

Focus Five Consultants

University of Ottawa

Faculty of Social Sciences
Ottawa, Ontario
K1N 6N5

Members of Committee
National Federation of Aboriginal Peoples (NFAP)

Dear Committee Members,

Focus Five Consultants is pleased to have this opportunity to respond to your request for evaluating the efficiency and effectiveness of the Court Challenges Program (CCP), particularly in meeting the cultural needs of the Aboriginal communities.

The evaluation process is a critical, yet often overlooked component of any program or project, and the CCP is uniquely poised to benefit from the results of a thorough assessment in its ability to meet your needs. In this era of increased accountability in service-delivery, we cannot over-emphasize the merits of evaluation data in driving your program's decision-making process into the future.

Our team has completed an evaluation strategy, focusing on the five key components outlined in your request. We have attached a brief summary of our findings and suggestions, which we hope conveys the need to develop an ongoing evaluation plan. If your program chooses to carry out this plan, Focus Five Consultants would be keen to assist you in implementing your evaluation strategy.

Thank you for this opportunity, and should you have any questions or comments regarding this initial summary please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Focus Five Consultants



Table of contents

Executive summary.....	p2
Section 1 : Purpose of the evaluation.....	p3
Section 2 : Background information.....	p.3
Section 3 : Evaluation design.....	p.5
Section 4 : Our proposed evaluation plan.....	p.5
Section 5 : Discussion and conclusions.....	p.15
About Focus Five Consultants.....	p.15
Appendix A : Interview Guide.....	p.17
Appendix B : Focus Group Guidelines.....	p.18

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This initial proposed evaluation was developed in response to your request regarding the Court Challenges Program efficiency and effectiveness evaluation. A review of the relevant program history is provided, as well as commentary about the evaluation undertaken by Prairie Research Associates. In light of this information, our team has developed its own evaluation plan incorporating additional research questions and methods.

Our primary concern in approaching this task was to maintain a respectful attitude to the needs of the aboriginal community as a whole, and the unique position of the NFAP. It appears that the CCP as it stands does not ideally meet the particular needs of the NFAP, and that a needs assessment could be carried out to successfully determine a more appropriate approach.

Overall, our plan addresses the following questions:

1. What evaluation questions may be relevant to the community?
2. What steps can be taken to gather information to answer these questions, taking into account the remoteness of some aboriginal communities and the need to be inclusive?
3. What other issues should the evaluation address, given the political and social context of aboriginal communities?
4. What are the long-range effects and outcomes of the Court Challenges Program, and how can they be assessed?

In addressing these questions we describe an inclusive, participatory approach to program evaluation, which focuses on Key Informant interviews, Focus Group, Surveys, and Document Analysis. We also deliver initial conclusions and recommendations, which would be refined through ongoing collaboration with NFAP, CCP and CCPC. We acknowledge the Program Logic Model which has been developed for the CCP but recommend that along with the outlined evaluation plan, NFAP work with us to develop their own Logic Model to better reflect their unique intended goals and objectives.



Evaluation Proposal for the Court Challenges Program

Section 1 : Purpose of the Evaluation

Our team Focus Five Consultants has developed a proposal in response to your request for evaluating the efficiency and effectiveness of the Court Challenges Program (CPP) as it relates and responds to the Aboriginal communities.

The proposed evaluation is concerned primarily with the “goodness of fit” between with the Court Challenges Program (CPP) in addressing the needs of Aboriginal community groups.

The evaluation will address the following issues;

- Coining evaluation issues/questions of relevance to the Aboriginal communities.
- Delineation of the steps needed to gather information to answer the identified issues/questions, given the remoteness of some communities and the need for inclusiveness.
- Identification of additional factors that the evaluation ought to address, given the political and social context of the Aboriginal communities.
- Identification of the long-range effects/outcomes of the Court Challenges Program as they pertain to the specific needs of the Aboriginal communities.
- Assessment of the identified effects.
- Identification of unsuccessful groups for gaining funding in the past and reasons for so.

The information resulting from this evaluation will result in a recommendation as to the suitability of the Court Challenges Program in addressing the specific needs of the Aboriginal community groups.

Section 2 : Background Information

The Court Challenges Program of Canada is a national non-profit organization which was set up in 1994 to provide financial assistance for important court cases that advance language and equality rights guaranteed under Canada's Constitution.

The Program has a 20 year history, during which its mandate and administrative structure have changed. When it was first launched in 1978 under the Secretary of state, the program was designed to fund cases relating to federal and provincial language rights protected under the Constitution. The program was later expanded in 1982, with the adoption of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, to include language rights outlined in the *Charter*. In 1990, the Program moved to the Human Rights Research and Education Centre at the University of Ottawa. It was then cancelled in 1992 by the federal government as part of a deficit reduction effort. However, in 1994 the Program was reinstated, when a first contribution Agreement was signed between Canadian Heritage and a newly created corporation, the CCPC. In 1998, a second contribution agreement was signed between the minister of Canadian Heritage and the CCPC.

A distinction has been stressed between the CCP and the CCPC, where the former has represented the Program itself, (that which is under present evaluation) and the latter structure capturing actual management. This distinction leads to the possibility of the Program being potentially administered by another organization, an event that has occurred at various points during the Program's history.

The mandate of the Court Challenges Program, in the area of equality rights, is currently restricted to the funding of test cases which challenge federal law, policy or action. Presently, the courts and many equality seekers hold a broader view of equality, one that is often called "substantive equality".

A substantive equality approach recognizes that patterns of disadvantage and oppression exist in society and requires that law makers and government officials take this into account in their actions. It examines the impact of law within its surrounding social context to make sure that laws and policies promote full participation in society by everyone, regardless of personal characteristics or group membership.

Substantive equality requires challenging common stereotypes about group characteristics that may underlie law or government action as well as ensuring that important differences in life experience, as viewed by the equality seeker, are taken into account. The Supreme Court of Canada recently affirmed its commitment to a substantive approach to equality in its unanimous decision in *Law v. Canada*.

Being of central importance to the present evaluation of CPP, explication of the specific needs of Aboriginal communities is in order. In recognition of the disproportionate socio-economic conditions in Aboriginal communities and the divisiveness that has emerged between aboriginal and non-aboriginal people, the provincial government has made a commitment to economic development and the reduction of social tensions through the equal treatment of all residents. This, however, has necessitated that Aboriginal matters be addressed differently than they were in the past.

This is a central issue to the suitability of CPP in addressing the needs of the Aboriginal communities. Specifically, there is a need for public involvement in land claims and perhaps most importantly, the need to support increased Aboriginal self-reliance by promoting Aboriginal economic development.

These two issues are considered inseparable as successful resolution of claims creates a public environment for economic development. Furthermore, Ontario's view has been that the federal government must take the lead on aboriginal self-government matters as the senior government with responsibility for Aboriginal peoples.

In summary, these needs may be conceived in terms of requiring a program that is based on a "growth model". This in some respects stands in stark contrast with the deficit model advocated by CPP.

The relevance of CPP's mandate and resultant activities will be juxtaposed against the actual needs of the Aboriginal communities. Furthermore, the success of CPP in addressing those needs will be evaluated.

Section 3 : Original Evaluation Design

Data from the original evaluation design's summary; specifically as related to the number of activities funded during the first three years (provided in table 5) was analysed using a Chi-Square analysis.

Significant differences were found between the number of cases falling under Equality Rights and Linguistic Rights for all of the years reported and all of the activity categories except for Case Development 2000-2001, Litigation 1998-1999, and Impact Studies 2000-2001.

Essentially this confirms that over the previous three-year period, far more of the CCP activities were concerning Equality Rights than Linguistic Rights. Also, it was confirmed that a significant discrepancy between the four activity areas; Program Promotion and Access, Case Development, Litigation, and Impact Studies – highlighted the emphasis on litigation-based projects at the CCP.

This data can be taken as measure of actual program activities of the CCP, compared to the intended activities. While the original design does not focus on how the activities of the CCP relate to the specific needs of the aboriginal community and NFAP, our proposed evaluation plan will further explore how the CCP-specified focuses of Equality Rights and Litigation (under which the current Kouchibouguac test case falls) may or may not be a best fit for the program needs of NFAP.

Section 4 : Our Proposed Evaluation Plan

Evaluation Design and Style

The CCP program is ongoing and evaluation findings are intended to adjust the program design to address efficiencies and impacts. This suggests a formative approach to this evaluation. A goal-based model focusing on efficiency, effectiveness and impact of CCP

is the basis for addressing the issues of *relevance, success, program design and delivery* and *cost-effectiveness*.

Sources of Information

Information for this evaluation will come from a variety of sources. Many of the suggested data sources in the original framework can be associated with methods of data collection listed in the methodology. Additional sources of data and means of collection are also included. Document review and analysis, key informant interview, focus groups, appreciative inquiry, and surveys will provide information necessary for this evaluation.

In a desire to successfully gather relevant information from various sources (groups from a rural, urban or remote site, from various tribes and cultural backgrounds), the evaluators should be ready to travel long distances and funding should be reserved for that particular need. Information should first be gathered about how well different communities are equipped in communication means (internet for example) and what are their different traditions about evaluation and communication.

Evaluators should be particularly sensitive to communities' concern about the importance of "getting together" for consultation and their level of comfort with communication tools such as videoconference. This tool would reduce the need for transportation if the level of comfort in communities is appropriate. Evaluators should also be aware of which communities already maintain a communication link, which could facilitate information gathering. Evaluators should further ensure that the various communities are well represented in the different group meetings. Different groups within communities should also be represented, such as adolescents, women, etc.

Methodology

Data collection tools :

Document review of relevant background literature include

Data collection tools fall into the following categories:

1. Document review (relevant background files and annual reports)
2. Interviews with selected key informants (determined in consultation with stakeholders)
3. Focus groups (participants involved in either NFAP or CCP, as well as general aboriginal community groups)

Analytical Techniques

The evaluation will analyse data collected through quantitative and qualitative analyses, and cost-benefit analyses.

Quantitative Analysis

Data gathered from NFAP, CCP and other original documents will be analyzed with the appropriate statistical software and techniques where the data will permit. Trends over the history of the CCP program will be determined, as well as the historical and ongoing needs of the NFAP through quantitative approaches to the data.

Qualitative Analysis

Key Informant interviews, focus groups, appreciative inquiry and survey will provide rich qualitative data that will be analyzed inductively to gain further insight, identify critical issues and allow for an analysis of issues that are difficult to convey with more traditional quantitative approaches. Subtleties will be drawn out from Key Informant interviews, and community perspectives gauged through focus groups and selected questionnaires.

Cost-effectiveness Analysis

Cost-benefit analyses will be conducted to determine the cost of delivery of CCP programs to NFAP cases, and the comparative costs associated with any newly proposed program which might better suit the needs of the NFAP.

Evaluation Framework

The NFAP has requested an evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of the Court Challenges Program as it specifically pertains to the Kouchibouguac rezoning laws case. However, they have also expressed interest in the program's relevance and responsiveness to Aboriginal communities and individuals across Canada, and one of their aims is to unite as many Aboriginal people as possible in the context of both the specific case, and the overall relationship between the CCP and Canadian aboriginals.

In response to the wide scope of the evaluation questions they have presented, we have compiled a list of diverse issues relevant to contemporary Canadian aboriginals, and which have in the past, or could in the future, be addressed by CCP. Once again, given the types of questions NFAP is asking, and given the diverse needs of the people they represent, it is important that this evaluation be conducted at least in part on a "macro" level given the far-reaching, complex, and often contradictory needs of a diverse and socio-culturally distinct population. Following is a summary of aboriginal socio-cultural, political, and legal issues which could be the focus of future court challenges. This

evaluation will need to address some or all of these questions and issues, with respect to the relevance, success, and shortcomings of CCP specific to aboriginal interests. The following outlines Focus Five's proposed evaluation framework

1. Relevance of evaluation questions/issues to the Aboriginal community and data gathering steps

Evaluation Questions :	Indicators :	Data Sources :
1. Relevance		
Does CCP definition of minority and disadvantaged groups successfully apply to the different communities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed definition from CCP List of communities characteristics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key informant interview Surveys Focus groups
In what legislative areas are communities' cases typically found? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are they found outside language and equality areas? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of general claims from communities Comparative analysis with cases covered by CCP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document review and analysis
Which communities actually use CCP services?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data from CCP cases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document review and analysis
What research activities have been undertaken so far and in what law area? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do these area target typical NFAP cases? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of past publication from CCP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document review and analysis
2. Success		
How often did NFAP used CCP services in the past?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statistical profile of CCP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document review and analysis
What was the typical time elapsed between request and reception of services?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statistical profile of CCP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document review and analysis
Were the cases successful or unsuccessful? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does NFAP define success? How does CCP define success? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statistical profile of cases according to : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NFAP definition CCP definition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key informant interview Document review and analysis Focus groups
What were the reasons why cases were successful? Unsuccessful?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of CCP cases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key informant interview Document review and analysis Focus groups

Are there commonalities between these two categories of cases?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of CCP cases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key informant interview • Document review and analysis • Focus groups
What was NFAP and community members' general level of satisfaction about services?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opinion of community members about received services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key informant interview • Surveys
What is the level of awareness of CCP program in the community? (are foreign communities aware of its existence ?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of communities that know about CCP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys
3. Program design and delivery		
What types of cases were submitted to CCP services?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of CCP cases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review and analysis
Are CCP staff and CCPC board members appropriate to take charge of NFAP cases specifically? (ethnic identity, professional training, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff and board members training areas • Socio-demographic data about staff and board members • Socio-demographic data about communities members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review and analysis • Focus groups
Are communities well informed by CCP staff of the case progress? Are specified rights and freedoms well clarified?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clients' satisfaction • Clients' knowledge about rights and freedoms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys • Focus groups
Does CCP successfully link communities with law resources?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of resources used by communities clients 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys • Document review and analysis
4. Cost-effectiveness and alternatives		
Is the funding appropriate to meet NFAP cases specific needs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data from CCP budget • Cost per cases that are similar to NFAP typical cases • Repartition of costs according to case type 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review and analysis

II. Other issues to be addressed by the evaluation framework:

The following is a list of additional questions regarding Aboriginal socio-cultural, political, and legal issues that could be part of an evaluation. This evaluation section has been organized according to the relevance and success of the prospective program.

1. RELEVANCE OF CCP TO ABORIGINAL PEOPLE

1.1 Has the CCP program been successful and egalitarian in its ability to meet the needs of a variety of aboriginal communities and individuals, or has the bulk of its usefulness and impact been with a specific type of group?

On a related note, has the CCP responded effectively to the rapidly changing needs of modern aboriginal culture and communities? For example, has it been solicited by and has it responded effectively to the often very diverse and conflicting needs of;

- Urban aboriginal populations vs. Rural aboriginal populations
- People living on reserve vs. people living off reserve in remote culturally heterogeneous communities
- Northern, remote, and economically disadvantaged aboriginal communities vs. Economically established, self-sufficient and politically powerful southern communities such as Ontario Six Nations
- Aboriginal individuals and groups without ties to a band or the aboriginal community in general. (For example, could this program be accessed and used successfully by the most socio-economically marginalized, devalued and isolated aboriginal people, such as urban aboriginal homeless populations?)
- Aboriginal women/families
- Aboriginal youth and children

1.2 Has the CCP been used to defend rights of non-status aboriginals, urban aboriginal individuals or groups?

- Is this program accessible to and relevant to people of mixed aboriginal/non-aboriginal heritage who self-identify as aboriginal, or non-aboriginal people who live in aboriginal communities and who identify culturally and socially as aboriginal (such as non-aboriginal partners/spouses of aboriginal people, and non-aboriginal single parents with aboriginal children).
- Has CCP been used to defend the rights of aboriginal children adopted into non-aboriginal families, both adult and juvenile adoptees, or the rights of aboriginal communities to maintain separate social services agencies.

1.3 Relevance to Issues of International Scope

- Has the CCP been responsive to the changing geopolitical reality,
- Is it used in solidarity with indigenous populations that exist outside of Canadian juridical realm. What is the history and future potential for international court challenges? For example there are a number of current Canadian indigenous legal

concerns which transcend established juridical boundaries. Is CCP responsive to these types of cases?

- Is it effective in the international courts system. Some possible examples worth examining either in this evaluation or in a future needs assessment are:
 - Cases involving the reclamation of aboriginal artefacts
 - Court challenges regarding Canada – U.S. border crossings

2. SUCCESS OF CCP WITH RESPECT TO DIVERSE ABORIGINAL ISSUES

2.1 The Ability and Willingness to take on adversarial, politically sensitive cases

- Is CCP able to address issues with politically sensitive/volatile content where tension and potential for conflict run high. Are they able to diffuse situations, in past have cases been chosen on basis of need, political ends, media visibility. If so, long-term outcomes (visibility, both national and international, dialogue, communication and co-operation between aboriginal and non-aboriginal communities, increased Canadian sympathy and sensitivity to aboriginal needs, rights and values)
For example, has CCP been used creatively and flexibly, i.e. a diversity of issues, or has it focused primarily on high-profile, socio-politically meaningful cases such as land claims?
- Has CCP responded to funding requests for court challenges relating to Aboriginal political autonomy and self-government? If so, what were the outcomes?

2.2 The Success of CCP in dealing with Aboriginal Language Issues – aboriginal language rights, preservation of aboriginal language through establishment of aboriginal language programs in schools. Rights of urban (status and non-status) aboriginals to obtain funding so that their children can obtain instruction in their traditional language.

2.3 Has CCP been respectful in its dealings with aboriginal peoples? Specifically, in terms of

- Satisfaction of aboriginal communities with CCP encounters.
 - Was relationship with CCP adversarial, paternalistic, inflexible, or did CCP employees respond to unique, distinct cultural needs of aboriginal communities.
- Flexibility.
 - Is CCP aware of and sensitive to indigenous rights.
 - When necessary and appropriate, able to work using participatory evaluation strategies
 - able to identify and bracket historical euro-centric evaluation traditions beliefs so as to work in harmony with more collectivistic and community-focused aboriginal value systems.
- Respectful and culturally appropriate?

- Comment on understandable perception within many aboriginal communities about evaluations
- Awareness of balance between aboriginal and non-aboriginal interests, and effort made to resolve emotionally charged disputes in a way that both parties met, and adversarial tension is addressed and minimized.

2.4 Success of Courts Claims related to Natural Resource access and management rights (may be tied in with land claims issues)

- hunting rights
- fishing rights
- mining and logging rights

2.5 Educational Rights

- establishment and protection of aboriginal educational programs
- funding for aboriginal (status and non-status) post-secondary students
- establishment and protection of primary & secondary aboriginal language and cultural programs.

2.6 Defense and Maintenance and Nurturance of Aboriginal Culture

- Protection and Establishment of Aboriginal Arts and Literary funding

2.7 Promotion of Aboriginal economic development

III. Long-range effects/outcomes of CPP and their assessment:

Long-range outcomes	Method of measurement
Increased media attention and visibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #, type, and frequency of media (television and paper) coverage • critical analysis of aboriginal court cases involving CCP • Comparative analysis of aboriginal vs. Non-aboriginal court cases involving CCP
Increased awareness of Canadians to Aboriginal rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys with random samples of Canadians • Focus groups with diverse Canadian communities

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus groups with aboriginal lawyers. More Specifically, assessing their experience with CCP and aboriginal rights
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Success in achieving Aboriginal cultural rights through CCP • Maintenance of aboriginal cultural rights 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus groups with Aboriginal action and cultural groups who have been successful and unsuccessful • Quantitative analysis of the information from the aforementioned focus groups • Change in funding to Aboriginal culture programs over time as a result of CCP
<p>Increased communication with National and international Aboriginal communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-fertilisation of groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys with Aboriginal communities across Canada • Focus groups with Aboriginal groups across Canada. Specifically examine the type of information shared between groups (i.e., is this information related to CCP?)
<p>Establishing legal and political power</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus groups with lawyers managing Aboriginal affairs. Assess their impression of Aboriginal legal advances • Focus groups with Aboriginal leaders and cultural bands
<p>Establishing precedent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number and type of Aboriginal legal cases using CPP • Types of rulings achieved in Aboriginal cases (cases realized in

	court with the aid of CPP)
--	-------------------------------

Reporting:

Focus Five Consultants will first provide NFAP a thorough initial report based on the Needs Assessment phase. This will be followed by shorter status reports, delivered at regular intervals throughout the evaluation cycle. Once all data collection methods have been carried out, a final evaluation document will be produced which will highlight the key results of our collaboration with NFAP in carrying out the evaluation. Taking into account the input gathered from Key Informants and Stakeholders, we will present a series of recommendations about how NFAP and Focus Five Consultants can move forward.

Evaluation timeline

	Timeline for NFAP – CCP Evaluation (March 2003 – August 2003)					
<i>Evaluation Activity</i>	March 2003	April 2003	May 2003	June 2003	July 2003	August 2003
1. Evaluation framework finalized	◆					
2. Determine schedule, monitoring process	◆					
3. Collection of relevant NFAP, CCP documents and data		◆				
4. Analysis of written documents			◆	◆		
5. Training for interviews and focus groups			◆			
6. Midterm monitoring evaluation				◆		
7. Run evaluation activities		◆	◆	◆	◆	
8. Analysis of interview and focus group information (qualitative				◆	◆	

and quantitative)						
9. Final evaluation						◆

Section 5 : Discussion and Conclusions

- Conduct a Needs Assessment involving Aboriginal groups from across Canada.**
 Given the aforementioned discrepancies between the original mandate of the Court Challenges Program, and the divergent and growing legal-political desires of Canadian Aboriginal groups, it is recommended that a needs assessment be conducted which would explore the possibility of creating a new program, similar to CCP and possibly governed by the same organizational body, but one which is specifically aimed at aboriginal issues.
- Establish a program logic model based on the intended aims/goals of the NAFFP.**
- Work in Collaboration with Aboriginal Program Evaluators if and whenever possible.**
 Along these Lines, throughout the duration of the evaluation, follow a participatory model of program evaluation which is sensitive and responsive to the specific needs of Aboriginal communities and groups. In the process, utilize and respect existing aboriginal councils, lines of communication, and decision-making bodies.
- Conduct a Historical Analysis and Review of the types of Aboriginal legal Cases CCP has funded in the past.**
 In this way, we can examine their relevance and success, with respect to the evaluation framework presented above.
- Conduct a Thorough Cost-Benefit Analysis**

References

- Bickman, L. (1987) Using Program Theory in Evaluation. In New Directions for Program Evaluation, vol. 33. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Cronbach, L.J. (1982) Designing Evaluations of Educational and Social Programs. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Martin, L.L. & Kettner, P.M. (1996) Measuring the Performance of Human Service Programs. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Rossi, P.; Freeman, H. & Lipsey, M. (1999) Evaluation: A systematic approach (6th edition). London: Sage Publications

About Focus Five Consultants

Newly established in 2003, Focus Five Consultants is proud to offer a wide array of services in the areas of Program Development, Needs Assessment, Implementation Evaluation, and Outcome Evaluation. In association with the University of Ottawa, Focus Five Consultants has a managerial staff in place which will ensure our successful navigation through a period of controlled growth.

Globally, program evaluation has rapidly become a top priority for both the public and private sectors, and is an invaluable tool in response to the demand for increased accountability. Focus Five Consultants has a balanced skill-set to address this priority, with all associates having Ph.D.-level training in research design, statistical methods, qualitative methods, and program evaluation. Further background and history of Focus Five Consultants is available online at www.focusfive.ca.

Appendices

Appendix A : Interview Guide

Key Informant interviews would be carried out with individuals identified by the key stakeholders as having valuable, informed opinions about the needs of NFAP and the services provided by the CCP. While each would be open-ended and respectful of the Key Informant, a rough working model for such an interview would cover the following points:

1.	What is your name and role in NFAP or CCP?
2.	What are the needs of aboriginal people that you feel should be addressed by NFAP?
3.	What are the needs of aboriginal people that you feel should be addressed by CCP?
4.	How well is NFAP meeting these needs through the funding available through CCP?
5.	For needs not being met, how would you best envision these needs getting met?
6.	What are the barriers in place right now to meeting these needs?
7.	How can these barriers be overcome?

Appendix B : Focus Group

Focus Groups are designed to have an open-ended style which will aid in facilitating a participatory approach to data collection. The following sample protocol is a rough guideline for how such sessions would be carried out for the evaluation needs of NFAP:

TIME	ACTIVITIES
0:00-10:00 minutes	-Introductions of participants. -Introduce moderator/observers. -Explain ground rules of session.
10:00 – 20:00	-Participants further introduce themselves by explaining their relation or interest in NFAP, and/or CCP -Determine the level of services currently used by participants
20:00 – 50:00	-Introduce idea of barriers to CCP services, discuss differences between successful and unsuccessful requests for funding -What areas of CCP are they satisfied and dissatisfied with? -What services are not available from CCP, but would be required to meet their needs?
50:00 – 80:00	-Explore ideas around overcoming barriers -What would make CCP services easier to obtain or more effective?
80:00 – 90:00	-Debriefing and wrap-up by moderator -Ask for additional comments or questions from participants.