar profile of frustration can be drawn of Secretariat staff responsible for the NVO Program and the SFP.

They appear over-extended and they too must cope with working on a portfolio which is a lower priority among federal government responsibilities when it comes to the allocation of fiscal resources by the government.

The Ministry's Secretariat, once a major think tank and program innovator, a policy development body, and nucleus of the Ministry of the Solicitor General, underwent a process of downsizing which began in

1985-1986 which included an overall reduction in staff from 322 in 1985-1986 to 240 in 1991-1992. (In 1988-89 the Secretariat experienced a reduction of 45 person years, and $153.6 million were transferred to Justice Canada.) This downsizing appears to have placed stress on the staff with respect to the regular workload they must cope with. While the Ministry's Secretariat continues to provide program and policy development services, like so many others in Government today the Secretariat must "do more with less".

The downsizing and staff turnover has resulted in fewer and fewer employees in the Secretariat having a full understanding of NVOs and their role in relation to the Ministry and to the work of policing, corrections, and parole. The management, administration, and coordination of the NVO Sustaining Funding Program is carried out by one staff under the direction of a manager.

The impact of this downsizing and re-organization was to be offset somewhat by an assumption of responsibilities by Justice Canada. In the transfer of responsibilities and resources to Justice Canada in 1989, there was an understanding that Justice Canada might develop and maintain a sustaining funding program.

This evaluation finds that the relevant offset of work and responsibility to Justice has not materialized, as planned, resulting in the continuance of many NVOs to look to the Secretariat for assistance and support. Furthermore, in circumstances when the majority of NVOs have a natural functional relationship with the MSG Secretariat, the Correctional Service of Canada, the National Parole Board and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, expectations upon the Secretariat continue to flow to it from the NVOs. But the sustaining funding resources are, apparently, categorically limited.

Furthermore, the Secretariat, like all other federal government departments, is presently facing an additional budget reduction in the order of 3-5%.

The Secretariat's efforts must be expended in a struggle at the day-to-day program level to maintain its regular functions while protecting a program that virtually all of the NVO committee members perceive to be of value to the government and the Ministry in a climate that has clearly seen grants and contributions programs at risk, and in some cases lost.[5] This defensive reaction to protect what is viewed as good in general, yet requiring improvement, has for the last ten years lacked clarity of purpose, assertiveness, and appropriate program management. Most NVO respondents indicated that the Sustaining Funding Program was managed essentially as an administrative function, and that funding levels have never been systematically reviewed, and more practically for most, adjusted upward to what they perceive as "adequate levels".

Simply stated, since consolidating the Sustaining Funding Program in the Secretariat in 1983-1984, with attendant commitments to evaluate the program and ensure proper management, virtually all significant program activities have stalled. What would be normal management and accountability requirements and activities have been lost. This has increased uncertainty and added stress internally at the Secretariat as the NVOs push for clarity and predicability with respect to funding and their relationship with the Ministry: and externally, as NVOs become increasingly insecure about their perceived value to the Ministry.

The corporate environment is no better for NVO's than it is for the Secretariat.

Voluntary, community-based, non-governmental, or as they are occasionally called "private" agencies, especially those devoted to offenders, have a history of under-funding and volunteer burnout. They evolve and devolve as they rise and fall from favour or perceived relevancy in the community and in the eyes of government bodies that support them. This is a chronic stress.

This chronic stress has become more acute in the 1980s during the constraint era and period of government deficit reduction. It is nearing an extreme in the present economic recession. Staffing cutbacks, program reduction, and reduced services are common.

In addition to these fiscal environmental stresses, the fourteen NVOs receiving financial support from the Ministry under the SFP have lived in a climate of change and perceived threat for the past ten years. They have undergone major review, their expectations have been raised by the Ministry and then dramatically lowered; their sustaining funding levels, planned to increase yearly to offset inflationary costs, have been frozen at 1984 levels; they are now uncertain about their grants and contributions, feeling increasing pressure to compete for project-specific money. Pursuit of projects, in and of itself, is not felt to be bad; when basic operating costs are not secured, however, the projects become a means of survival, and the projects tend to divert the organizations from their declared purpose. They are unable to plan, and their mission and purpose is under threat of erosion. Their health, their efficiency, and their effectiveness drops off.

Furthermore, as Canadian criminal justice policy has increasingly reflected a "law and order" approach to crime, offenders, and the protection of society, NVOs have had to adjust their programs and services and/or find themselves at philosophical divergence with mainstream policy. This has placed some of them at times in a state of fundamental conflict with a "collaborator", the government, with whom they have worked hand-in-hand over the years.

This divergence has increased in notable ways over recent years, when NVOs have taken a different view of legislative initiatives brought forward by the Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice. Furthermore, at the operational level, tensions have run high from time-to-time on different approaches to procedures, standards of performance, and over the decision taken by the agencies of the Ministry of the Solicitor General to not guarantee preferential treatment to voluntary organizations when establishing community-based services.

This ideological divergence with associated tensions in and of itself is not uncommon in a relationship which recognizes the advocacy function, yet it has added stress in circumstances where there are limitations on the availability of funding resources.

3. A Strained Relationship:

Great expectations for a validated role and place in relation to the Ministry were encouraged by the Ministry in the early 1980s, consistent with the 1977 recommendations of the Task Force on the Role of the Private Sector in Criminal Justice.

These expectations included the prospects of bringing to a conclusion decades of working together without a clear agreement about their relationship.

The process of clarifying the relationship was fully collaborative, a joint initiative in the spirit of a "partnership".

The expectations included hopes for reliable grant funding, on the basis of a five year cycle, and at levels that would be adequate to support the national infrastructure of NVOs whose work had been assessed as of relevance and value to the Ministry.

Program and fiscal policy directions changed within government, most of the individuals who represented the Ministry in the relationship clarification process changed, funding was frozen at 1984 levels. The process stalled. It is fair to say that the NVOs perceived a breach of trust.

Employees in the Ministry's Secretariat attempted to secure and protect what resources they had left, while respecting government's policy and directions. They found little appreciation for their efforts among an NVO group that had lost faith.

The reduction of program people in the Ministry who knew the NVO sector well and had good relations with the NVOs, left a staff who wished to get on with the "work" the two have in common. Instead, they ran into repeated concerns about funding and issues stemming from a past they had not created or participated in.

An increasing divergence on policy and program issues added strain to a fiscally difficult situation. Channels of communication that were once open to both the Ministry and the NVOs, channels that would help solve a problem before it mushroomed, channels that clarified the reason for a differing point of view so that neither side was surprised in public, were no longer available or were perceived by both sides to be blocked.

In this context, formal evaluation was perceived as an inappropriate tool for assessing the program's merit, funding levels, and issues of communication and accountability.

In fact, however, much continues to be accomplished between the Ministry of the Solicitor General and NVOs at the service delivery level. The daily business of keeping the system going requires contact and cooperation on infrastructure and service delivery.

B. ACCOUNTABILITY: A NEED FOR PROGRAM RATIONALITY

1. **The goal of accountability**
2. **Toward program rationality**

1. The goal of accountability:

The preoccupation of the Secretariat and the NVOs for the last decade, and for the criminal justice system at the federal level in Canada, despite the "business" and the practical "work" they do together, has been to resolve their relationship and establish a rational basis for the NVO Program and the Sustaining Funding Program.

History shows this effort stalled in the mid-'80s, that it was resurrected unilaterally to some extent in the Ministry's effort to explicate its policy on relations with the voluntary sector.

Normal and expected elements of a rational program, however, have not been operationalized.

Thus, regular reviews of applications for funding, assessment and review of program eligibility criteria, review of individual performance of NVOs in the context of funding support, have not occurred except on the most pro forma basis.

In a sense, both the Ministry and the NVOs were trapped by history; their ability to work together to adapt to rapid change has been impaired. Accountability has suffered.

The Ministry, however, expects accountability on the part of NVOs with respect to the funding they receive and how the NVO Sustaining Funding Program relates to the Ministry's mandate and mission; NVOs are prepared to be held accountable, as noted on page 20, and NVOs expect accountability from the Ministry by expressing clearly the requirements and expectations associated with funding support, in the context of a reliable funding policy. Both recognize that in doing so the conditions will exist in which NVOs can act responsibly in pursuit of their objectives, which by receipt of funding support are seen to be in concert with the mandate and mission of the Ministry of the Solicitor General.

Appropriate funding under specific terms and conditions provides a basis upon which to plan and coordinate as both sectors, generally, and individual NVOs, turn to the business of the day. A clear context makes possible both the review of individual performance of NVOs, regular assessment of the relevancy of their work to the Ministry, and overall evaluation of the NVO Sustaining Funding Program. Regular review may see some NVOs refused sustaining funding as they are judged no longer eligible and other NVOs' applications approved.

This accountability function has never been formally operationalized. Instead, both parties have relied on their relationship to compensate for this deficiency.

A strained relationship and increasingly difficult communication are weak tools to meet this mutually perceived necessity for accountability.

2. *Towards program rationality*

(a) ELEMENTS OF THE MINISTRY'S POLICY ON RELATIONS WITH THE VOLUNTARY SECTOR:

The elements of the Ministry's Policy on Relations with the Voluntary Sector provide a clear means by which the rationality of the NVO Program is operationalized and a means by which the NVO Sustaining Funding Program may be assessed. The elements are:

(i) consultation with the voluntary sector;

(ii) information sharing;

(iii) exchange of expertise and knowledge;

(iv) provision of resources; and

(v) accountability measures.

It will be seen that performance on these dimensions is varied, judged here as "low" to "moderately successful", with (v), "accountability measures", being the weakest.

(i) Consultation with the Voluntary Sector:

Our findings (as detailed in Appendix D, Individual Profiles of Each NVO) indicate that a high level of activity takes place on this dimension of the NVO Program. This applies to voluntary organizations who focus on fulfilling the direct service function as well as to those who tend to focus on advocacy and reform.

The consultations leading up to Bill C-36 are the most recent example, although an illustrative sampling shows that voluntary organizations have commented on the policy on Pardons, on Bill C-89 Victims and Parole, Amendments to the YOA, and numerous other Ministry of the Solicitor

General policy initiatives; in one case the Canadian Training Institute has completed a discussion paper for Correctional Service of Canada entitled, "The Implications of and the Capacity of Correctional Service Canada and NGOs in Implementing the Correctional Operational Plan Including the Integrated Offender Management Strategy".

(ii) Information Sharing:

There is a willingness on the part of the Secretariat and the NVOs to share more information than they currently do. The reduction in information sharing stems largely from the stresses, constraints and limitations already mentioned.

A strong exception to this is for groups whose primary function is the provision of direct service or who work in close collaboration with the CSC, NPB, and RCMP on projects, especially when these federal agencies have a fee-for-service arrangement with NVOs.

(iii) Exchange of Expertise and Knowledge:

This dimension seems to be less productive than it has been in recent years. The ability of the Ministry and the NVOs to sponsor workshops, seminars, and conferences has been curtailed with budget cuts. There is little if any seconding or exchange of staff between the Ministry and the NVOs. Support for bilingualism, employment equity, and access to employment for minorities and other groups is virtually non-existent.

(iv) Provision of Resources:

1. Form of Resources
2. Critique of Provision of Resources

1. Form of Resources:

Resource provision to NVOs is principally in the form of Sustaining Funding by way of a Grant or Sustaining Contribution; to a lesser extent in contributions by the Secretariat to a project; and by fee-for-service contracts.

A Grant is an unconditional transfer payment made to a recipient and for which the government may or may not receive any goods or services. There is no formal agreement governing the use of the grant and no audit requirement. (Our findings indicate, however, that all NVOs assume that some degree of accountability is implicit when they receive a grant: at the very least, this may take the form of a readiness to assist the Ministry with requests for information, efforts to mobilize and participate in consultations requested by the Ministry, good business relations practice; and it could extend to more structured review of applications for grant renewal against Ministry eligibility criteria.)

A Sustaining Contribution is a conditional transfer payment made to a recipient, subject to audit and for which the government may or may not receive any goods or services.

The use of these two funding tools was intended, in the past, to support fledgling NVOs and more mature ones. A sustaining contribution would be directed to an emerging NVO, or a coalition, and a grant would provide support to offset the core operating expenses of an established NVO.

This evaluation is concerned primarily with grants and sustaining contributions, although we noted that some NVOs receive project contributions from time to time and those that have direct service capability are most likely to have a fee-for-service arrangement with the government, particularity at the operational level of the organization such as offender programs or parole supervision, in addition to any sustaining funding.

The Grants and Sustaining Contributions of the Sustaining Funding Program total $2.3 million, and are distributed among fourteen (14) NVOs. (The average amount per NVO is $164,000 although in fact the range of support varies from $30,000 to $666,400.) These funds are intended to provide stable and predictable funding to NVOs to maintain their national structure and cover core operating expenses to carry out long-term tasks and fulfil their objective.[6]

2. Critique of Provision of Resources:

   (a) Eligibility criteria were established by the Ministry in order to determine which organizations may be considered for a grant. A grant was to have been approved in principle for five years.

   We note that the eligibility criteria have not been updated, and in fact, because of uncertainty about funding for the Sustaining Funding Program and given that no new funds have been available to the Ministry Committee convened by the Secretariat and responsible for overseeing the Sustaining Funding Program, no new applications are entertained annually.

   With a view to improving the rationality of the program and the overall issue of accountability, a brief critique of the eligibility criteria may be found in Appendix E.

   To the extent that the Ministry's Secretariat has defended present levels of funding, the Ministry is meeting some of its objectives as set forth in its 1991 Policy on Relations with the Voluntary Sector.

   (b) Apart from issues of the eligibility criteria for sustaining funding, and the pro forma treatment of the Sustaining Funding Program from one-year to the next, serious questions arise with respect to the Program's:

1. **definition of "core operating expenses"**, a term not clearly understood nor uniformly applied throughout the program, and tending at present to include some activities that go well beyond "fixed" operating costs;[7]

2. **use of the phrase "fulfil their objectives"** with respect to an NVO, where the NVO's objectives can be quite tightly drawn and specific or very broad; and may or may not include: service to members that falls outside the interests of the Ministry of the Solicitor General; networking and information sharing that falls outside the specific interests of the Ministry of the Solicitor General; production of publications and reports which may or may not be of interest to the Ministry of the Solicitor General and which may or may not be sold by the NVO to other consumers;

3. **aspirations to provide "stable and predictable funding to NVOs to maintain their national structure"**, when in fact:

   (i) Funding has been unpredictable and on a year-to-year basis; and

   (ii) Levels of support vary from 13% to 93% of core operating expenses, with the average level of support being more in the order of 55%;

4. **"rule of thumb"** (carried over from the Eligibility Criteria) **that NVOs should provide 25% of their core operating costs** through other sources of support, when the actual ability of some NVOs to generate revenues elsewhere is virtually impossible (notwithstanding project opportunities); and when the organization's raison d'être, type, structure, and development or maturity may or may not support this target;[8]

5. **declaration that a grant is usually approved in principle for a period of five years** when in reality the funding has been on a year-to-year basis for the past nine years;

6. **failure to develop and apply accountability measures** that would give integrity to the NVO Program and Sustaining Funding Programs.

(v) accountability measures

Accountability as an element of the Ministry's relations with the voluntary sector is seriously impaired. It is at a critical level, and without repair, it is conceivable that in today's fiscal climate the entire viability and survival of the NVO Program could be put at risk.

Representatives of both the government and the voluntary sector in Canada recognize that if accountability measures were in place, the basis would exist for the NVO Program and Sustaining Funding Program to be valid, appropriate, and self-renewing for this Ministry and this government.

C. ECONOMIES AND EFFICIENCIES

1. The Historical Account
2. The Current Assessment

1. The Historical Account

The early (1800s) involvement of the community in corrections and parole in Canada was not motivated by the pursuit of economies for either reformers or government representatives who supported their efforts. Nevertheless, volunteer service was obviously to some extent, free labour.

Voluntary organizations at the community level, and many NVOs, through voluntary board membership of private citizens and lay involvement on sub-committees and special projects, have been adding value to the funding they have received from time-to-time; a precise measurement of this is not available.

These fundamental economies have been more prominent in the motivation of government agencies to support, and indeed encourage the growth of voluntary agencies over the years. It seems axiomatic that community-based programs and services run by a skeletal paid staff who coordinate and support the work of volunteers in organizational settings that are lean and non-bureaucratic are an efficient expenditure of public funds.

It can be argued, that in addition to these "micro" examples of efficiencies and economies, the development since the 1960s of provincial offices of voluntary organizations and the rise of NVOs with national offices are also an economizing of public dollars.

Some times the creation of an NVO was driven from the roots up, as like-minded, and indeed formally linked community-based groups wished to have a more cost-effective structure to advance their programs, services, and reform and advocacy agenda. Sometimes the federal government, indeed the Ministry of the Solicitor General, encouraged the development of an NVO and supported the establishment of a national head office in order to achieve efficiencies as it promoted and executed its agenda from the federal level down to the community level.

Consulting with, seeking information from, and disseminating views, innovations and specific Ministerial initiatives through one point of contact was more cost-effective than attempting to contact dozens, if not hundreds of groups. (The cost-effectiveness of NVOs as collaborators with the Ministry of the Solicitor General can be observed in the Crime Prevention Program in the 1980s, when a Ministerial agenda was embraced by the NVOs and crime prevention activities were mobilized throughout Canada both to the Minister's credit and the well-being of society.)

In 1983, when an extensive review was made of applications for sustaining funding from individual NVOs, it was the view of the Ministry that fourteen (14) applicants were worthy of support in the form of grants and sustaining contributions.

No annual reviews, as originally envisaged, have been conducted to re-assess these or other applicants, and no other type of inquiry has provided an opportunity to explore sources of systemic efficiencies, rationalization, or other creative alternatives. Annual reports, the annual production of a brief profile of NVOs, and in some cases the production of an audited statement do provide some insight into economies and efficiencies.

2. A Current Assessment of Economic Efficiencies

(a) Limitations on obtaining an assessment of economies and efficiencies

(b) Descriptive and Analytical Matrix of NVOs

(c) Individual Profiles

(d) Analytical observations

(a) Limitations on obtaining an assessment of economies and efficiencies:

(i) Grant funding is by definition "carte blanche", where according to Treasury Board policy there "is no formal agreement governing the use of the grant and no audit requirement". A fundamental limitation is thus the absence of a data base upon which to make assessment. (It should be noted that the Ministry's booklet, published in 1986 and entitled "Sustaining Funding Program for National Voluntary

Organizations" set forth a framework that would have generated relevant data over time that would assist in an assessment. This Framework, as we have noted, has not be adhered to in any active manner.)

(ii) Definitions used in the Sustaining Funding Program, such as "core operating expenses" are not uniformly understood or applied, creating inconsistencies in financial reporting. Individual assessments, and especially comparisons between NVOs are extremely difficult in the current context.

(iii) The inherent differences among NVOs, many of whom arise as a response to a perceived particular need in the criminal justice system, makes individual measurement and comparisons very difficult. For example, some NVOs are primarily engaged in direct service delivery to offenders, and their national infrastructure exists for the purpose of supporting operations; others are focused primarily on advocacy and public education.

The measurement of economies, efficiencies, and effectiveness becomes even more difficult to assess, when for example:

- a direct service operation is in the early stages of organizational development and will have a different set of infrastructural support requirements than a more "mature" operation (i.e., "young" organizations may require more "venture" or "risk" capital to get established); or

- the "product" of an NVO is "advice", and "advocacy", and measures of effectiveness could include "number of consultations participated in" or "briefings submitted"; yet the quantitatively less active but qualitatively more effective NVO might be measured by the degree to which

a policy outcome is consistent with the objectives of that NVO.

- to measure the effectiveness of a public education effort is even a much more nebulous exercise.

Nevertheless, despite these limitations, an attempt to analytically describe the present recipients of funding has been made here.

(b) Descriptive and Analytical Matrix of NVOs:

(i) One Means of Describing and Comparing NVOs

The **"Descriptive and Analytical Matrix of NVO's"** appears in Appendix F. The Matrix is a preliminary attempt, in the absence of historical and uniform data, to describe and analyze the NVOs currently receiving funding support from the Sustaining Funding Program. The descriptive information has been taken from reports and documents provided by the Ministry Secretariat and the NVOs. The analytical material is based on these documents as well as the interviews which were conducted during this evaluation. The analysis has not been subjected to a systematic process of validation and verification. Throughout, the primary objective is to present the NVOs in a manner that enables a level of description and comparison across an extremely varied range.

As stated in Ministry files, it is not practical to create a typology of NVOs that separates them into organizations that engage in advocacy from those who offer direct services. As commented in "A New Era for Voluntarism", United Way, 1986: "Most healthy voluntary organizations engage in both service and advocacy. While they offer service to individuals, families, and the community, they also advocate

reforms in societal conditions which influence the need for such services".[9]

This evaluation has determined that the NVOs receiving sustaining funding fulfil a number of functions for their members, for their corporate affiliates, to offenders, parolees and clients of the criminal justice system, to the public at large, and to the Secretariat and agencies of the Ministry of the Solicitor General.

For purposes of description and analysis, we have noted four functions of particular interest here:

- **direct service**: to a "client", excluding members of the NVO;
- **public education**: to the public at large;
- **advocacy/reform**: in addressing policy and legislative issues, and certain operating procedural issues to government;
- **professional-organizational**: in service to its membership, in standards development, in organizational development and maintenance functions.

Our analysis recognizes that virtually every NVO performs all functions; we attempt to designate which of these is/are the primary functions of a given NVO.

In addition, we are able to list the number of employees of the NVO, the size of its membership and/or corporate affiliates, its functional relationship with the Ministry of the Solicitor General, its Total Operating Budget, the Core Operating Expenses of maintaining a national infrastructure, the amount of funding support provided towards those core operating expenses by the Sustaining Funding Program. We

also attempt to assess the NVOs "community presence/impact at the citizen level".

(ii) AN OVERALL ASSESSMENT

1. FISCAL OVERVIEW:

Fourteen (14) NVOs receive a total of $2.3 million in support from the Ministry of the Solicitor General under the Sustaining Funding Program.

The $2.3 million represents less than 1% of the Total Operating Budgets (or volume of criminal justice service) of these NVOs, where the Total Operating Budget is estimated to be $98.0 million. $4.2 million (or 4%) of the Total Operating Budget is Core Operating Expenses, suggesting a high degree of efficiency overall. The SFP contributes 56% to the total Core Operating Expenses, although the percentage of support from the SFP to the Total Core Operating Expenses of each NVO ranges from 13% for the Salvation Army to 93% for the Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies. The NVOs have 3.0 paid employees, on average (excluding the Salvation Army which has a larger regionalized operation).

(The efficiency measure, that is Core Operating Expenses being only 4% of the Total Operating Budget, is just one indication of the value added by NVOs to the funding support they receive. It is an overall figure and not a measure of individual performance. In fact, some NVOs, especially those whose function is primarily advocacy/reform, utilize all their core funds in meeting those objectives. They are not funded for the purposes of supporting a direct service delivery structure. They are funded in support of their advocacy/reform role.)

Funding support at the national level assists some voluntary organizations to enter into fee-for-service arrangements with

agencies of the Ministry of the Solicitor General. For example, in addition to (and because of) support in the form of sustaining funding, several of the NVOs have fee-for-service contract arrangements with the agencies of the Ministry of the Solicitor General: for example, the Salvation Army Correctional and Justice Services Department has approximately $4.0 million in service contracts with Correctional Service Canada, as does the St. Leonard's Society.

Two of the NVOs, the John Howard Society of Canada and the Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies receive larger sums of money in grant support, most of which is distributed to their provincial or local autonomous affiliates to offset core operating expenses at that level of their organizations. For example, of the $666,400 received in grant funding by the John Howard Society of Canada, $83,000 (or 12%) is retained for its national office functions and the remainder supports the national infrastructure. Both JHSC and CAEFS receive membership contributions from their provincial/local affiliates to assist in maintaining their national offices.

2. FUNCTIONAL OVERVIEW

Having noted that virtually all NVOs perform all functions monitored in this evaluation, variations may be noted in their primary functions as follows.

Five (5) of the NVOs fulfil, all four functions monitored in this evaluation (direct service, public education, advocacy/reform, and professional-organizational). These are:

- John Howard Society of Canada;
- Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies;
- Association des services de rehabilitation sociale;

- Salvation Army Correctional and Justice Services Department;
- St. Leonard's Society of Canada.

The Church Council on Justice and Corrections fulfils three of the four functions. Notably by providing direct service through its Quebec office's visitation program for "Lifers" in penitentiaries in the Montreal region, in addition to its advocacy/reform and public education functions.

Three of the fourteen fulfil, as their primary functions, advocacy/reform and professional-organizational functions. These are:

- Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police;
- Canadian Criminal Justice Association;
- National Associations Active in Criminal Justice.

Of those three, two appear to be associations of professionals, as distinct from "professional associations". These are the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police (CACP), in particular, and the Canadian Criminal Justice Association (CCJA) more generally. The CACP's membership, is primarily composed of police chiefs, professionals in policing, and police commissioners, and it tends to be exclusionary: the general public, as such, cannot be a member. The CCJA has no restrictions on its membership but its membership is primarily drawn from students of criminology, criminologists, probation and parole officers, and correctional officials.

In their own right, both associations are quite active in matters of interest to their members, and they contribute advocacy/reform initiatives of relevance to the Ministry of the Solicitor General.

As "associations of professionals", the CACP more so and the CCJA, to a much lesser extent, are not built upon a base of volunteers at the community level; they might better be described as "nongovernmental" organizations than voluntary organizations, notwithstanding their corporate legal status.

Neither is a trade association or "guild", but they do work to advance the practice of criminal justice on behalf of their respective memberships. As such, they have an advocacy function, reflecting their membership's view of preferred criminal justice, corrections, and policing practices; they serve a professional-organizational function in advancing good practices. More so in the case of the CACP, each speaks out on behalf of the interests of their members in the manner of a guild or trade association.

National Associations Active in Criminal Justice (NAACJ) is a coalition of 21 NVOs, including most, but not all of those who receive funding support under the SFP, and other nongovernmental and professional associations such as the Canadian Bar Association, the Canadian Association for Adult Education, the Canadian Psychiatric Association and the Canadian Association of Native Courtworkers. As a coalition, NAACJ does not speak out on behalf of its members as does the CCJA and the CACP; NAACJ does provide a forum to explore policy issues from multiple perspectives across the broad range of criminal justice concerns; it assists it members to develop common views and reform/advocacy initiatives; and it supports the professional development of its members.

As a coalition, NAACJ receives a sustaining contribution, a form of support which might have been reassessed in regular Program evaluation.

The Prison Arts Foundation is most active fulfilling two primary functions: direct service through its art competition program and related services to offenders; and public education, an area of increasing activity.

Two of the NVOs, the Block Parent Program of Canada Inc. and Seventh Step Society of Canada, provide a direct service function, almost exclusively. Most of their advocacy function is proactive "advocacy in service" and reactive, in providing responses to requests from government for consultation on particular issues.

A relatively unique NVO is the Canadian Training Institute, whose development was actively promoted by relevant agencies of the Ministry of the Solicitor General. The Canadian Training Institute produces training materials and offers courses of instruction to Correctional Services Canada, other NVOs in the NVO program, especially those with a direct service function, and other groups outside criminal justice.

The potential contribution of CTI to the field of criminal justice, including the agencies of the Ministry of the Solicitor General and the NVOs who receive funding support from the SFP, is under-developed.

3. FUNCTIONAL RELATIONSHIP WITH MINISTRY OF THE SOLICITOR GENERAL

Eleven (11) of the 14 NVOs have a functional relationship with Correctional Service Canada and the National Parole Board, and the corrections branch of the Secretariat of the Ministry of the Solicitor General. Two, the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police and Block Parent Program of Canada, relate directly to, and tend to have an active interest in, policing.

Network: Interaction for Conflict Resolution began as a community-based organization that pioneered victim-offender reconciliation programs, and has over the last twenty years evolved into a more broadly constituted body with interests that place it more directly in a functional relationship with Justice Canada. Its activities in innovative means of dealing with conflict, crime, and offenders could be, but presently are not, applied more extensively in the correctional and parole areas of service.

4. COMMUNITY PRESENCE/IMPACT

In reviewing responses to interview questions, such as "Who is your 'client'?" and "How do you measure your effectiveness as an NVO?", some measure of the degree of voluntarism of the NVO, the nature of its constituency and its impact on the Canadian public from the general level to the grass roots in the community was obtainable.

Our assessment of the degree to which these NVOs are community-based through a voluntary level of activity or have a presence or impact in the community for the general public, is demonstrated on a scale of 1 - 5, where 1 means "low" and 5 means "very high".

LEVEL 5: The Block Parent Program of Canada is judged as very high in Community Relations/Impact, inasmuch as it has 1,000 voluntary local groups across Canada at the neighbourhood level.

LEVEL 4: Next, in terms of community presence/impact are, in no particular order:

- the John Howard Society of Canada which has 60 corporate affiliates offering a comprehensive range of programs through paid staff and volunteers at the local level;

- the Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies, whose 19 locals delivered a wide range of services to federally sentenced women and who report that 1,181 volunteers delivered 97,352 hours of work in 1991, in addition to services provided by paid staff;

- Association des service de rehabilitation sociale, which has 60 affiliates throughout Quebec providing a comprehensive range of services through voluntary and paid staff;

- the Salvation Army whose service network at the community level includes extensive contracting with CSC, federal parole supervision, specialized programs working with sex offenders, and community-based individual and family services for offenders; and

- the St. Leonard's Society, delivering $4.0 million worth of correctional and parole services through a growing national service delivery network, notably half-way houses.

LEVEL 3: The Church Council on Justice and Corrections and Network: Interaction for Conflict Resolution have a moderate level of community presence and impact, with the Church Council having the potential to engage and influence up to 12,000 church congregations in Canada. Network: Interaction for Conflict Resolution has a membership of 350 members active in conflict resolution in schools, the workplace, and in criminal justice, and it hosts bi-annually the only national Canadian Conference on conflict resolution in addition to publishing a newsletter which is distributed to an increasingly broader audience.

LEVEL 2: Those with a low level of community presence/impact are the Canadian Criminal Justice Association, whose 1,200 members are primarily professionals in criminal justice and whose activities in public education and advocacy reach the general public from time to time; and National Associations

Active in Criminal Justice, whose 21 NVOs together may have an significant impact at the community level, but not as the National Associations Active in Criminal Justice itself.

LEVEL 1: Those NVOs assessed as having some, but the least amount of community presence/impact on citizens at the local community level are:

- the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, whose chiefs and sub-committee members reach the community on some issues at certain times but whose base is not rooted in the community through voluntary activities;
- the Seventh Step Society of Canada, which operates a self help program for "hard core" inmates and parolees, with little presence or impact in the community as such;
- Canadian Training Institute, which deals on a regular basis with service providers; and
- Prison Arts Foundation, which places inmate and ex-offender art on public display from time-to-time and whose presence/impact in the community is increasing.

(c) Individual Profiles

A detailed summary of the purpose and structure, functions, and activities of each of the 14 NVOs appears as "Individual Profiles" in Appendix D.

(d) Analytical Observations

Drawing on the Descriptive and Analytical Matrix, the interviews with key respondents, the records and documentation available, and the individual profiles, we are able to present a number of analytical observations which will form the basis of some of the recommendations in this evaluation. Keeping in mind the critical questions under review, that is, the relevance of the NVO Program and Sustaining Funding Program, the performance of the Sustaining Funding Program, and the management of the Sustaining Funding Program, we make observations on the following dimensions:

1. Value Added by the NVOs through the Sustaining Funding Program; and
2. Inconsistencies.

1. **Value Added by the NVOs through the Sustaining Funding Program:**

A POSITIVE MULTIPLIER EFFECT:

This evaluation finds that the NVOs, including their head offices, add value to the federal government's activities in criminal justice, in particular, to the services and mandate of the Ministry of the Solicitor General.

National offices serve a number of key functions which add value to the Ministry of the Solicitor General:

INFORMATION SHARING:

- within the national structure of the voluntary organization from the national level down and vice versa;
- with the Ministry of the Solicitor General

PROVIDING A NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE:

- distilling federal initiatives as an analytical service for affiliates;
- promoting national standards;
- advancing service and program innovations throughout the country

SERVING AS A NATIONAL FORUM:

- for provincial and regional constituents to network and liaise on operational matters, program innovations;
- to develop common approaches, strategies, and responses to federally proposed legislative and policy changes (within the limits of local autonomies)

STABILIZING THE ENTIRE NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE OF AN NVO:

- in a high change environment, making executive staffing and major program changes at the regional and local level less traumatic;
- facilitating NVO-specific internal negotiations over the distribution of resources, including grant and sustaining contribution funding support;
- providing an institutional memory and reducing the information coordination and program management burden on the Ministry by providing a single stable point of reference in the country.

Furthermore, when there are differing views about a Ministerial initiative, a service issue, a procedural matter, or a spectacular incident, NVOs have the potential, and until recently, have tended to work in close collaboration with the Ministry of the Solicitor General to effect the most constructive outcome. There is real economy and potential effectiveness in having a national office of an NVO organization, so that even in the most difficult times, a means exists by which dialogue can take place between the government and the voluntary sector and its network in Canada. As one NVO representative put it: 'any tension between the voluntary sector and the government would be worse if NVOs did not exist; at least this way, we can talk.'

Apart from information processing and program management efficiencies, NVOs generally demonstrate a significant multiplier effect for federal dollars received in sustaining funding support. In one case, CAEFS, 1,181 volunteers provided 97,352 hours (or 54 person years equal to approximately $2 million worth of unpaid service) in communities throughout Canada. This contribution alone nearly matches the total amount of funding ($2.3 million) provided to the NVOs through the Sustaining Funding Program. (With benefits to provincial governments removed, the overall impact would still be significant if the contributions of all NVOs is taken into consideration.)

It is noteworthy as well that a significant portion of the total operating budget (or volume of business/service as measured in absolute dollars) of some NVOs is supported by sources other than federal, provincial and territorial governments. For example, it is estimated that 50% of the John Howard Societies' total "business volume" of $30 million are "revenues" from charitable donations that are in turn provided as "services". United Way campaigns and other sources of non-governmental support match government contributions. Similar values apply in other cases, notably the Salvation Army which draws support from its Red Shield Campaigns.

(b) The downside of an exclusive fee-for-service arrangement:

While respecting the appropriateness of fee-for-service arrangements with voluntary and private organizations, this evaluation was informed that a total shift to fee-for-service arrangements, with respect to either the direct service or advocacy/policy development functions of NVOs, could lead to a negative cost-benefit outcome.

A fee-for-service approach applied across the entire spectrum of functions provided by NVOs and their affiliates, and of value to the government, will tend to narrow the focus of the advocacy function that community-based voluntary groups provide in Canada. This will diminish the government policy- and program-enhancing role that NVOs are able to perform with the support of the grants and contribution programs.

It can be expected, as well, that an exclusive fee-for-service arrangement will lead to overall increases in costs to the government.

An exclusive fee-for-service arrangement would put at risk the value added through a voluntary base; citizens motivated to participate voluntarily in matters that concern them at the local level would no longer enjoy the explicit moral and fiscal support of government, and fees for service would likely rise over time to offset lost voluntary labour/service.

Furthermore, administrative overheads which presently are addressed very cost-effectively, to some extent through the NVO Sustaining Funding Program, would also increase the cost to government in an exclusively fee-for-service arrangement with the voluntary sector.

(c) Greater synergies and increased economies are possible:

Greater synergies among themselves and more impact at the community level could be achieved by NVOs. Fairly uniform responses to interviews showed that NVOs are not networking as

frequently and as effectively as they would like; that services some NVO provide, for example training, publications or analysis, are not well known by others and are not purchased or consumed by this natural market when they could be. Joint efforts among the NVOs, such as campaigning successfully against return of the death penalty and collaborative efforts between the Ministry and the NVOs, such as developing "a key issues response team" and strategic planning exercises are underdeveloped.

NVOs could also be a more effective strength in the Ministry's policy and professional service delivery repertoire.

NVOs are underutilized in promoting, without compromise for either party, Ministerial initiatives. NVOs have not, on their own or in conjunction with the Ministry, exploited their public information, public education and public relations capabilities to a mutual advantage.

Concerned, among other things, about reported increases in crime and violence in Canadian society, disturbed about the public's lack of understanding of the appropriate role of sanctions and treatment for offenders, disappointed that the actual success rates of parole supervision are lost in media reports of spectacular incidents, it would appear that the NVOs have not had the impact they could have.

Furthermore, increased economies appear to be possible by addressing issues such as apparent duplication of services, coordination of isolated initiatives that would be better informed and be received better in the criminal justice system "market place", and other inconsistencies.

The grants and contributions programs of the Ministry of the Solicitor General were consolidated into the NVO Sustaining Funding Program in 1983-1984 and are currently managed by Executive Services. Executive Services fulfils a central, co-ordinating role and as such it is in a good position to draw more from the Program. The NVO Sustaining Funding Program, however, does not have the level of

profile within the Ministry of the Solicitor General to exploit potential synergies.

(ii) Inconsistencies:

1. The Association des services de réhabilitation sociale is not in practice a national association as generally understood within the present eligibility criteria. It functions as an NVO within the borders of Quebec.

2. The Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police is more in the order of an association of professionals, than a community-based association of volunteers. Its eligibility for funding under the Sustaining Funding Program for voluntary organizations could be questioned, independent of an assessment of the nature and quality of its work, and the role it serves in its relation to the Ministry of the Solicitor General.

3. To a much lesser extent but in a similar theme, the Canadian Criminal Justice Association does not have a constituency comprised of community-based volunteers, rather its volunteers tend to be professionals active in criminal justice.

4. Network: Interaction for Conflict Resolution is an active, innovative body that had its roots in community-based corrections and has developed more broadly. It appears to have been destined for sustaining funding support from Justice Canada, but presently faces an uncertain future. Furthermore, its services and advocacy functions which make it eligible for support from the SFP of the Ministry of the Solicitor General have atrophied significantly.

5. To be specific, Network: Interaction for Conflict Resolution pioneered applications of alternatives to incarceration, including victim-offender reconciliation programs, yet Network appears not to have built upon its early success, having broadened its scope. At the same time, and independently, Canadian Training Institute offers conflict resolution training programs.

6. The Canadian Training Institute, whose growth into an NVO was promoted by the federal government, aspires to be a "centre of excellence" in the development of training and professional development materials, and course instruction in matters relevant to corrections, parole, and policing. The Institute's products and services are not as widely known in the NVO community as might be expected, especially among those organizations who deliver direct service. This is lost opportunity.

7. The Canadian Criminal Justice Association has a number of provincial affiliates, although no provision for funding them exists similar to that available to the John Howard Society of Canada and the Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies.

8. A number of associations with provincial, regional or local corporate affiliates have not been treated in a uniform manner under the Sustaining Funding Program.

9. National Associations Active in Criminal Justice is a coalition of NVOs. As such, it is the recipient of a sustaining contribution. It, and the Canadian Criminal Justice Association appear to duplicate some major advocacy/reform functions and professional-organizational functions directed at the NVO sector generally. While duplication of effort may or may not be of concern to funders under the SFP, the issue of potential synergies and effectiveness is raised.

   CCJA hosts a conference, a Congress held biennially, convening many of the players in Canada in criminal justice, but primarily representatives from corrections and parole. NAACJ, a broadly constituted coalition of NVOs active in criminal justice convenes its members quite frequently and regularly, but does not host conferences on the scale of the CCJA's Congress.

   NAACJ has produced leading edge think pieces and reform discussion papers, maintains a research committee, yet the CCJA publishes the

only professional journal in corrections and criminology in Canada, the Canadian Journal of Criminology.

10. The research role among these groups is noticeably understated or non-existent. NAACJ has a research committee but the Canadian Training Institute is the only NVO that asserted an active interest in applied research in corrections and criminal justice; no concrete examples were observed.

11. While each NVO fulfils some advocacy/reform functions and some are very active in policy development for their own constituencies, the major policy development, research, training and networking functions of the NVOs as a sector are centred at CCJA, NAACJ, and CTI; they are fractured, and based on the data collected in this study are seen by Ministry representatives and NVO representatives as less effective than could be.

PROGRAM RELEVANCE, PROGRAM PERFORMANCE AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT: CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Three essential questions emerge from the objectives of this evaluation:

1. Should the Ministry of the Solicitor General maintain its NVO Sustaining Funding Program?

2. Is the NVO Sustaining Funding Program effective in meeting its stated objectives?

3. Is the NVO Sustaining Funding Program managed in a way to ensure survival of what is appropriate and best, consistent with Government priorities, the Ministry's mandate and mission and the changes that influence and shape these from time to time?

This evaluation leads us to conclude that the answer to question #1 is: yes, the Ministry of the Solicitor General should maintain its NVO Sustaining Funding Program. The shared responsibility between the Ministry and NVOs for criminal justice services in Canada has been validated by this study; the value added to the Ministry and to Canadians by the participation of NVOs in criminal justice with support from the Sustaining Funding Program has been documented; and alternatives, such as relying exclusively on fee-for-service agreements are not without significant costs.

In response to question #2, is the SFP meeting its stated objectives, we note that the Sustaining Funding Program is generating added value (for the government and the community) in the community, despite the level and terms and conditions of the funding.

As the objectives of the SFP are currently stated, however, the SFP is not effective in meeting its stated objectives, particularly, in attempting to "provide stable and predictable funding to national voluntary organizations to maintain their national structure and cover the core operating expenses necessary to carry out long-term tasks and fulfil their objectives".

In response to question #3, we have also found that the Sustaining Funding Program is presently not managed in a manner to ensure survival of what is appropriate and best, consistent with Government priorities, the Ministry's mandate and mission and the changes that influence and shape these from time to time. No regular review of applications takes place, enabling the Ministry to select from among applicants those deserving funding support; no measures of accountability have been developed and employed systematically; the program has primarily been treated as an administrative file for a number of reasons as documented in this report in our discussion of history.

Nevertheless, the various functions NVOs perform, the willingness of all parties to improve their working relationships, and the policy, political, and service costs associated with a failure to restore the program suggest that actions be taken to move forward, productively.

The first steps to situate the NVO Sustaining Funding Program "in the '90s" are outlined in the following recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

FOR IMMEDIATE IMPLEMENTATION:

1. **Continue the NVO Sustaining Funding Program, with improvements.** Having made a commitment to maintain the NVO SFP, implement measures to:

   - give the program rationality by referring to and taking program management guidance from the elements of the Ministry's 1991 Policy on Its Relations with the Voluntary Sector;
   - ensure that realistic commitments and expectations with respect to funding on the part of the Ministry are made explicit;
   - develop a management structure that enables periodic evaluation of the SFP's performance and review of the individual NVOs applying to the SFP.

2. **Confirm and notify all relevant parties that the NVO Sustaining Funding Program of the Ministry will continue to be managed by Executive Services, Ministry Secretariat.**

3. **Establish, within fiscal capabilities, a three-year cycle for the SFP grants and contributions.** This measure to stabilize the program and to make accountability possible should:

   - commence April 1, 1993;
   - give notice immediately to eight (8) of the fourteen (14) presently funded NVOs that they are on the cycle.
   - specify that the SFP will be re-structured during this cycle, making it possible that approved NVOs will encounter some change with respect to funding levels and accountability associated with the support they receive before the end of

the 3-year cycle. The eight (8) NVOs recommended for immediate approval are:

John Howard Society of Canada

Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies

St. Leonard's Society of Canada

Salvation Army Correctional and Justice Services Department

Prison Arts Foundation

Church Council on Justice and Corrections

Block Parents Program of Canada Inc.

The Seventh Step Society of Canada

4. **Give Ministerial consideration to the appropriateness of the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police being recipient of support under the SFP,** inasmuch as it appears insufficiently "voluntary" to qualify, notwithstanding the direct relevancy of its activities to the policing and security mandate of the Ministry of the Solicitor General and its merit for funding support.

   If it is determined that the CACP should continue to receive funding under the SFP, place it on the 3-year cycle under a sustaining contribution commencing April 1, 1993 and identify it as an "exception". As an "exception", CACP's status should be monitored annually to see if its status remains the same or changes as a result of revisions to the eligibility criteria as recommended herein and/or as a result of self-generated changes to the CACP.

5. **Give Ministerial consideration to the appropriateness of the Association des services de réhabilitation sociale being recipient of support under the SFP,** inasmuch as it functions and delivers its services almost exclusively through a provincial network within the Province of Quebec and therefore lacks the characteristic of an NVO applicant under the current eligibility criteria, notwithstanding its merit for funding support.

   If it is determined that the ASRS should continue to receive funding under the SFP, place it on the 3-year cycle under a sustaining contribution commencing April 1, 1993 and identify it as an "exception". As an "exception", ASRS's status should be monitored annually to see if its status remains the same or changes as a result of

revisions to the eligibility criteria as recommended herein and/or as a result of self-generated changes to the ASRS.

6. **Effect the transfer in funding support for Network: Interaction for Conflict Resolution to Justice Canada,** ensuring that such support will in fact be given. If such a change cannot be effected forthwith, invite Network to participate in multi-party discussions, as recommended herein, to determine a means by which its MSG-relevant functions and services may be rationalized with the MSG-relevant functions of three other NVOs identified in this evaluation for such an exercise.

7. **In order to preserve, enhance and make more cost-effective at the sectoral level:**

   (a) the advocacy-reform role of NVOs, generally;

   (b) their applied research and information sharing functions;

   (c) their networking capability;

   (d) their professional-organizational service in areas such as the development of standards, creating and disseminating training tools, planning, resourcing and facilitating professional development opportunities such as seminars and conferences, and the publication of intellectual materials;

   offer to convene a process of multi-party discussions among the following NVOs:

   Canadian Criminal Justice Association,

   National Associations Active in Criminal Justice,

   Canadian Training Institute; and

   The Network: Interaction for Conflict Resolution (as appropriate).

   to explore creative alternative means by which those functions which they perform that are relevant to the Ministry may be preserved, refined and presented to the Ministry for ongoing support within the SFP.

This discussion, which could include creative alternatives for program delivery such as federated or consortium models, should be facilitated by an independent party, and paid for by the Ministry.

8. **In the event that the NVOs identified in Recommendation 6 do not choose to participate in multi-party discussions as recommended, the Ministry should entertain applications for sustaining funding from each on its own merits.** These NVO's, however, should not be placed automatically on the three year cycle without specific review. In particular, the duplication of effort and lack of synergy between NAACJ and CCJA should be addressed and the manner in which the potential contribution of CTI to the development of intellectual products can be exploited to a greater advantage for all should be examined.

9. **Within Executive Services, take steps to ensure program purpose, authority and resources for the day-to-day operation of the NVO Sustaining Funding Program** by:

- giving the NVO and SFP a higher profile in the Ministry and in Executive Services through the establishment of appropriate committee structures and reporting mechanisms;
- requiring agencies to designate sufficiently senior and NVO-knowledgable staff to execute the mandate of the NVO Committee through regularly-scheduled meetings and activities;
- linking the NVO Program more effectively to the Minister's office, through appropriate briefing mechanisms at the DM, Heads of Agencies, and ADM levels within the Ministry;
- making provisions for active consultation and exchange with the NVOs; and
- putting the NVO program on the strategic planning agenda of all agencies in the Ministry of the Solicitor General.

FOR INTERMEDIATE IMPLEMENTATION
(October 1, 1992 - March 31, 1993):

10. **Through a policy statement, make explicit to NVOs that when the Ministry of the Solicitor General enters into consultation with them, it does not construe consultation to mean negotiation**, and that the Minister reserves the prerogative to take advice from NVOs and from others and that final decision-making resides with the Minister.

11. **Revise the SFP eligibility criteria with a view to making them more specific and reflective of the current mandate and policies of the Ministry of the Solicitor General.** This process may involve a consultation with the NVOs, but the prerogative for changes should remain with the Ministry.

12. **Develop and implement a cost-effective consultation process involving Ministry representatives and NVO representatives in order to:**

    - **define core operating expenses**, taking into consideration the nature of NVOs, and making explicit allowances for differences among them that relate to the functions they serve;

    - **in accordance with Treasury Board policy, establish guidelines and a formula for determining the nature and levels of funding support to eligible NVOs.** Consideration should be given to the role of sustaining contributions and grants, recognizing the relevancy of the developmental stage of an organization, the degree of fee-for-service work it undertakes for the agencies of the SGC, and the realistic ability of the NVO to attract funding support from other sources.

13. **Review individual performance of NVOs regularly against the NVO Sustaining Funding Program eligibility criteria** (i.e., at 18 month intervals in the three-year cycle in anticipation of application for the renewal of funding).

14. **Evaluate, by objective evaluation, the Ministry's NVO Sustaining Funding Program every five (5) years.**

ENDNOTES

1. Michael Quinn Patton's Utilization-Focused Evaluation (Sage, 1978), provides an excellent outline of the philosophy and methodology and specific options in studies that strive to ensure the utilization of evaluation by recognizing that "utilization is affected by every aspect of an evaluation, from initial conceptualization to data analysis and interpretation" (page 21). Patton states that "utilization-focused evaluation emphasizes what happens in a study to determine its eventual impact before a final report is produced. The key to utilization will be found on the path the evaluation takes before the findings are exposed to the general light of public scrutiny." (page 21) Describing utilization-focused evaluation as a flexible approach, Patton states that "utilization-focused evaluation is not a formal model or recipe for how to conduct evaluative research. Rather, it is an approach, an orientation, and a set of options. The active-reactive-adaptive evaluator chooses from among these options as he or she works with decision-makers and information users throughout the evaluation process." (page 284)

2. Page 13, Community Involvement in Criminal Justice, Report of the Task Force on the Role of the Private Sector in Criminal Justice, Volume 1, 1977.

3. The Task Force worked at a time of economic restraint in Canada, noting that funding levels to community agencies were levelling off and that cut backs had occurred in the most flexible of Government funding programs. Some community groups feared having to close down. Citizen participation was found to mean many things and the Task Force considered it "important to distinguish between the participation of the volunteer and the concept of citizen participation as a conscious, deliberate process which has change as its primary goal. We make this distinction, not to downplay the importance of volunteer efforts in criminal justice, but to identify the qualitative differences between volunteering to help and participating to bring about change as a major goal." Community Involvement in Criminal Justice: Volume I (page 113).

A need for greater cooperation and co-ordination of NGOs was identified, and in a fiscal climate that saw increased pressure on governments to control expenditures and to assure cost-effectiveness of expenditures made to outside organizations, accountability was an issue. The Task Force set forth a rationale for sharing responsibility with the NGOs, and the Task Force made a number of recommendations under the following headings:

- Reinforcing Community Responsibility in Criminal Justice

- Utilizing Community Resources more Effectively
- Toward a Shared Partnership of Responsibility and Resources
- Suggested Areas of Shared Responsibility
- Strengthening the Non-Governmental Organizations
- Controlling the Impact of Government Policy Initiatives
- Strengthening the Role of Citizens in Planning
- NGOs and the Planning Process
- Toward a Stabilized NGO Funding Base.

4. (i) Mr. Pat Graham, Executive Director, Seventh Step Society of Canada reports of a fund raising campaign his Society undertook in 1986: "Of the 500 letters we sent out to targeted potential donors in the private sector, we received 200 letters back saying 'how good' our cause seemed to be, but only one small donation!".

(ii) Similar accounts are given by other NVOs who have attempted to secure funding support from the private sector. It appears that United Way campaigns, and in the case of the Salvation Army - the Red Shield campaign, are the only consistently realistic hopes of non-governmental funding.

5. Reference is made here to "Reduction in grants and contributions and other programs" contained in Budget papers tabled in the House of Commons by the Honourable Don Mazinkowski, Minister of Finance, February 25, 1992.

6. See Ministry "Policy on Relations with the Voluntary Sector", 1991.

7. Considerable attention will need to be paid by Ministry staff to the issue of defining core operating expenses. This evaluation presents financial tables that were developed to show the level of core funding support required to maintain a national infrastructure, and presenting the amount of funding the SFP contributed to these core expenses. This exercise has helped demonstrate the extent to which federal funds are "multiplied" through NVO networks, especially for organizations that provide direct service. The exercise was extremely difficult, however, and the following quote from a letter received from Mr. John Sawdon, Executive Director, Canada Training Institute highlights just one dimension of the problem:

In submitting these figures, you should be aware that due to increasing costs and a constantly eroding sustaining contribution, we are being forced into pursuing fee-for-service arrangements in continuing to operate as a national charitable organization. Although these services are not reported as "core" costs, one could argue that "many of the costs" should be recognized as core costs. An example, in facilitating networks of provincial/regional groups to provide services aimed at improving the criminal justice system we set "standards" for training delivery and provide support to committees to meet these. Due to deceasing sustaining contribution dollars, we are forced to pursue fee-for-service arrangements to generate funds to offset costs of this service. In complying with your reporting structures, these costs are not included as core costs.

I trust you will take this dilemma into consideration as you prepare your report to the Solicitor General Canada.

8. Eligibility criteria of #6 of the Sustaining Funding Program for NVOs specifies:

(6) The organization is normally able to secure at least 25% of its core funding from other sources than the federal government.

9. Ministry file on NVO Program

APPENDIX A

EVALUATION STUDY
NATIONAL VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS
TERMS OF REFERENCE

May 1992

EVALUATION STUDY
NATIONAL VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS

Terms of Reference

BACKGROUND

The Ministry recognizes the importance of NVOs to the fulfilment of its mandate. The Ministry of the Solicitor General's Secretariat has had the responsibility for managing the sustaining funding program to National Voluntary Organizations (NVOs) since 1983. NVOs are important players in reaching the broad Ministry objective of a safe and secure society. The purpose of the sustaining funding program is to provide stable and predictable funding to the NVOs to ensure the maintenance of their national structures and cover the core operating expenses necessary to fulfil their objectives.

Certain factors affect the relationship between the Secretariat of the Ministry and the NVOs such as the absence of funding increases since 1984. Another factor that influences the relationship is the nature of the roles adopted by the NVOs: service delivery; advisor and critic in the development and delivery of government policy; and, the advocacy and innovation role where pressure is placed by NVOs on the Ministry to implement policies, programs and procedures to meet the needs of their client groups. Also, the Ministry, in its dealings with several NVOs, may create conflicting or competitive relationships in that these NVOs are asked to provide comments on documents which may or may not be in conflict with the association's activities and beliefs.

The Ministry has developed a policy on relations with the voluntary sector to clarify the Ministry's relationship with the sector while preserving the balance among jurisdictions. A copy is attached to these Terms of Reference.

The current objectives of the Sustaining Funding Program are:

1. to provide funding to national or potential national voluntary organizations working in criminal justice:
   - to ensure the existence or development of national organizations to represent each organization's provincial or local bodies;

- to encourage independent and cooperative action with the Ministry in areas that will further the Ministry's objectives;
- to encourage improved communications between the Ministry and voluntary organizations;
- to promote the development of national voluntary work in support of Ministry objectives;
- to increase public knowledge of the criminal justice;
- to promote and sustain citizen participation in support of Ministry objectives.

2. to provide special funds to NVOs to encourage them to pursue economic self-sufficiency thereby enhancing their ability to work with the Ministry while maintaining their independence and autonomy.

SCOPE OF WORK:

I. Objectives:

The Ministry of the Solicitor General and Treasury Board requires an evaluation of the NVO program to determine whether the sustaining funding program is meeting its stated objectives. A number of potential issues were identified in an evaluation framework completed in 1988 and these have now be re-evaluated in light of current needs and changes made to the program since then.

The study will review the program mandate, policy and objectives, program structure, funding criteria, application assessment, yearly reviews, communication and program outputs.

II. Study questions and /or issues to be addressed:

A. Program Relevance:

A.1 Should the Ministry of the Solicitor General (MSG) be involved in sustaining funding activities?

A.2 Does the Ministry's Sustaining Funding Program (SFP) address realistically an actual need?

A.3 What impacts and effects, both intended and unintended, result from carrying out this program?

A.4 What are the benefits to the Ministry of carrying out such a program? What are the risk factors to consider?

A.5 Does the Sustaining Funding Program as it exists today continue to be relevant to the objectives and priorities of the Ministry?

A.6 Are there effective alternative approaches for supporting the national voluntary sector?

A.7 Are the Sustaining Funding Program's objectives understood by the Ministry's key officials (Minister's office; RCMP, NPB, CSC, Secretariat,...)?

A.8 To what extent is the Sustaining Funding Program contributing positively to the implementation and objectives of the Ministry of the Solicitor General's new policy on its relationship with the NVOs?

A.9 What are the benefits to the Ministry of providing sustaining funding to each of the 14 organizations currently receiving funding?

A.10 Could the benefits received by the Ministry of the Solicitor General from NVOs be better delivered in a more cost-effective manner/or other organization structure?

A.11 What is the potential impact of reducing or eliminating sustaining funding support for each of the 14 organizations?

A.12 Are there other organizations that could provide greater benefits to the Ministry?

B. Program Performance:

B.1 To what extent do NVO recipients meet/support the objectives of each of the Ministry of the Solicitor General's policies and programs? These should be analyzed at the five activity areas: consultation; information sharing; exchange of knowledge; provision of resources; and, accountability measures.

B.2 In what manner and to what extent does the program complement or overlap with other Ministry agencies and with other federal departments sustaining funding programs?

B.3 Are the current program objectives and specific parameters still relevant?

B.4 Are the NVO's meeting those program objectives that are still relevant?

B.5 Is the intent of the Sustaining Funding Program understood by the NVOs?

C. Program Management:

C.1 Is the present configuration still relevant with respect to eligibility criteria? Do the eligibility criteria allow for a more pertinent (meet our needs) choice of voluntary organisations for funding? Are the nature and application of the eligibility criteria perceived biased and/or arbitrary?

C.2 Are there better ways of achieving the Sustaining Funding Program's results: alternative funding? alternative support? consolidation of funds to various NVOs? rationalization?

C.3 What are the needs and expectations of the NVO's? How well are these being addressed through the Sustaining Funding Program? Can alternative methods address any shortfall?

C.4 Should monitoring and/or auditing of NVO's annual financial reporting be more rigorous?

C.5 Does the accountability/responsibility structure for the Sustaining Funding Program and the reporting requirements for NVOs facilitate good management practices by the Secretariat.

III. Methodology:

The Sustaining Funding Program will be evaluated using quantitative and/or qualitative data from interviews and current internal documentation and data obtained from NVOs. The methodology will follow OCG guidelines and requirements

IV. Deliverables:

The contractor will provide an evaluation report at the end of the contracting period to be approved by the Directors of Management Review and Intergovernmental Affairs.

STEERING COMMITTEE:

The evaluation of the NVOs will be directed by a Steering Committee to be chaired by the Director of Intergovernmental Affairs and will include representatives from the Ministry Secretariat, the Correctional Service Canada, the National Parole Board and the RCMP.

The Steering Committee will:

* oversee the project and ensure the application, by the consultant, of an appropriate empirical approach and methodology;

* discuss the issues brought forth by the consultant during the conduct of the evaluation and respond to concerns raised by the consultant in conducting the review;

* review the findings, conclusions and recommendations from the fact-finding and analytical tasks undertaken by the consultant;

* brief their management as required on the direction and progress of the study and the deliberations of the Steering Committee;

* the Chair of the Committee will provide briefings for the Minister, the Ministry Agencies and for the NVOs.

* the Chair will prepare the management response and will formulate the action plans in consultation with the Committee in response to the evaluation.

FUNDING

The contract is to be awarded on a fixed price basis not to exceed including travel. If the scope of the work changes and affects the amount required for the project, the project authority (Director, Management Review) must authorize the changes.

SKILLS REQUIRED

The contractor must have demonstrated:

* experience with the practice of program evaluation in the federal government including qualitative and quantitative research methods;

* knowledge of federal government policies and practices in the delivery of funding programs;

* familiarity with the theory of program evaluation, especially as it relates to the different attributes of various evaluation approaches;

* a documented track record in expeditious conduct of similar evaluation consulting work. Contractor will provide a minimum of two recent references (including complete name, address and phone number) that can be contacted directly.

* a clear understanding of the intended goals and objectives of federal government sustaining funding activities;

* broad understanding of the issues and concerns related to sustaining funding;

* understanding of the mandate of the Ministry of the Solicitor General and how it related to the sustaining funding program;

* knowledge of provincial, municipal and federal government sectors in Canada;

* capacity to conduct interviews and to review written material in both official languages

CONFLICT OF INTEREST:

The contractor hired must be an objective researcher not presently associated with any of the 14 organizations which receive or has received sustaining funding from the Ministry of the Solicitor General.

Auditors and evaluators currently on a contract for the Office of the Auditor General are not to be engaged at the same time as auditors for the Management Review Directorate.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES:

The consultant/contractor must be able to condcut the interviews in either official languages, in conformance with the Official Languages Act. The final report is to be drafted in English only.

REPORTING:

The contractor will provide a verbal and/or written progress report to the Director, Management Review on a weekly basis. The contractor will also report on an ad hoc basis, on demand to the Steering Committee.

SCHEDULE OF WORK/MILESTONES

The contract will begin immediately upon award. A first draft report is to be presented to the Steering Committee members no later than August 15, 1992.

SECURITY CLEARANCE

None required to perform this work.

COMPLIANCE WITH ACCESS TO INFORMATION AND PRIVACY ACT AND MINISTRY SECURITY PROGRAM

Contractors must comply with all regulations of the Access to Information and Privacy Act with regard to materials produced during the review. No materials shall be released to a third party without prior written authorization of the Director, Management Review.

TRAVEL

Travel may be required during the conduct of this review. All travel must be pre-authorized by the Director, Management Review and must conform to Treasury Board guidelines and rates for government travel. Travel is to be billed as a separate item by the contractor.

SECRETARIAT/CONTRACTOR RELATIONSHIP

Type of Reporting:	a weekly progress report and/or meeting if required. the contractor will also report to the Sustaining Funding Review Steering Committee on an ad hoc basis, as required.
Ownership by MSG/ Management Review:	of all evaluation working papers and related documents and software, and exclusive rights thereto.

SUBSTITUTION OF PERSONNEL

The Director, Management Review must give prior written approval before the contractor can substitute those contractors identified in the proposal.

QUESTIONAIRE/SURVEY AND STATISITCS CANADA

This evaluation study will not involve any surveys or questionnaires, thus not material will need to be registered with Statistics Canada or Public Opinion Research.

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL
AND
LIST OF KEY RESPONDENTS

APPENDIX B
PROTOCOL FOR SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS WITH KEY INFORMANTS
EVALUATION STUDY NATIONAL VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS

Are there any questions you have, or observations you would like to make about the reason for this evaluation, its terms of reference and my role as the evaluator?

How would you describe your relationship with (the Ministry Secretariat/the NVOs)?

Do you see the sustaining funding which (you give/receive) as carte blanche funding? Are "strings attached?"

There is an increasing emphasis on "accountability" in many programs and sectors these days. What is your view of Accountability with respect to the support you give/receive under the Sustaining Funding Program?

How much of your core operating expenses are addressed through the funds you receive under the Sustaining Funding Program?

How is the level of support you receive determined?

Is it adequate (taking into consideration that apparently absolutely no more funds are available than the present total amount)?

How would you determine the level of support an NVO should get in the form of sustaining funding?

Are there any NVOs currently receiving funding that you believe, based on your understanding of the Ministry's policy on its Relations with the Voluntary Sector and the Sustaining Funding Program, that simply do not appear to fit into the Program?

Are there other associations or NVOs you know about who presently do not receive support from the Ministry under the Sustaining Funding Program, but who should be supported?

Who are your clients?

What are your products or services?

How do you measure whether you are effective as an NVO?

Are there more creative ways to achieve your purpose as an NVO?

What exactly is the value that a national office adds to the NVO, especially in cases when the NVO is quite "mature" with a well developed national infrastructure and service delivery system?

Is there anything you thought we might cover which we have not; any thing you would like to add or emphasize?

LIST OF KEY RESPONDENTS

Ms. L. Berzins
Church Council on Justice and Corrections

Ms. L. Binch
Block Parent Programs of Canada

Mr. T. Carlson
John Howard Society of Canada

Mr. J. Filion
Ministry of the Solicitor General

Ms. J. Francis
Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies

Mr. P. Graham
Seventh Step Society of Canada

Mr. E. Gurney
St. Leonard's Society of Canada

Mr. S. Hamilton
Ministry of the Solicitor General

Major D. Howell
The Salvation Army Correctional and Justice Services Department

Mr. M. Johnson
Prison Arts Foundation

Ms. J. Johnston
Ministry of the Solicitor General

Mr. S. King
The Salvation Army Correctional and Justice Services Department

Mr. R. Labelle
National Associations Active in Criminal Justice

Ms. L. Laliberté
Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies

Ms. J. Lavallée
Association des services de réhabilitation sociale

Mr. R. Legault
Ministry of the Solicitor General

Mr. D. Lewis
Solicitor General of Canada

Mr. S. Lortie
Justice Canada

Mr. J. MacLatchie
John Howard Society of Canada

Ms. L. MacLeod
National Associations Active in Criminal Justice

Reverend D. McCord
Church Council on Justice and Corrections

Mr. W. McGrath
Former Executive Director, Canadian Criminal Justice Association
Former Chair, National Associations Active in Criminal Justice

Ms. S. McMechan
The Network: Interaction for Conflict Resolution

Mr. F. Miller
Former Executive Director, National Parole Board
Former Secretary, National Associations Active in Criminal Justice

Mr. J. Murphy
Ministry of the Solicitor General

Ms. N. Nelson
Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies

Ms. K. Pate
Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies

Ms. N. Pement
Ministry of the Solicitor General

Sgt. L. Penny
Ministry of the Solicitor General

Mr. H. Sapers
John Howard Society of Canada

Mr. J. Sawdon
Canadian Training Institute

Mr. F. Schultz
Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police

Reverend J. Scott
Church Council on Justice and Corrections

Mr. G. St.-Jean
Canadian Criminal Justice Association

Mr. G. Stewart
John Howard Society of Canada

Ms. L. Thériault
Church Council on Justice and Corrections

Mr. J. Walker
Ministry of the Solicitor General

Mr. D. Wigington
Ministry of the Solicitor General

Mr. R. Zubrycki
Ministry of the Solicitor General

APPENDIX C

A CHRONOLOGY OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL LANDMARKS

From Community Involvement in Criminal Justice: Report of the Task Force on The Role of the Private Sector in Criminal Justice, Volume I, 1977.

APPENDIX D

PROFILES
OF
NATIONAL VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS
PARTICIPATING IN
THE SUSTAINING FUNDING PROGRAM
OF
THE MINISTRY OF THE SOLICITOR GENERAL

PROTOCOL

The following brief profiles of the National Voluntary Organizations participating in the Sustaining Funding Programs are an attempt to highlight their philosophies, objectives and activities as national organizations; providers of direct services; reform/advocacy functions; public education functions; and their professional-organizational functions.

The delineation between these functions is not always clearly defined. In some cases, there are advocacy elements in the provision of direct services or there are direct service components in the advocacy/reform components. The following categories describe the various functions.

DIRECT SERVICE FUNCTIONS

Services are provided by an organization to:

- persons in conflict with the law (persons charged, persons on probation, inmates, parolees)
- persons directly affected by the actions of individuals who have come in conflict with the law (family of offenders and victims of crime)
- members of the community who recognize the societal responsibility for crime and want to become sensitized to criminal justice issues or work with direct service organizations. National voluntary organizations offer opportunities for these persons to become, or be trained as volunteers, or to participate in workshops on justice issues.

Services provided include:

- operation of programs and courses
- operation of facilities
- conducting research

REFORM/ ADVOCACY FUNCTIONS

Groups who wish to improve the principles, objectives and operation of our current criminal justice system advocate for change.

Advocacy/Reform activities include:

- conducting research
- submissions to the appropriate authorities of proposals for change
- consulting with the appropriate authorities when those authorities are proposing changes to principles, objectives and operations of the criminal justice system
- promoting networking among like-minded organizations to strengthen the voice for change; to exchange information; to decrease the likelihood of duplication of effort
- to facilitate a greater participation of Canadians in their justice system

The mechanisms for these activities includes:

- publications, such as background papers, journals, newsletters
- Sub-committees and their critiques and opinions
- meetings to liaise, develop views and strategies
- national forums, such as conferences

PUBLIC EDUCATION FUNCTION

- programs which are directed at the general public
- educating the general public about the societal benefit and value of the NVOs direct service programs
- educating the general public about the need to improve the principles, objectives and operations of our current criminal justice system
- responding to requests for information from the general public

PROFESSIONAL-ORGANIZATIONAL FUNCTIONS

Serves professionals working in the criminal justice area through:

- setting standards
- conducting professional development activities (i.e. training workshops)
- publishing professional journals.

Organizational development activities: strategic planning, networking

Developing mechanisms/activities for the review of the activities of the organization?

BLOCK PARENTS AND BLOCK PARENT PROGRAM OF CANADA INC.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE

The Block Parent Program of Canada (BPPC) is an affiliation of registered Black Parent Committees in Canada. Members are: all members of Board of Directors; the Chairman of each provincial Board/Committee; and one delegate from each non-federated province or territory.

The Board of Directors oversees Block Parent Programs throughout Canada. The Board ensures that the basic principles of BPP are uniform throughout the nation and are maintained to a high standard, both in the screening process for volunteers and the use of the BPP symbol. The BPPC works to retain and protect the uniqueness of BPP symbol of the BPP of Canada by assuring its proper use at all times. The Board sets guidelines that all member communities must operate within and the National Board helps to guarantee the credibility of the Program.

The Board has an advisory function in relation to its members. It advises and aids member bodies in every way, except financial. It aids communities in non-federated provinces, territories to establish new Block Parent Programs in every way except financial.

The Executive Director, appointed by the Board annually, is responsible for French/English material and liaising with french speaking program.

The Board helps maintain active communication at provincial and territorial level of the Block Parents Program though regular News Bulletins and at the local level through bi-annual "National Voice of Block Parent" newsletter, distributed to BPP Committees in Canada

DIRECT SERVICE FUNCTIONS

Block Parent Groups

The first Block Parent group was founded in London, Ontario in 1968. The Block Parent Program of Canada Inc. was incorporated in 1986. In 1991, over 325,000 homes across Canada displayed the Block Parent sign.

Block Parents have provided safe havens for citizens, particularly children, in times of need and to promote safe streets. Block Parents offer assistance by telephoning necessary emergency services, assist the Police by reporting suspicious or criminal activity in their communities. The Block Parent Program is a volunteer-organized, crime prevention program. The two main focuses of the organization are the recruiting and maintaining of a wide base of volunteers to act as Block Parents and the teaching of children in elementary schools about the Block Parent Program.

Block Parent Program of Canada inc.

Over the past few years, the Block Parent Program of Canada has broadened the scope of its service. It is not only for children in need but for adults as well. BPPC has distributed brochures to seniors to let them know they may contact Block Parents if they are in danger. Another brochure informs any other adult, such as women, teenagers or victims of Alzheimer's Disease, that they may contact Block Parents if they feel endangered.

PUBLIC EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Block Parents Program of Canada helps keep Block Parents Program in the public eye on a national basis through national advertising campaigns, promotions and fund raising activities in cooperation with its national sponsors. This has involved working with national companies and the government in organizing nationwide Block Parent activities, such as National Block Parent Week. BPPC has also participated in Crime Prevention week. These activities include press releases, displays, brochures and compiling annual statistics of all Block Parent Programs in Canada.

In the past year, BPPC has placed public service announcements on YTV. It has distributed a brochure on "Safety Skills for Children" that includes a section on preventing sexual assault, how to choose a day care wisely, community resources and taking action.

PROFESSIONAL-ORGANIZATIONAL FUNCTIONS

Block Parents Program of Canada has become an Associate Member of Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police and Canada Safety Council.

CHURCH COUNCIL ON JUSTICE AND CORRECTIONS

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE

The Church Council on Justice and Corrections was established in 1972. It is a national, bilingual and charitable organization composed of 10 denominations of 12,000 church congregations.

DIRECT SERVICE FUNCTIONS

Through its Quebec office, CCJC has established a dynamic visitation program for "Lifers" in penitentiaries in the Montreal region. It has also participated in helping to establish an organization whose goal is to provide a support network for families of prisoners, "Canadian Families and Corrections Network (CFCN)".

CCJC is developing a major project to produce a Congregational Resource entitled: "Responding to Violence in Families: A Plan for Community Action". It is being developed through is a three-year initiative in five centres across Canada focusing on education and training for parishes and congregations about the realities of family violence.

REFORM/ADVOCACY FUNCTIONS

CCJC's approach to justice is both ecumenical and multidisciplinary and based on a need to bring spiritual and human values to all levels of our justice and corrections systems and to demonstrate the positive impact and benefits of these values on these systems. The Council sees itself acting as a catalyst for change, where some of the ideas and concepts first developed at CCJC are later transplanted to other venues which have more resources. A top priority since 1975 as been their work on alternatives to incarceration.

CCJC's works to achieve its objectives through communication and advocacy; research; and community animation. Its work is based on developing and disseminating education programs to congregations and community groups on issues related to crime, courts, corrections and family violence as they relate to the role of the community and volunteers and foster community-based initiatives to take action on this issues. CCJC's approach takes into account the whole community, including issues relating to women, natives and Native spirituality and other different cultures.

CCJC works with many different groups and at different levels to achieve its objective: within the churches, at both the congregational and institutional level; other community groups; national voluntary organizations; federal and provincial governments; and foundations. Its activities span direct service through to a proposal to amend the Criminal Code.

CCJC has worked with Correctional Services Canada to seek more concerted and humanly sensitive policies which deal with the special needs of increasing numbers of inmates and their families.

CCJC is also working for a situation to ensure that when the P4W in Kingston is closed and the five regional centres are functioning, there be adequate provision for the spiritual nurture and growth of women, including appropriate means to meet the needs of aboriginal women. It participates on a committee charged with ensuring that needs to support spirituality are met. As well, it is working with other national organizations, such as CAEFS in this area and has met with the Solicitor General.

CCJC also had the opportunity to test its resource, Dialogue on Crime and Punishment: Focus on Youth. With the assistance of the Department of Justice, it assessed the relevance and effectiveness of this resource for use within particular cultural, multicultural and gender-specific contexts: for dealing with female young offenders; native young offenders; and ethnic young offenders.

CCJC has made comments on legislation and policy at federal level: in particular on Bill C-36 (Corrections and Conditional Release); on the policy on Pardons; and on Bill C-89 - Victims and Parole.

The Council is working with the National Associations Active in Criminal Justice, for which CCJC is playing a leadership role in a proposal for Alternate Court Procedures. This proposal would amend the Criminal Code to provide the Crown, with the consent of the accused, to elect to proceed through an alternative process in which non-incarcerative sentencing options would be explored and various conflict mediation procedures and ADR methods would be encouraged. Imprisonment would not be a sentencing option. CCJC is currently in the process of promoting of the proposal and in consultation, seeking support from experts, Justice Canada, Provincial and Territorial Attorneys General.

CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF ELIZABETH FRY SOCIETIES

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE

The Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies is a federation of autonomous Societies which works with, and on behalf of women involved with the justice system, in particular women in conflict with the law.

As an association, CAEFS develops policies and positions, takes action directed at reform of the criminal justice system and acts on common interests affecting women.

Goals of the national organization include:

- providing an Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies and to assist member societies in developing and maintaining high standards of programs and services in such areas as the courts, institutions or in the community and whether they be for the purpose of assistance, guidance, rehabilitation or prevention, and whether provided by professional or volunteer personnel.

- facilitating communication and cooperation among Elizabeth Fry Societies and similar societies and to encourage the formation of new Societies or groups with similar purposes.

- obtaining funds for the financial support of the organizations.

CAEFS has also conducted an extensive organizational review of its mission, guiding values and principles, as well as administrative policies. The review resulted in a revised mandate, guiding principles and a funding formula for CAEFS.

DIRECT SERVICE FUNCTIONS

Elizabeth Fry Societies are community-based agencies dedicated to offering services and programs to women in need.

REFORM/ADVOCACY FUNCTIONS

Elizabeth Fry Societies advocate for reforms, and offer a forum within which the public may be informed about, and participate in, all aspects of the justice system as it affects women.

CAEFS is based on the principle that women have the right to access to equal opportunities and programs in the justice system and that action is required to ensure that programs, services and facilities are based on the individual needs of women in conflict with the law. Furthermore, any disposition or sentences imposed on women should be community-based without reliance on incarceration, unless there are compelling reasons to the contrary. The community ultimate responsibility responding to, and providing for, women in conflict with the law.

It is a goal of CAEFS to encourage suitable reform at all levels of the criminal justice system and in particular the needs of women in conflict with law and to promote public awareness and understanding of the needs of women in conflict with the law on ways in which individuals and communities can address these needs.

CAEFS also seeks to improve communication and cooperation with agencies and services in the correctional field. CAEFS has continued to maintain its ties with other groups through the National Associations Active in Criminal Justice; the Canadian Criminal Justice Association; the National Action Committee on the Status of Women; the Women's Legal Education and action fund; the National Association of Women and the Law; the National Council of Women of Canada; National Voluntary Organizations; United Way National Agencies Committee.

Women in Prison: CAEFS and Elizabeth Fry Societies across the country have played an active role in working towards the full implementation of the recommendations of Creating Choices: the Task Force on Federally Sentenced Women. One of their primary interests is to be advocates to ensure that federally sentenced women are involved in the design and development of services and programming options for them. CAEFS is committed to using collaborative and inclusive process to resolve any potential differences in its work in this area.

Advocacy and Law Reform: In the last year, CAEFS made presentations to the Temporary Absence Review Panel; the Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General on Bill C-36, the proposed Corrections and Conditional Release Act; and to the Panel on Violence Against Women.

Future activities include a focus on issues related to long term sentences and new amendments to the Young Offenders Act.

Work will continue on the potential applications of the Lavallee case and the Battered Women's Defence, a national literacy project in collaboration with the John Howard Society of Canada.

PUBLIC EDUCATION

CAEFS continued to publish and expand the circulation of its newsletter, published three times a year. "Voices from Inside", an open forum for federally sentenced women, was established as a section.

THE SALVATION ARMY
CORRECTIONAL AND JUSTICE SERVICES DEPARTMENT

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE

Uniform priorities are established by the National (Territorial) Office, while each region and centre of operation sets its own goals.

The Mission Statement of The Salvation Army Correctional and Justice Services Department is to minister to offenders, victims, witnesses and other persons affected by and serving in the justice system by practical assistance and through a demonstration of Christian love and concern.

A primary objective is to provide programs and support services for the accused, the offender, the victimized, those who administer the legal and justice systems, and family members.

Other objectives of The Salvation Army are: to provide a forum for public education on justice issues and crime prevention; to monitor and assist in the development of correctional reform; and to make an impact on the legislative process.

A goal for 1992-1993 is to enrich and define services in networking CSC programming with other Salvation Army Departments. Another goal is to conduct a National Training Workshop for The Salvation Army Correctional and Justice Service Directors and front line staff.

DIRECT SERVICE

The Salvation Army provides a broad range of programs and services from pre-trial to post-release, including: crime prevention/education, lifeskills, literacy, employment/job search, victim/witness assistance, community residential facilities, family reintegration, and chaplaincy.

In 1990-1991, The Salvation Army assistance to offenders and their families from pre-trial to post release included: 18,191 visits; 46,049 interviews in 120 courts; 62,697 counselled during 14,384 visits to 112 institutions; 33,958 persons supervised in the community under some form of sanction; 32,084 interviewed and 2,898 assisted within the community; and the operation of 22 community residential centres and provides various services and programs through 75 other centres.

1992-1993 Goals include:

- continue the development of services and programs to meet the needs of sexual offenders as recommended by a Salvation Army Committee studying this area
- continue ministries to families in the justice system by the expansion of the Relink and other Programs to meet family needs
- develop addictions programs in Federal-related service areas

REFORM/ADVOCACY FUNCTIONS

The Salvation Army makes representation to government officials and responds to government policy and program initiatives.

In 1990-1991, the Salvation Army's responses to government initiatives included: A Consultation Response: A National Perspective to the Working Group of the Task Force on Federally Sentenced Women; Official Response to the National Parole Board Discussion Paper, Victims and the National Parole Board; and the Official Response to The Young Offenders Act Proposals for Amendment.

The Salvation Army participates on several committees and associations which share a common interest in the criminal justice system.

1992-1993 Goals include:

- enhance involvement with female offenders in the Federal system, including the implementation of a Salvation Army National Committee to support and build upon recommendations of the Task Force on Federally Sentenced Women
- maintain regular liaison with the NVOs meeting in New York at the UN
- establish a committee to provide recommendations in the development of a working approach to crime prevention.

PROFESSIONAL-ORGANIZATIONAL FUNCTIONS

The Salvation Army Correctional and Justice Services Department has continued to develop regionalization with the rewriting of the Manual for Regional Co-ordinators and the establishment of Regional Management and Staff Training and Development Committees.

Resource Manuals and Guidelines have been rewritten or established for: Human Resource Management; Business Administration; Case Management; and Chaplaincy Services in courts and institutions.

The Salvation Army Correctional and Justice Services Department has also developed a Standards/Policies/Procedure manual.

ST. LEONARD'S SOCIETY OF CANADA

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE

The St. Leonard's Society of Canada is a national affiliation of 19 non-profit community organizations operating over 30 programs, the majority of which are in Ontario with other locations being British Columbia, Nova Scotia and Quebec.

The Society has developed an official affiliation agreement to foster more effective interaction between affiliates.

Major goals include:

- the prevention of crime by promoting, developing and implementing improved policies, procedures and service delivery within the criminal justice system
- the promotion of the acceptance of responsibility and accountability by persons in conflict with the law, in order to change behaviour that contributes to crime
- helping the community understand its responsibility in both the incidence of crime and in the manner in which society responds to it.

DIRECT SERVICE FUNCTIONS

St. Leonard's Society of Canada is now one of the largest halfway housing organizations in Canada, teaching basic life skills, counselling for substance abuse, dedicated to reintegrating ex-offenders into society as productive members of the community. St. Leonard's Society believes that, for the benefit of all citizens and in the spirit of forgiveness, those who have paid their debt to society deserve a second chance.

The Society assists persons in conflict with the law and works to prevent recidivism by facilitating member agencies to provide educational programmes, industrial workshops, community residential centres and such other supportive programmes as may be approved by the Directors of the Corporation.

Its affiliates provides a variety of programs and services to adult male ex-offenders on conditional release, young offenders, and penitentiary inmates. It occasionally assists

female offenders and victims. In 1990-1991, its affiliates provided housing for 4,908 individuals representing 101,184 total days care and assisted hundreds of others through programs such as Community Service Orders and Parole.

The Society has received a $427,000 grant from the Trillium Foundation for improvement of facilities and enhancement of programs of affiliates. It has established a grant of $25,000 to develop an accurate profile of national and local needs.

The Society will assist Correctional Services Canada with their need for additional beds in Community Resource Facilities.

REFORM/ADVOCACY FUNCTIONS

St. Leonard's Society of Canada is committed to prevention of crime through programmes which promote responsible community living.

Major past achievements include: taking part in many Ministry committees and makes representations to government officials and Parliament on issues pertaining to incarcerated and released offenders. It prepared an official response to the Department of Justice and the Ministry of the Solicitor General on the revisions to the Penitentiary Act. The proposal focused on reform rather than band-aid solutions. It focused on rebuilding public trust in the criminal justice system; more effective sentencing and sentencing administration; reintegration and public protection; fairness and accountability for offenders; reducing over-reliance on incarceration and the need for alternatives; and addressed the concerns of victims.

The Society will continue to provide a forum for the development, exchange and dissemination of ideas and information and represent the collective voice of members with government agencies on common.

The Society will continue to make representations to provincial governments and municipalities about the zoning laws restricting the setting up of community residential centres.

The Society is planning to a market strategy to widen its scope to encompass halfway houses and other affiliates in the whole of Canada and will take a leadership role in encouraging existing affiliates to expand their services and client base.

PROFESSIONAL-ORGANIZATIONAL FUNCTIONS

The Society will be providing leadership in the development, implementation and monitoring of standards for the delivery of services.

CANADIAN CRIMINAL JUSTICE ASSOCIATION

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE

The Canadian Criminal Justice Association is an umbrella organization of 1,300 members, including professionals who represent almost every facet of the administration of criminal justice in Canada. In addition to individual members, there are criminal justice/criminology/corrections associations in most provinces, eight of which are associated with CCJA.

The main objectives of CCJA are:

- to bring individuals together to promote a higher level of understanding and interaction among practitioners, professionals and the public on criminal justice issues;
- to facilitate and encourage the public and voluntary sectors to work together to resolve problems in the criminal justice system and the community;
- to promote and foster improved criminal justice programs, policing and legislation;
- to recognize the special needs of those affected by crime, including victims, family of victims and offenders, as well as the community as a whole;
- to provide a forum in which members of the public can discuss criminal justice issues;
- to acquire and disseminate information and knowledge about all aspects of criminal justice.

REFORM/ADVOCACY FUNCTIONS

Major activities of CCJA are:

- advocacy and promotion of dialogue and networking through consultation and submission of briefs; dissemination of information; undertaking of innovative projects; and production of publications;
- organizes biennial Canadian Congress on Criminal Justice, a major event for criminal justice and corrections professionals, attracting between 800-1,000 persons;

- produces five regular publications: The Bulletin (6 issues annually); The Justice Report (3-4 issues annually; and The Canadian Journal of Criminology (4 times per year). Two directories are published each year, The Justice Directory of Services and the Directory of Services for Victims of Crime. Single issue publications include Public/Private Partnerships in Prison Industries and Proceedings of the Seminar on Victims Rights and the Judicial Process. All publications are produced in both official languages.

Major achievements of CCJA are:

- Comments on a Government of Canada consultation document, "Directions for Reform", A Public Consultation Package on Sentencing, Corrections and Conditional Release: This document has grown from CCJA's analysis and review of a preceding document "Taking Responsibility" (the Report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Solicitor General). The "Directions" comments constituted the most extensive effort undertaken by CCJA in 1991. An extensive consultation was undertaken among the 1,500 CCJA members through the circulation for review and comment of the Ad Hoc "Directions" Committee's draft response. The Ad Hoc Committee's final report was submitted to the Deputy Solicitor General in December, 1991. It was agreed that a new mandate for the Ad Hoc Committee would be struck and it was renamed the Parliamentary Monitoring Committee. Its mandate is to monitor the implementation of "Directions for Reform" and to facilitate the highest possible public input for new legislation.

- Safer Communities: A Social Strategy for Crime Prevention in Canada, called by CCJA, the first comprehensive policy formulation in relation to crime prevention in Canada. Its development involved the participation of five other national organizations and the support of the Department of Justice. The document emphasized that government leadership and action on crime prevention should come from municipal governments as being the closest to their citizens. CCJA was invited to join the enlarged International Organizing Committee for the Second International Conference on Urban Safety, Drugs and Crime Prevention, held in Paris in the Fall of 1991.

- organized The National Forum on Offender Rehabilitation: A series of local and regional seminars followed by a one day national conference was initiated by CCJA and jointly organized by CCJA and its affiliates in collaboration with the Ministry of the Solicitor General and the Department of Justice. An estimated 5,000 people participated across Canada.

- CCJA participates in a number of national and international committees on criminal justice and corrections, such as Corrections International, the American Correctional Association, the National Associations Active in Criminal Justice, the National Liaison Committee (for which it provides secretariat services), and the CCJA/CSC Consultation Committee.

PUBLIC EDUCATION

CCJA provides information to the public on request, including selected copies of its publications.

PROFESSIONAL-ORGANIZATIONAL FUNCTIONS

Major activities are:

- organizes biennial Canadian Congress on Criminal justice, a major event for criminal justice and corrections professionals, attracting between 800-1,000 persons;

- produces five regular publications and the primary one of interests to professionals is The Canadian Journal of Criminology (4 times per year)

- produced standards and accreditation procedures for adult corrections.

CANADIAN TRAINING INSTITUTE

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE

To have the nationwide capacity for delivering field-relevant services, CTI is building an infrastructure to support the design of new programs, to train and supervise trainers; to consult with both non-governmental and governmental agencies; and to facilitate committed and involved provincial-regional networks.

A major objective of CTI is to sustain a viable National Institute by: ensuring adequate funding; engaging and developing a pool of trainers, consultants and practitioners; and creating the organizational capacity to respond to change. It has been conducting an Organizational Self-Renewal Process: CTI completed the first phase of it strategic planning process.

The mission of CTI is to enhance individual personal and professional development including organizational transformation for the purpose of improving the delivery of client-centred services by human service agencies. The mission of CTI, as a national training institute-centre of excellence, is to be achieved by providing training, consulting and applied research services.

The major objectives of CTI are:

- To provide qualitative field relevant training to human service agencies operating residentially based and community correctional programmes which promotes excellence of service.

- To provide professional qualitative consulting services in facilitating change and excellence of service.

- To identify, engage in/or facilitate the undertaking of applied research services which enhance the delivery of services within the criminal justice field nationwide.

DIRECT SERVICE FUNCTIONS

- Workshops: To date in 1992-1993, CTI has held 38 workshops, involving 462 people and 112 instruction days.

- Nationwide Institute Trained and Developed Trainers: CTI has enhanced its training development infrastructure, graduating five trainers in various parts of the Counsellor Development Series and enroling two new trainers in developmental process.

- Consultation Services: CTI completed a discussion paper for CSC entitled, The Implications of and the Capacity of CSC and NGO's in Implementing the Correctional Operational Plan Including the Integrated Offender Management Strategy. CTI is continuing to gather and analyze data on the Toronto ESAH House project for a publication detailing this agency's attempts to remain client-created. CTI facilitated a session of managers of CSC's Ontario Central District office in a communication and team-building exercise.

- Resource Development: CTI created a manual on Cross-cultural Awareness and Communication Skills. It published a Directory of Community Residential Services 1991-1992, Correctional Service Canada (Ontario Region).

- Applied Research: CTI is preparing for Phase III of the Management Needs Assessment project.

Some challenges CTI would like to address in 1992/93 are:

- To begin offering a Cross-Cultural Awareness and Communications program aimed at enhancing awareness of: the needs of a multicultural client group; multicultural employee pool; and as a means of determining validity of service approaches.

- To create the capacity for the delivery of Cognitive and Pro-Social Skills training, including a research pool in validating this approach to non-governmental agencies Canada-wide.

- The redesign of and expansion of the Crisis Intervention and Prevention training program to include a segment on critical incident stress and post trauma syndrome. The development of a Train the Trainers program will allow CTI to both respond to an increasing incidence of employees assaulted on the job, as well as victims of violent crimes.

- The design of Management Training including Team Building in assisting agencies to operate more effectively with reduced resources in a rapidly changing environment.

- Enhanced liaison role with provincial and federal corrections training and development networks in reducing duplication of efforts and in creating a strategic plan for ensuring the availability of multi-skilled and responsive service delivery system.

REFORM/ADVOCACY FUNCTIONS

Activities

- Conferences and National Forums: CTI was a member of the program committee to develop IARCA's Stigma Conference in conjunction with the September, 1991 World Therapeutic Communities Conference. CTI continues to be active in the National Liaison Committee and the National Associations Active in Criminal Justice.

THE NETWORK: INTERACTION FOR CONFLICT RESOLUTION

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE

The Network is an association of organizations and individuals dedicated to developing collaborative conflict resolution throughout Canada which facilitates interaction among these groups and individuals.

The Network members are active in varied applications such as teaching creative conflict resolution to children in schools, resolving day-to-day conflicts in the work place, land use and environmental mediation, cross-cultural conflicts, and victim-offender reconciliation.

The Network maintains two regional, part-time offices in Nova Scotia and British Columbia. It is developing part-time contract staff in Quebec.

The objectives of the Network are:

- to facilitate interaction among interested individuals and organizations;
- enhance conflict resolution methods, skills, and mechanisms
- provide resources for expanded applications of conflict resolution
- improve public awareness and social policy.

DIRECT SERVICE FUNCTIONS

The Network develops resource materials, conducts training sessions, convenes conference, and stimulates policy development.
The Network publishes the Canadian Dispute Resolution Directory and it preparing a Victim Offender Reconciliation Program (VORP) kit and an Environmental Dispute Resolution Kit.

The Network operates a small mail order "book store" with selected titles in conflict resolution.

Training in many aspects of conflict resolution continues to be a service provided by The Network. This year 26 training workshops were offered and a series of eight one-day seminars were offered on conflict resolution in the work place.

The Network administers the Fund for Dispute Resolution, a $1.1 million fund to support dispute resolution activities in Ontario.

REFORM/ADVOCACY FUNCTIONS

In the area of justice and corrections, the Network facilitates the interaction, exchange, and the development of restorative justice and conflict resolution in criminal, civil and community disputes throughout Canada.

The Network represented Canadian programs at NATO-sponsored research workshop in Italy on victim-offender reconciliation.

PUBLIC EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

In its facilitating role, this year the Network fielded 825 requests for information, providing materials, making referrals and distributing materials.

This year, The Network sponsored "Interaction '92", a biennial national conference on conflict resolution, around the theme "Sharing Common Ground: Culture and Conflict in Canada".

The Network publishes Interaction, a newsletter appearing quarterly.

In the upcoming year, the Network is committed to initiating broadly-based public education about conflict resolution in Canada.

PROFESSIONAL-ORGANIZATIONAL FUNCTIONS

An objective of the Network is to promote values and ethical standards of collaborative conflict resolution.

In 1991-1992, the Network developed formal affiliations with three fraternal organizations:

- the Mediation Development Association of B.C. (Mediation B.C.)
- the Society for Conflict Resolution in Ontario (SCRO).

Members in both of these groups will automatically become members of the Network.

- Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies at Conrad Grebel College (at the University of Waterloo).

In the upcoming year, the Network is committed to building inter-organizational linkages in the field of conflict resolution.

CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE

The Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police is an agency representing professional senior police executives. The current membership of 740.

The business of CACP is conducted by an elected Board of Directors - Chiefs and Directors of police forces. Several sub-committees make recommendations about the Association's ongoing work.

The national office serves as the central coordinating bureau for the Association's various activities and records, and liaison with outside sources.

The Association maintains liaison with its regional and provincial counterparts to lend support in police matters that may have extra-jurisdictional and nation-wide applications.

The objectives of CACP are:

- to encourage and develop cooperation among police organizations and their members
- to create and develop the highest standards of efficiency in law enforcement through the fostering and encouragement of police training by education and research
- to promote and maintain a high standard of ethics, integrity, honour and conduct in the profession of law enforcement
- to foster the uniformity of police practices and cooperation for the protection and security of the people of Canada.

REFORM/ADVOCACY FUNCTIONS

An objective of CACP is to encourage and advance the study of modern and progressive practices in the prevention and detection of crime.

CACP maintains a close working relationship with other sectors of the system, and particularly agencies of government. Committee membership includes the police; representatives from government agencies, industry, science, the legal profession, and academics.

The National Joint Committee of CACP and Federal Corrections Services brings together the police and all federal correctional agencies. It was established to maintain a more effective mechanism of communication and consultation and has helped in resolving difficulties associated with parole matters.

The mutual concern of police and industry about crime and its pervasion of the business world prompted the creation of the Prevention of Crime in Industry Committee which has facilitated the development of ways and means to combat industrial crime, and the establishment of a beneficial relationship between industry and police.

PROFESSIONAL-ORGANIZATIONAL FUNCTIONS

The CACP publishes the Canadian Police Chief, which serves as the main communication link with members and others.

The committees cover areas of concern, such as crime prevention; detection and investigation; research into equipment and supplies; young offenders; organized crime; training; law amendments; and crime statistics. The work of these committees is aimed at assisting day-to-day police operations and elevating standards of law enforcement through projects and information and services.

PRISON ARTS FOUNDATION

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE

The Foundation is governed by a Board of Directors with national representation elected by the members. There are provincial Prison Arts Affiliates in B.C. and Manitoba, and other affiliates are being developed.

DIRECT SERVICE FUNCTIONS

The Prison Arts Foundation aids and encourages artistic and cultural development in Canadian correctional institutions and in convicted offenders. These programs are developed in recognition of the value of such programs in the rehabilitative process and to develop the talents and skills of inmates.

The Foundation collects and displays visual arts and crafts created by convicted offenders and collects and publishes creative writing of convicted offenders.

Some primary program areas are:

- Creative Arts and Crafts Competitions: The Foundation's Annual Prison Arts Competition attracted almost 600 entries in all fields of artistic and crafts endeavours from inmates and parolees in federal, provincial and territorial facilities. Participation is particulary high where programs operate and where exhibitions have been shown in prisons.

- Arts Education Programs in Institutions: Supplementary courses in correctional facilities include painting, drawing, sculpting, photography, music, creative writing, and various crafts.

- Art Rental Program: Placement of artwork in the Foundation's gallery provides exposure, while these pieces may be purchased or rented.

The Foundation publishes Words from Inside, an edited selection the best entries from the Creative Writing category of the Annual Competition.

The Foundation administers a scholarship which contributes towards the education costs of a convicted offender who wishes to pursue formal education in art.

The Foundation wishes to develop further are in the areas of aftercare; theatre; and Native Canadians.

PUBLIC EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

The Foundation aims to stimulate public interest in and involvement with the Canadian criminal justice and correctional systems, convicted offenders, and processes and programs of rehabilitation.

Some primary program areas are:

- Exhibition and Sales of Inmate and Parolee Art: A Touring Exhibition of best entries in the Competitions and other works is shown in correctional facilities, retail malls, libraries and other public places. The Foundation has also purchased a small Permanent Collection and works held on consignment. In 1990, a gallery/showroom in Brantford was opened.

  in 1991, the Foundation staged one of its largest exhibitions at the Freedom to Read Conference, which focused on literacy work in corrections. The Foundation also participated in an Arts and Crafts Show and Sale at Harbourfront.

- Art Rental Program: Artwork from the Foundation's gallery may be rented at a nominal fee or may be purchased.

The Foundation was involved in the production of When Words Are Bars, a publication of Core Literacy of Kitchener. It is a manual for the design of literacy programs in correctional facilities.

JOHN HOWARD SOCIETY OF CANADA

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE

The John Howard Society is a federation of provincial and local Societies comprised of people whose goal is to understand and respond to problems of crime, to work with people who have come into conflict with the law, to review, evaluate and advocate for changes in the criminal justice process and to engage in public education on matters involving criminal law and its application.

The John Howard Society of Canada published Update, a newsletter for Board and staff.

The Society is planning a corporate support program and will continue its direct mail campaign.

DIRECT SERVICE FUNCTIONS

The John Howard Society promotes the application of the least onerous sanction within a restorative justice model and undertakes to provide services in ways consistent with its values and principles whose goal is to reduce the use of imprisonment. It encourages social cohesion and the safety of individuals through mediation, reparation and, wherever possible, reconciliation.

It provides aftercare services in order to successfully integrate offenders into the community.

REFORM/ADVOCACY FUNCTIONS

It monitors government policy, administration and service delivery with respect to offenders with a view to ensuring inmates are treated with dignity, equity, fairness and compassion. The Society maintains a close relationship with the Correctional Service of Canada and the National Parole Board.

In 1991-1992, the John Howard Society:

- appeared before the Commons Committee regarding Bill C-36, to encourage the Committee to see the folly of increasing parole eligibility criteria
- was involved in the Penal Reform International conference in the Netherlands
- published phase II of the John Howard Society to promote literacy and it published booklets for community agencies to promote literacy (with the Assistance of Secretary of State)
- did development work for a corporate fundraising campaign
- produced John Howard-citizen involvement materials based upon work of Althing conference
- was involved in follow-up studies on YOA amendments proposed at the Special Legislative Committee hearings.

In 1992-1993, the John Howard Society of Canada plans:

- to follow up activities in literacy
- to promote response to federal government legislation, specifically, Bill C-36
- to respond to current issues/needs of sex offenders, aboriginal justice, crime prevention and AIDS
- to appear before Parliamentary Committee on the YOA.

PUBLIC EDUCATION

The John Howard Society is committed to undertaking responsibility to promote activities contributing towards a healthy community life. This includes creating the opportunity for crime prevention through social development and by encouraging people who have been in conflict with the law to develop attitudes of responsibility and accountability.

The John Howard Society promotes community acceptance and responsibility for both individual and social aspects of criminal activity, encouraging citizen involvement in the delivery and management of justice related activities.

PROFESSIONAL-ORGANIZATIONAL FUNCTIONS

An objective of the John Howard Society is the improvement and progressive development of standards related to service.

THE SEVENTH STEP SOCIETY OF CANADA

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE

The Seventh Step Society of Canada is a foundation of provincial and territorial organizations, promoting and developing the Seventh Step philosophy in Canadian institutions and communities. Its mandate includes to support, guide and to ensure adherence to the Seventh Step self help principles.

Some objectives of the Society are:

- to consider and discuss all questions affecting the interests of the Society, to initiate and watch over and, if necessary, to promote deputation in relation to general matters affecting the Society; and

- to promote, acquire and operate a resident headquarters to assist members of the Society in need of such a facility;

Some of the objectives are:

- to assist, develop and foster a spirit of self-reliance by way of cooperation among its members and other ex-convicts, so as to achieve the rehabilitation of ex-convicts; and

- to motivate members of the hard core convict population to change their attitudes, values and behaviour; and

- to promote the theory and practice of the principles of good citizenship and cooperation.

- to provide public education in the area of crime and criminal rehabilitation; and

- to monitor developments in the Criminal Justice System and take a position on those issues the Board of Directors deems pertinent to the membership.

The Society is a member of the International Seventh Step Foundation.

DIRECT SERVICE FUNCTIONS

Activities include:

- programs directed toward developing normal social and constructive approaches to living in the community upon release from prison, including weekly forums for the full and free discussion of all matters of mutual interest among ex-convicts;
- The Alberta Seventh Step Society is providing programs in the three federal penitentiaries and the one provincial institution.
- The Alberta Society is in the final phase of its pilot Young Offender Program, assessing attitudes and behaviours of those involved.
- The Alberta Society's Community Residential Centre is operating at full capacity.
- The Alberta Society operated a Casino and many Bingos, earning $45,000 last year.
- The Ontario Seventh Step Society operated six groups in provincial institutions and three in federal penitentiaries for male and female inmates. There are two adult street groups currently servicing the community.
- There are three groups for young offenders and four for other youths.

PUBLIC EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

The Seventh Step Society organizes mini-conferences in different locations to convince the inmates, ex-inmates and the public of the viability of its model and to keep volunteers and members motivated.

PROFESSIONAL-ORGANIZATIONAL FUNCTIONS

The Seventh Step Society is building a national capacity for program delivery.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS ACTIVE IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE

NAACJ brings together 21 national and voluntary professional associations from the voluntary and private sector, interested in criminal justice who are actively promoting a socially responsible approach among those involved in the criminal justice system.

The goals of NAACJ are:

- to explore a shared vision based on a common passion for justice;
- to share and generate information, ideas, expertise, values, awareness, sensitivity and understanding;
- to serve as a catalyst for action by member agencies; and
- to serve as a forum for recognizing the strength in the diversity of its members and the power of the collectivity of its members, by collectively representing one or more viewpoints.

Issues and concerns of NAACJ:

- Criminal Justice: philosophy and policy, public education, UN Guidelines
- Legal Process: alternative sanctions, changes and sentencing, law reform recodification of the criminal code
- Crime Prevention: policy and programs, 'at risk', children
- Offender Programs: electronic monitoring, AIDS, residential, employment training, addictions, sex offenders, re-integration for lifers, long term offenders, psychological services.

Other areas of concern: funding; follow through on closing of Prison for Women; Racism; Aboriginal Justice Issues; Violence in the Family - Treatment of Abusers; Young Offenders; and Individuals with intellectual disabilities.

REFORM/ADVOCACY FUNCTIONS

The Social Responsibility Committee held several meetings and a one full day retreat. Work has continued on the Alternative Court Proposal and Justice Canada has shown in interest in funding a small project for the legal background work. An objective of the Committee is to make the Proposal more readable and thus more accessible to a wider audience.

In February, 1991, the NAACJ Chair presented a brief, Preventing Violence Against Women: A Socially Responsible Approach, to two Parliamentary Committees.

In January, 1992, a consultation was held between the members of the Ontario Justice Review Project and the National Associations Active in Criminal Justice.

The U.N. Sub-Committee has begun to work on a draft U.N. resolution on the fundamental purpose of criminal justice. The resolution will articulate the principles from NAACJ's Social Responsibility Approach and the notions about punishment which we have more recently endorsed.

PROFESSIONAL-ORGANIZATIONAL FUNCTIONS

NAACJ is exploring whether it should or not it should seek incorporation.

The U.N. Sub-Committee is exploring acquiring consultative status with the U.N..

The U.N. Sub-Committee has undertaken to produce for members a briefing document, designed to provide a quick reference to the U.N. administration of criminal justice policy.

The Research Committee held individual meetings with all Federal Government Criminal Justice research units to discuss the units' current priorities, contacts and funding issues. The Sub-Committee then collated written materials from these units into a Preliminary Summary of Federal Government Initiatives and Publications.

The Research Committee is exploring several options in the upcoming year, such as a conference or workshop on research.

ASSOCIATION DES SERVICES DE REHABILITATION SOCIALE DU QUEBEC

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE

ASRS's mission is to promote and support participation of the community and community agencies in the criminal justice system, crime prevention and the elimination of delinquency.

ASRS is comprised of 60 member agencies involved in various services for people in conflict with the law, crime prevention, paralegal assistance, alternative measures, shelters, self-help groups, family services, re-employment, health services and substance abuse.

PUBLIC EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

ASRS assists and advises members of the public wishing to get involved in the criminal justice system

It promotes volunteer work in the field of criminal justice.

PROFESSIONAL-ORGANIZATIONAL FUNCTIONS

- ASRS serves as a forum for its members and appears at hearings and before public or government commissions
- it groups general or specialized social services concerned with the social rehabilitation of persons in conflict with the law
- it supports these services in their activities, particularly those relating to persons in conflict with the law
- ASRS cooperates with public and private services in the various correctional, judicial, social and community sectors

- it assists and advises the member agencies of the Association in carrying out their mandate

- ASRS promotes the establishment of services for persons in conflict with the law, and assists them in the organization process

- ASRS produced the directory, Répertoire des ressources communautaires en justice pénale et des bureaux du SCC.

- ASRS publishes a newsletter, L'Informel.

APPENDIX E

SUSTAINING FUNDING PROGRAM FOR NATIONAL VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS

CRITIQUE OF ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

APPENDIX E

SUSTAINING FUNDING PROGRAM FOR NATIONAL VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS

CRITIQUE OF ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

INTRODUCTION

The eligibility criteria for the Sustaining Funding Program of the Ministry of the Solicitor General are found in the Ministry's Booklet, made available to NVOs in 1986.

In the Foreword, it is noted that: "the current funding program started in the fiscal year 1983-84 after Cabinet approved a budget of $ 2.5 million a year for a period of five years, to assist national voluntary organizations whose objectives and activities are related to those of the Ministry of the Solicitor General".

The criteria of the Sustaining Funding Program, the means of applying for support, and essentially, a "Framework" for managing the Sustaining Funding Program, are outlined in the booklet. As noted in this evaluation (1992), the Program, for all intents and purposes, has not been active as set forth in the booklet.

With a view to re-establishing the Program on appropriate fiscal and policy footings, in accordance with the findings and recommendations of the evaluation, a brief critique of the eligibility criteria which date to the first half of the 1980s is presented here.

CRITIQUE

Eligibility Criteria for Grants

(1) The organization is a national voluntary organization registered as a charitable non profit organization and incorporated under the Canadian Corporations Act.

Notation to this criterion specify that a "voluntary organization that is in the process of becoming a national organization or, even though not national, is concerned with issues or groups not otherwise represented by a national organization, may be considered for a grant. In those cases the requirement for incorporation will be waived".

We submit that the intent behind this provision (or exception) is worthy, but the provision is too generous, potentially leading to poor program management, poor control. The provision may reflect the state of development (or underdevelopment) of many voluntary groups at the time of establishing the SFP; concerned that no Ministry-significant voluntary group/initiative be lost, the doors for obtaining grant support were held wide open.

In today's fiscal reality, when grant funding is under scrutiny, and when project-specific funding and alternate means of support are available, and when voluntary groups should be challenged and supported to act with greater synergies through peer support vehicles, this exception is questionable.

(2) The organization's objectives and activities are related to those of the Ministry.

The immediate observation here is that this criterion is simply too broad, and requires some qualification.

Notwithstanding the fact the Ministry's agencies have recently gone through mission statement exercises, thereby generating concrete guidance in the evaluation of an application for the SFP, it remains a practical truth that an

incredibly broad spectrum of objectives and activities could be construed to relate to those of the Ministry.

Whereas broad-minded and progressive criminal justice thinking will easily lead to issues, and interests as diverse as social and economic planning and development, alternative dispute resolution, crime prevention (including target hardening and environmental design), and a range of matters that have to do with the dignity, rehabilitation and restoration of offenders and victims, the Ministry must establish realistic criteria consistent with its present realities; or embrace the goal of experimentation and accept and defend exceptions to its mainstream agenda.

Alternative vehicles, joint initiatives with Justice Canada, Secretary of State, Health and Welfare, and other federal agencies become increasingly urgent when responsibilities are drawn in clear and tight circles, yet reality insists that interdependence is necessary to function effectively in today's world.

The implications for the enhanced and creative activities of NVO and SFP staff are underlined here, as are the potentials of a more integrated NVO sector.

(3) The organization has a Board of Directors.

It may be helpful to reinforce the objective that the board be composed of volunteer, private citizens.

(4) The organization has internal accountability functions.

Especially in circumstances when grant funding is "carte blanche", this requirement should be given more detail. For example, the John Howard Society of Canada (JHSC) and the Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies (CAEFS) currently receive grant funding in relatively large amounts and direct the majority of those funds to provincial or local autonomous affiliates. These funds support a national infrastructure which in turn supports a considerable level of service activity throughout Canada. Some of that service activity is fee-for-serve contracts obtained from agencies of the Ministry of the Solicitor General, some is contract work

carried out for provincial and territorial governments, and some is service to the community made possible by donations from the community.

Once a "carte blanche" grant is issued to JHSC or CAEFS and especially if it is for a term of three to five years, the Ministry has no means to ensure that the distribution of those funds within the NVO are continuing to be responsive to need and any shifts in program activities or priorities throughout the country, as they relate and pertain to the Ministry.

(5) The organization is well established and has a high level of credibility.

Some specification of what is meant by "well established" would assist a committee in assessing an application.

The relationship between "grants" and "sustaining contributions" as tools to support voluntary organizations in different states of organizational development is indicated here.

(6) The organization is normally able to secure at least 25% of its core funding from other sources than the federal government.

This has been a particularly difficult criterion to assess in this evaluation. While the present text does not commit the government to contribute the remaining 75% of core funding to match the 25% raised by those NVOs who are able to do so, there is confusion in the voluntary sector and in the Ministry around this issue.

Notation to the criterion in the Ministry's booklet is: "While most NVOs have very limited opportunities to obtain funding from other sources, it is considered that they gain in independence and in strength as they increase their non-government funding base. A case may be made by an organization for an exception to this criterion because of the particular circumstances of that organization."

This notation demonstrates the sensitivity that the authors had to the difficulty for some NVOs to obtain any amount of funding support from other sources, while establishing what was considered to be a healthy objective, and presumably a realistic one.

The results of the present evaluation show that certain NVOs are simply unable to generate funding from sources outside government; others might be viewed as extremely successful in this respect. If the total volume of activity in terms of absolute dollars of service provided by some NVOs was compared to the core operating costs it takes to support such an operation, and then the contribution to those core costs by the Ministry of the Solicitor General through the SFP was noted, it could be concluded than some NVOs are very able to attract funding from other sources. For it will be seen that the Ministry is, on average, providing less that 50% support to core costs, and much is being accomplished by some NVOs.

Responses to this fact range from optimistic views that NVOs are demonstrating they really can do more with less, and that more support to core expenses would lead to an even greater multiplier effect; to reports from individual NVOs that the absence of a significant contribution by the Ministry of the Solicitor General to core operating expenses is contributing to the decimation of the NVO, at least insofar as it aspires to operate on a national basis and in accordance with its expressed mandate. A few NVOs have declared that without sustaining funding support from the Ministry they would be forced to close their doors.

This evaluation has demonstrated that there is a lack of standardized, comprehensive data upon which to draw precise conclusions on this issue, or to make specific recommendations. The notion of 25%/75% appears arbitrary at best. What is obvious is the need to address this criterion more systematically.

(7) The organization has a visible constituency.

This criterion is particularly troublesome as it is presently stated. While it reflects a valid concern for granting bodies, considering public accountability and value-for-dollar, nothing is stated about the nature of the constituency in a way that reflects the specific objectives of the Ministry. Thus, we discovered that the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police and the Canadian Criminal Justice Association clearly have strong constituencies, and visible ones; yet both are primarily comprised of professionals. On the one hand, police chiefs; on the other, professionals in criminal justice.

The issue of the degree to which an NVO should be based in the community, have lay as well as professional members, and/or is comprised of corporate affiliates should be examined in the context of the Ministry's mandate, mission and objectives in maintaining a SFP.

(8) The organization is actively engaged in pursuing its stated objectives through strategies and activities acceptable in a free and democratic society.

The notation to this criterion spells out more clearly the intent of the criterion. It is recommended that the intent be more clearly stated in the criterion itself.

The notation reads: "This criterion expresses a recognition that voluntary organizations should not be penalized in their access to funding, from promoting or proposing alternative means or mechanisms to reach shared goals."

What might be added here, in addition to placing the advocacy/reform function of NVOs foursquare, is clarification with respect to consultation. The prerogative of the Minister to consult and take particular advice, but not be bound by any advice as he/she has ultimate responsibility for the Ministry, must be made clear. The role and parameters of consultation must be understood by NVOs who enter into consultation with the Ministry.

Consultations that strive to develop a consensus view are more persuasive in the end, and their product is likely to be more enduring.

(9) **The organization agrees to provide information requested by the Ministry according to government policy on grants.**

This is a difficult issue. While grants are "carte blanche", and while the policy of grant funding is to be protected, clearly both the Ministry of the Solicitor General and NVOs want accountability improved; both are also prepared to operationalize the exchange of information on a more regular and enriched level than now exists.

It may be possible to specify information requirements more explicitly, even if they are cast in the context of the need to regularly re-apply for a grant and to be assessed; the need for some internal accountability and reporting as in Criterion 4; and the need to develop a reliable data base upon which Treasury Board and Ministry Audit and Evaluation may evaluate the Sustaining Funding Program.

Sustaining Contributions:

To a very great extent, the criteria for sustaining contributions are identical to those for grants; the thrust of the sustaining contribution criteria is to make provision for organizations in the process of becoming NVOs, for coalitions, and for other national organizations which do not meet the eligibility criteria for grant funding.

Our concern is the need for a disciplined use of sustaining funding as a tool to support worthy applicants who come before the Ministry; and that the use of the tool be judicious. Sustaining Funding should not, for example, go one inevitably for a recipient - the "maturation" and status of the recipient should be monitored to see what funding support, if any, continues to apply. On the other hand, an applicant who has received grant support but at the end of a funding cycle is assessed as no longer deserving of a grant, yet worthy of support for a particular reason, might revert to sustaining funding status, or be directed to alternative means of support.

A Word on Implementation:

If the Ministry decides to continue, with improvements, the NVO and Sustaining Funding Programs as recommended in this evaluation, it becomes apparent that efforts dedicated to implementing the recommendations, including a review of eligibility requirements, consultation with NVOs, and facilitation of novel means of reducing duplication, increasing efficiencies and effectiveness, will be necessary.

As mentioned elsewhere in the body of the Evaluation Report, Secretariat staff will require support, as will some NVOs.

APPENDIX F

A DESCRIPTIVE AND ANALYTICAL MATRIX OF NVOS

DESCRIPTIVE AND ANALYTICAL MATRIX OF NVOs

NVO	NO. VOLUNTEERS	NO. EMPLOYEES	CORPORATE AFFILIATES/ MEMBERSHIP	PRIMARY FUNCTIONS [#1]				PRIMARY FUNCTIONAL RELATIONSHIP WITH MSG	COMMUNITY PRESENCE/ [#2] IMPACT AT CITIZEN LEVEL (Low 1 2 3 4 5 High)	TOTAL OPERATING BUDGET (TOB)*	TOTAL CORE OPERATING EXPENSES (TCOE)*	% TCOE of TOB	SUSTAINING FUNDING PROGRAM SUPPORT	SFP as % of TCOE
				Direct Service	Public Education	Advocacy/ Reform	Professional-Organizational							
Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police	0	5.0	471 Members			✓	✓	policing	1	$926,000	$315,000	34%	$49,000	16%
Canadian Criminal Justice Association	260	4.0	1,200 Members 70 C.A.			✓	✓	corrections parole	2 [#3]	$492,000 [#4]	$366,000	73%	$235 000	64%
John Howard Society of Canada	40	2 0	60 C.A.	✓	✓	✓	✓	corrections parole	4	$30,000,000	$862,000	3%	$666,000	77%
Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies	25	3.0	19 Autonomous Societies	✓	✓	✓	✓	corrections parole	4	$12,000,000	$633,000	5%	$590,000	93%
Association des services de rehabilitation sociale	30	4.0	60 C A.	✓	✓	✓	✓	corrections parole policing	4	$20,000,000	$185,000	1%	$142 000	77%
Salvation Army Correctional and Justice Services Department	21	24 0	54 C A.	✓	✓	✓	✓	corrections parole	4	$19,500,000	$675,000	4%	$88,000	13%
Prison Arts Foundation	40	2 5	2 C A	✓	✓			corrections parole	1 [#5]	$225,000	$98,000	45%	$65,000	66%
Church Council on Justice and Corrections	150	4.5	10 C A. 12,000 Churches	✓	✓	✓		corrections parole	3	$283,000	$213,000	75%	$54,000	25%
Canadian Training Institute	12	5.0	7 C.A.	✓ ♦		✓	✓	corrections	1	$382,000	$193,000	51%	$143 000	74%
Seventh Step Society of Canada	25	2.0	27 C.A. 141 Members	✓				corrections parole	1	$1,300,000	$105,000	1%	$59,000	56%
Block Parent Program of Canada	7	0	12 Prov. Committees	✓				policing (prevention)	5	$120,000	$120,000	100%	$30,000	25%
Network: Interaction for Conflict Resolution	12	5.0	350 Members		✓	✓	✓	on decline; more with Justice	3	$258,000	$49,000	19%	$45,000	92%
St Leonard's Society of Canada	30	4.0	19 C.A.	✓	✓	✓	✓	corrections parole	4	$12,600,000	$285,000	2%	$118 000	41%
National Associations Active in Criminal Justice	8	1 5	21 NVOs			✓	✓	corrections parole	2	$79,000	$79,000	100%	$67,000	85%

* These are unaudited figures, untested for validity and reliability, taken together they give a general picture of value added and levels of support.

♦ Where "client" is line and management level service providers

[#] See note on attached page

NOTES FOR
THE DESCRIPTIVE AND ANALYTICAL MATRIX OF NVOs

NOTE #1

Primary Function: Many NVOs provide a number of functions to their members, their corporate affiliates, to offenders and clients of the criminal justice system, the public at large, and to the Ministry and agencies of the Solicitor General of Canada.

Four functions are:

1. **Direct Service:** to a "client", excluding members of the association
2. **Public Education:** to the public at large
3. **Advocacy/Reform:** in addressing policy issues and certain operating procedural issues to government
4. **Professional-Organizationational:** in service to members, in standards development, in organizational development and maintenance

The functions checked here are judged to be primary functions of the NVO for the purposes of this evaluation.

NOTE #2

Community Presence/
Impact at Citizen Level: This is a measure of the degree to which the NVO is community-based as demonstrated through a voluntary level of activity, having a presence in the community/impact on the general public (1 is low - 5 is high)

NOTE #3

One recent initiative, The National Forum on Offender Rehabilitation, attracted 5,000 participants across the country in local and regional services.

NOTE #4

This excludes The Quebec Society of Criminology, which for financial reasons, is not formally affiliated with CCJA. With Quebec included: Total Operating Budget = $692,000 and Total Core Operating Expenses would be 37% of the Total Operating Budget.

NOTE #5

Prison Arts' impact in the community is increasing with more public displays, a relationship with an art gallery.



PLEASE, INFORM "MANAGEMENT REVIEW" IF THIS DOCUMENT IS BORROWED ON INTERLIBRARY LOAN

S.V.P. VEUILLEZ INFORMER "EXAMEN DE LA GESTION" SI CE DOCUMENT A ETE EMPRUNTE AU PRET-ENTRE- BIBLIOTHEQUES

)UE

99 DEC 06.

09. SEP 08.

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.