

Our objective is to complete the IMPAC survey by about the end of this fiscal year. The success of the survey depends entirely on the positive and active support of departments. The results of the survey are a prerequisite for the establishment of the consultative process between my office and departments. There is a need for urgency because both the Public Service and the government must be in a position to provide fact-based evidence of the status of their management practices, and to provide evidence of plans for improvement where a need is indicated.

Now, I would like to outline briefly another related project of my office.

A group within the Efficiency Evaluation Branch is undertaking a study related to the Treasury Board's policy on program evaluation. Branch personnel are being assisted in this work by experienced people from several departments. Their task is to develop a list of small "p" programs within the same departments as the IMPAC survey. Let's call them, "chewable chunks". These chunks are the sections of a department's operations and programs the effectiveness of which are deemed capable of being evaluated as a coherent whole. Once these have been identified they will be divided into three groups. First, those chunks which we judge to be relatively easy to evaluate, for effectiveness; second, those that may be evaluated but with some difficulty; and finally, a group of chunks which are perceived not to be evaluable. Program pieces might appear in this last group because the objectives of the "chunk" have never been clearly stated, or, although the objectives have been clearly stated, there are no known methods for measuring whether they have been achieved.

Next, we will apply a cost and staff-year value to each of the small "p" programs. Finally, departments will be asked to develop their plan for evaluation, using the following criteria:

1. Ease of evaluation;
2. The value of the program in terms of expenditure dollars and staff-years;
3. The expected cost of the evaluation in relation to the size of the program;
4. Departmental or ministerial priority.