

Soumission par: / Submission by:

TRANSFORMATIONS



TRANSFORMATIONS

February 19, 2005

Canada Travelling Exhibitions Indemnification Program (INDEM)
Canadian Heritage
25 Eddy Street
Gatineau, Quebec
K1A 0M5

Dear Sir/Madam,

It is with pleasure that we submit to you our evaluation proposal for the Canadian Traveling Exhibitions Indemnification Program (INDEM).

Our evaluation plan is intended to provide you with the necessary tools for evidence based decision making. At Transformations, we are committed to producing sound evaluation results that will ultimately better your current policy as well as future policies within your company.

Enclosed you will find our evaluation approach for INDEM. We have designed a comprehensive summative evaluation that includes our proposed budget, timeline, methodology and sample surveys.

We thank you in advance for this opportunity, and we look forward to the possibility of working with you and your colleagues in the near future.

Sincerely,

Your Transformations Team

Table of Contents

<i>Purpose of Evaluation</i> _____	4
<i>Background Information</i> _____	4
<i>Evaluation Plan</i> _____	5
<i>Evaluation Methodology</i> _____	6
Document and Literature Review _____	6
Survey of Eligible Institutions (n=100) _____	7
Exit Survey _____	7
Key Informant Interviews _____	8
Analysis of Institutions’ Insurance Savings on Indemnified Exhibitions _____	8
Document Audit _____	8
<i>Limitations</i> _____	9
<i>Deliverables</i> _____	9
<i>Budget</i> _____	11
<i>Timeline</i> _____	12
<i>References</i> _____	13

Purpose of Evaluation

A summative evaluation of the Canada Travelling Exhibition Indemnification Program (INDEM) is required for a Departmental report to the Parliamentary Committee that will review administration of the Canada Travelling Exhibitions Indemnification Act, five years after its coming into force on December 15, 1999.

Transformations has been asked to provide evidence-based answers to the Treasury Board Evaluation Policy questions relating to program relevance, success, and cost-effectiveness. In addition, Transformations is required to take account of the seven tests for expenditure review announced by the Government of Canada on December 16, 2003.

Background Information

Since being introduced in 2000, the Canada Traveling Exhibitions Indemnification Program has enabled museums and art galleries the ability to import art and showcase galleries with reliable insurance through our federal government.

“Unlike commercial insurance, indemnification is a process whereby the government assumes financial risk for loss or damage to objects in eligible traveling exhibitions and provides compensation for damage or loss should they occur” (RFP, 2005).

The process of maintaining such a prominent insurance program depends on the applicant’s ability to show that their establishment is of the highest standards.

The Indemnification Program has two objectives:

- to increase access for Canadians to Canada’s and the world’s heritage through the exchange of artifacts and exhibitions in Canada; and
- to provide Canadian art galleries, museums, archives and libraries with a competitive advantage when competing for the loan of prestigious international exhibitions.

The idea behind the program is such that the government “reduces insurance costs for traveling exhibitions, enabling institutions to present domestic and international exhibitions which otherwise might not have been possible” (RFP, 2005).

Expected outcomes of the INDEM program include:

- increased capacity of Canadian institutions to host traveling Canadian exhibitions
- facilitation of the hosting of major international exhibitions; and
- access for Canadians to significant cultural property that might not otherwise be available to them

Evaluation Plan

Evaluation Questions	Indicators	Data Sources
RELEVANCE		
1) To what extent is there still a need for the indemnification of traveling exhibitions in Canada?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of applications over the years • Reasons for not applying • Public interest and patronage patterns (visitor #) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literature review • Exit Survey • Administrative Data • Key Informant Interviews
2) Is indemnification of traveling exhibitions still consistent with federal objectives/priorities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of applications over the years • Reasons for not applying • Public interest and patronage patterns (visitor #) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literature review • Exit Survey • Administrative Data • Key Informant Interviews
SUCCESS		
3) What results has the program had since 2000 in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Providing access for Canadians to Canada's and the world's heritage through the exchange of artefacts and exhibitions in Canada? - Providing Canadian art galleries, museums, archives and libraries with a competitive advantage when competing for the loan of prestigious exhibitions? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of loans for prestigious international exhibitions pre and post INDEM • Perceptions and opinions of the applicants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literature review • Administrative Data • Interviews • Survey of Eligible Institutions
4) Would traveling exhibitions have been possible without INDEM?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rejected and or those that did not apply to the program • Perceptions and opinions of the applicants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of institutions' insurance savings on indemnified exhibitions • Survey of Eligible Institutions
5) Have there been other positive or negative impacts of the program, e.g. improved collection care standards?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of loans for prestigious international exhibitions pre and post INDEM • Perceptions and opinions of the applicants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literature review • Exit Survey • Administrative Data • Key Informant Interviews • Survey of Eligible Institutions
Cost-effectiveness/Alternatives		
6) Are there ways the design of the INDEM Program could be improved or made more cost effective? Would legislative changes be required?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify best practices internationally • Measure financial savings to indemnified institutions • Perceptions and opinions of the applicants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literature Review • Analysis of institutions' insurance savings on indemnified exhibitions • Survey of Eligible Institutions • Key Informant Interviews
7) Are there ways the implementation of the INDEM Program could be improved or made more cost-effective? Would legislative changes be required?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify best practices internationally • Measure financial savings to indemnified institutions • Perceptions and opinions of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literature Review • Analysis of institutions' insurance savings on indemnified exhibitions • Survey of Eligible Institutions

	applicants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key Informant Interviews
8) Is/are there any other programs that overlap with or duplicate INDEM?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do comparable programs exist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literature Review • Survey of Eligible Institutions
9) Is output and outcome information being collected by the department sufficient to support impact measurement and reporting?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gaps in information being collected vs. information needed for impact measurement and reporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document audit to identify gaps

Evaluation Methodology

Data Collection Tools:

**Survey instruments and interview guides will be developed after the in-depth document and literature review is conducted. These data collection tools will be designed in consultation with the Department of Canadian Heritage.*

Document and Literature Review

We recommend a thorough review of relevant literature to provide context for the evaluation as well as to identify best practices and possible improvements for the design and implementation of the program.

As suggested in the original RFP, we will review Cabinet documents, TB submissions, the Act and Regulations, program guidelines, policies and procedures documents, the draft program RMAF, program data on applications and approved projects since 1999-2000, information about traveling exhibitions indemnification programs in four other countries (U.S., U.K., New Zealand and Australia), project files, and a summary of International Indemnity Programs prepared by the Mori Arts Centre Summary in 2002.

Under the assumption that a needs evaluation might have been conducted prior to the establishment of the program, we will also thoroughly review all past research supporting the implementation of the program. We will use this data for comparison when addressing the evaluation questions, *“To what extent is there still a need for the indemnification of traveling exhibitions in Canada?”* and *“Is indemnification of traveling exhibitions still consistent with federal objectives/priorities?”*

We will also conduct an extensive Internet and document search for programs comparable to that of INDEM to identify potential areas of service duplication.

Lastly, potential changes to the design and implementation of the program since its inception will also be identified and documented. These changes (if any) will be important to consider in the analysis of evaluation findings as the funding applicants may not have knowledge of such changes.

Survey of Eligible Institutions (n=100)

A census survey of all 100 Canadian institutions that develop traveling exhibitions large enough to be considered for the INDEM program will be conducted. The purpose of this survey is to highlight the important issues surrounding the INDEM program. It is imperative to obtain opinions of institutions who have applied for indemnification as well as those who have not applied, for the purpose of identifying gaps in services and areas of improvement. Specifically, the questionnaire will address reasons for applying and not applying; perceptions and opinions regarding the application process; number of loaned prestigious traveling exhibitions pre- and post-INDEM; identification of other comparable funding similar to INDEM; and suggestions for improvement on the program. In addition, each respondent will be asked to submit administrative data such as visitation pattern numbers and ticket sales since the programs inception. This data can be used to cross-check survey responses from eligible institutions regarding perceived impacts on visitation as a result of receiving the indemnification or not.

Questionnaires will be administered via email to the individual at each institution in charge of traveling exhibitions. Respondents will have the opportunity to complete the questionnaire and return it by email or by faxing it to a toll free number provided to them. Monitoring response rates and follow-up emails will be conducted at regular intervals to maximize the response rate.

Exit Survey

One of INDEM's program objectives is to increase access for Canadians to Canada's and the world's heritage through the exchange of artifacts and exhibitions. The current evaluation framework outlined in the RFP does not adequately address this objective as it does not take into consideration the perceived impact this program has had on Canadians in general. We therefore recommend an exit survey be conducted at selected museums and art galleries holding exhibitions that are covered through INDEM. Understanding that art is subjective and the timing of exhibits would vary, we would include a cross-section of various museums and art galleries.

Patrons exiting the exhibit would be encouraged to fill out a short three to five question, self-administered scannable questionnaire. Museum and art gallery staff, such as tour guides, would be asked to inform patrons of the questionnaire and encourage participation. An incentive could be offered to encourage participation in the study such a chance to enter a prize draw. In order to conduct statistical analysis within an acceptable margin of error, we suggest a sample size of 300 visitors for this exit survey.

Patrons would be asked questions regarding their motivations for visiting (in particular, did they come for the traveling exhibit?), their evaluation of the exhibit, and the importance of continuing to have such traveling exhibits.

Key Informant Interviews

Individual in-depth interviews will be conducted with informative members of identifiable groups. The purpose of the interview process is to obtain thorough and concrete opinions from key players who have an invested role in the industry. Triangulation will be achieved as these groups have been chosen because they portray a wide array of involvement in this field. Short but concise interviews, approximately 20-30 minutes in length, by trained and experienced researchers will be conducted in person; however, if this cannot be arranged, a telephone interview will be substituted. Interview guides will be developed for each group, and for analysis purposes similar questions will be found on each one.

Members from the following groups (as proposed):

- Representatives from PCH (n=2-3)
- Umbrella service organizations for museums, art galleries (potential applicants (n=2-3)
- Representatives of indemnification programs in four other countries (n=4)
- Representatives of museums/galleries whose projects were not indemnified (n=2-3)
- Representatives of museums/galleries with exhibitions that could have been considered for indemnification but did not apply (n=2-3)
- A representative of CCI (n=1)

In addition to the proposed groups:

- Stakeholders and exhibit trustees who loan the art to be exhibited (n=4)

Interviewees will be contacted for interview by recommendation/identification obtained from members of the Department of Canadian Heritage. The interview process will investigate cost-effectiveness of the INDEM program and ways to improve on the application process; number of loans for prestigious international exhibitions pre- and post-INDEM; identify best practices internationally and allow for comparison to Canada; and description of perceptions and opinions of the INDEM program.

Analysis of Institutions' Insurance Savings on Indemnified Exhibitions

An individual with actuarial experience/expertise will conduct a calculation of financial savings to indemnified institutions as a result of indemnifications by the INDEM Program. This individual will be identified by and hired by our firm for the purpose of analyzing the cost-effectiveness of the INDEM program. This type of analysis is crucial for the program as it will identify if the program's benefits outweigh the costs.

Document Audit

In order to address the evaluation question, *"Is output and outcome information being collected by the department sufficient to support impact measurement and reporting?"*,

we propose a document audit of the Department of Canadian Heritage's documenting procedures. A thorough review of current documentation procedures for output and outcome information compared to the requirements for impact measurement and reporting will help to identify information gaps. Once these information gaps have been identified, solutions can be created.

Limitations

The following outlines some of the limitations of our study:

- Obtaining required sample sizes
- Small number of institutions who have received indemnification
- Timing and scheduling challenges
- Key informants/respondents knowledge of the indemnification process

Deliverables

- Provide a detailed work plan and supporting documents ten working days after the contract is awarded
- Provide weekly status reports to the project authority
- Provide separate reports presenting data obtained from each line inquiry (document review, survey of eligible institutions, key informant interviews, analysis of indemnified institutions' insurance savings, exit survey, document audit)
- Provide a deck with a presentation of preliminary findings
- Provide a draft report including a presentation of the methodology and evidence-based answers to the research questions
- Provide a final report including conclusions, recommendations and an executive summary

Milestones for INDEM Summative Evaluation February 19th 2005 – June 28th 2005		
Milestone	Deadlines	Payments
1) Work plan and supporting documents	March 5 th , 2005	25%
2) Line of inquiry reports	May 21 st , 2005	40%
3) Preliminary results presentation	May 28 th , 2005	n/a
4) First draft report	June 1 st , 2005	n/a
5) Final report	June 28 th , 2005	35%

Budget

Activity	Person-Days of Effort	Activity Cost
Document and literature review	2	\$1,500
Development of survey questions	2	\$1,000
Development of interview questions	2	\$1,000
Administration of eligible institutions survey	5	\$3,500
Analysis of insurance savings on indemnified exhibitions	5	\$4,000
Administration of key informant interviews	10	\$8,000
Administration of exit survey	5	\$4,000
Perform documentation audit	2	\$2,000
Analysis of Information	15	\$12,000
Discussion of Preliminary Findings	2	\$1,000
Development of Draft Report	7	\$5,000
Review and Presentation of Draft Report	3	\$2,000
Development of Final Report	5	\$5,000
Total	65 days	\$50,000

Timeline

Week 1 – starting on Feb 19th; Week 20 – ending June 28th

Activity	Week																			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Administration of document & literature review		X	X																	
Development of survey questions			X	X																
Development of interview questions			X	X																
Administration of eligible institutions survey					X	X														
Analysis of insurance savings on indemnified exhibitions				X	X	X	X	X												
Administration of key informant interviews					X	X	X	X												
Administration of exit survey					X	X	X	X	X	X										
Perform document audit									X	X	X									
Analysis of information							X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						
Discussion of preliminary results													X	X	X	X				
Development of draft report															X	X	X			
Presentation of draft report																	X			
Development and delivery of final report																		X	X	X

References

Love, A. (1995). Evaluation Methods Sourcebook II. Canadian Evaluation Society.

Posavac, E. & Carey, R. (2003). Program Evaluation Methods and Case Studies: Sixth Edition. Pearson Education Inc.

Patton, M. (2002). Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods: 3rd Edition. Sage Publications.