Chronicling public sector renewal in Canada: the IPAC Award for Innovative Management

Joseph Galimberti

“to err is human, to blame is politics”

The IPAC Award for Innovative Management was launched in 1990. The stated purposes of the Award were as follows:

- To enhance the image of the public sector;
- To recognize organizations and individuals for creative and effective ways of doing things;
- To identify and publicize success stories in the public sector worthy of emulation; and
- To foster innovation.

In the mid-eighties in Canada there was growing dissatisfaction with government and the public sector as taxes and deficits continued to rise. The private sector had downsized: government had not. The private sector had modernized service delivery to its customers; government appeared uninterested in serving the citizens better. Government was perceived as being bureaucratic in the worst sense of the word and risk adverse, fearing that any mistakes would lead to further attacks from politicians, journalists, the private sector and the general public. However, the Institute of Public Administration of Canada (IPAC) knew that there were many exciting changes taking place in the public service of Canada but there was only anecdotal information. An Award for Innovative Management might just bring these changes to light and encourage others to do things differently.

I will next describe the characteristics of the Award, show how the Award has reflected public sector renewal in Canada, and then report on the nature of innovation based on scholarly research on submissions to the Award.

Characteristics of the Award

a) Theme

There is a new theme for the Award each year in order to encourage new submissions and to identify leading edge changes. In fact there are remarkably few repeated submissions. The annual theme is based on the IPAC agenda and confirmed with the Award sponsors, PricewaterhouseCoopers and IBM Canada and based on the IPAC agenda. The IPAC agenda is determined, in part, by a bi-ennial survey of deputy ministers (heads of departments) of the federal and provincial governments, chief administrative officers of major municipalities as well as IPAC’s seventeen regional chapters asking them to identify major challenges facing public sector organizations over the next few years.1 The Institute’s current priorities are: renewing the human resources dimension of the public sector, enhancing service delivery, and improving performance measurement and accountability.

The attached Table I lists the themes as well as the number of submissions generated by the themes since the Award’s inauguration in 1990. Since that date there have been 1291 entries. Themes that were broad in scope such as “Doing Things Differently” in 1998, or “Outside-In: Changing Government to Meet Clients’ Needs” in 2002 attracted the most entries, 154 and 132 respectively. More focused themes like “Measurement and Recognition” in 1999 produced 49 submissions. Also attached as Tables II and III are the submissions by geographical region and by order of government.

b) Evaluation

In October the Institute writes all deputy ministers at the federal and provincial levels and chief
administrative officers of major municipalities soliciting submissions. A firm deadline is set in February. Depending on the number of submissions there are three or four teams of pre-screeners composed of IPAC staff and employees of the sponsors, PricewaterhouseCoopers and IBM Canada. The teams identify the top twenty-five entries for the jury. The academic member of the jury is asked to read all submissions and other jury members frequently do so as well. Criteria are proposed and defined for the jury – innovative, relevance, significance and effectiveness. The jury then selects six to eight finalists who are invited for interviews. The interview consists of a ten-minute presentation by the finalist followed by forty minutes of questioning by the jury. The jury then selects the gold, silver, and bronze recipients. Attached as Table IV is a list of recipients from 1990 – 2002.

**Jury**

The jury is composed of five distinguished members of the public administration community. It is important to stress the “distinguished members” because in spite of the criteria for selection, there is considerable judgment required when making the final selection. As Dr. Sandford Borins put it

> “Evaluating these [the submissions] would be, I thought, a familiar task, akin to grading student exams. However, all the applicants were superb and of nearly equal merit. The appropriate analogy was not grading examinations but judging an Olympic event, such as diving or figure skating, in which all of the competitors are excellent and some are exceptional. It was extremely difficult to differentiate between performances”

Jury members are representative of the three orders of government in Canada (federal, provincial, local) as well as an academic member, with attention paid to the regions of Canada, language groups (French and English) and gender. Often the chair is a former Premier of a Province, a former federal Cabinet Minister or a former public servant who is now a prominent member of the business community.

The jury is changed completely from year to year to avoid any point of view being built into the process or to prevent a reluctance to reward a particular jurisdiction two years in a row. More importantly, involvement as a member of a jury, forces a closer look at the innovations and how they may be applied in his or her jurisdiction. The more people that can be involved as jury members, the faster new ideas and best practices will spread.

**Publicity**

The Awards are presented at the closing luncheon of the IPAC Annual Conference. The gold, silver and bronze recipients receive glass trophies and the finalists, posters. Press kits are made available for all those who attend. The top three also make presentations at a conference plenary session. IPAC conferences average about 500 participants. The academic member prepares an article on the competition for IPAC’s magazine, *Public Sector Management*. Summaries of all submissions with contact persons appear on the IPAC website, www.ipaciapc.ca to encourage members and others to peruse submissions of particular interest. As Professor Iain Gow pointed out in his book,

> “The great importance of emulation in the public sector provides the rationale for such new magazines as … IPAC’s *Public Sector Management* In sharing information about successful innovations, public sector managers have probably found the surest way to stimulate innovation in their community. That is why it is most encouraging that IPAC has created its Innovative Management Awards.”

One of the unexpected consequences of the Award has been its contribution to the scholarly literature and to the teaching of public administration. Jury member Professor Donald J. Savoie remarked that the Award provides an “inside look” at public sector management. The submissions are valuable research documents that stimulate research and writings on topics relevant to the work of senior managers and to the teaching of public administration. By 1993 IPAC was able to report that Professor Kenneth Kernaghan had published two articles on empowerment and partnerships in *Canadian Public Administration* based on the 1991 and 1992 entries
respectively. Professor Sandford Borins had published an article on service to the public in the *International Review of Administrative Sciences* using the 1990 submissions. Borins also used the submissions of the first four years for a report on “Public Sector Innovation: Its Contribution to Canadian Competitiveness.” The material on Canada in, *The Pursuit of Significance: Strategies for Managerial Success in Public Organizations* by Robert Denhardt is based on the Award. The book is a comparative study of public management in Australia, Canada, the UK and the US. Most recently IPAC has published *The New Public Organization* by Kenneth Kernaghan, Brian Marson and Sandford Borins that builds on submissions to the IPAC Award. The book has proven to be very popular and was reprinted in January 2002 about one year after its initial publication.

The Awards have also been used in various ways in the classroom as a teaching tool. Professor Evert Lindquist described his approach as follows:

> “Once this year’s finalists were chosen, but before the jury made its final decision, I circulated the submissions (plus an eighth submission) to 40 undergraduate students taking my course on Rethinking Government in Canada. Four teams of students were asked to advocate the merits of two of the submissions in front of the class. Then, regardless of the submissions their teams had presented, students wrote memos indicating which of the submissions should win the top three awards and outlining the criteria they used to arrive at their rankings.”

Professor Lindquist reported that the students, like the jury, had selected City of Vancouver’s Neighbourhood Integrated Service Teams and the Ontario Self-Service Kiosks as the gold and silver recipients respectively. However the bronze recipient (a Government of Canada Department) was far down the students’ list.

**Financing**

Those familiar with the Ford Foundation-Kennedy School of Government (FORD-KSG) awards for state and local government in the U.S. might think that an awards program is expensive to mount. The top ten in (FORD-KSG) receive awards of $100,000 each and the evaluation is conducted, in part, through site visits. While this would be a desirable state we have to rely on trophies and interviews. Proportionally the number of submissions IPAC receives stands up well in comparison indicating the importance and value of recognition. Our costs of $25,000 (staffing, trophies, stationery) are offset by the $20,000 in revenue we are able to secure from our sponsors. Other awards operate more like IPAC. The Commonwealth Association for Public Administration and Management (CAPAM) are modelled after IPAC’s Innovative Management Award and the United Nations has recently launched its own Public Service Awards on a fairly modest budget.

**The Awards and Public Sector Renewal in Canada**

The Canadian public service underwent significant changes beginning in the late 1980’s and continuing to the present. These changes include new organizational forms and processes, citizen-centred service delivery, empowerment, consultation and partnership, technology and a focus on measurement and results. It is not that any of this was particularly new. What was different was the speed and intensity with which these approaches were being applied. The paper will use examples from the submissions to chronicle the changes that have taken place. It should be noted that most of these innovations reflect many of the above categories, not just the one in which they are placed for illustrative purposes.

**New Organizational Forms**

I will describe three examples of new organizational forms that emerged during this period: self-management authorities, strategic operating agencies (SOAs) and a de-layering of a traditional government department. In a continuum from a government department to privatization, self-management authorities are close to the privatization end of the scale while SOAS are closer to the traditional government department. New organizational forms between the ends of the scale have been known in Canada as alternative delivery mechanisms. The Province of Ontario’s Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations won a bronze medal.
in 1998 for creating Self-Management Authorities as an alternative to the ministry’s front-line delivery of consumer protection and public safety programs. Following consultations with consumers and business the government established the Ontario Motor Vehicle Council, the Technical Standards and Safety Authority, the Real Estate Council of Ontario and the Travel Council of Ontario. These are not-for-profit industry associations whose delegated administrative functions include registration, inspection, complaints handling and prosecutions. The Government retains responsibility through legislative powers and keeps the Councils accountable through business plans, annual reports and performance measures. As well a government executive sits on the Board. The various associations have welcomed this opportunity to manage their own affairs.

Strategic Operating Agencies exist in the Provinces of Manitoba and Quebec and the Government of Canada and are somewhat akin to the Executive Agencies in the UK The Province of Manitoba’s Department of Finance was a finalist in the 1996 competition for its SOAs. The submission indicated that the aim of an SOA is to give greater authority and scope to managers and employees, enhance service and reduce the cost of government in return for being held accountable for results. Perhaps the best known of the Manitoba SOAs is The Manitoba Fleet Vehicle Agency (MFVA) providing internal vehicle leasing services to public sector departments. In fiscal year 1997, it made a profit of 2.4M on revenues of 17.4M. It achieved these positive results while operating in a competitive environment since departments are permitted to lease from the private sector.

In terms of new organizational structures within government departments, the relocation of the Office of the Registrar General of Ontario (Vital Statistics) more than 1,000 kilometres to Northern Ontario provided the opportunity to de-layer the branch and to implement a new organization with “a clean slate”. An organizational review revealed that the Office of the Registrar General "reflected a typical bureaucratic structure: layers of management are too deep (6 layers from Director to front line), functionality is too specialized (12 separate units), jobs are too detailed and responsibilities over controlled (147 staff with 41 job descriptions reflecting 23 different job classifications.)" The new structure consists of three levels with just one multi-skilled clerical position. In order to staff these positions, the Office worked with an interagency group representing people with disabilities, sole-support parents, visible minorities and francophones. A total of 60 of the 110 new recruits came from these categories reducing social assistance costs by $1 million as individuals moved from “welfare rolls to payrolls”. The Provincial Auditor's Report in 1994 revealed that productivity under this delayered approach had increased 55% over the low point in 1991. This submission was the gold award winner in 1995.

New Organizational Processes
In terms of process redesign or business process re-engineering as it is sometimes called, the best example is the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission which won the gold award in 2000. The Commission operated under an adversarial process of formal Commission hearings which included expert witnesses, intervenors, examinations and cross examinations as well as detailed staff analyses of the formal evidence. When the Commission was charged in 1996 with the challenge of bringing competition to the market for local telephone services, it realized that its current process was too expensive and time consuming for this task. As a result, it developed the CRTC Interconnection Steering Committee (CISC) composed of competing company experts, policy advocacy group representatives and government policy specialists to resolve the complex issues such as telephone numbering assignment and customer portability from one phone service supplier to another. There were up to 20 sub-committees dealing with 165 issues, which were resolved without any Commission hearings. Now that the transition to a competitive local telephone service has been completed to the benefit of all Canadians, the Commission has the tools to deal with other complex domains such as cable television.

Citizen-Centred Service Delivery
The gold award winner in 1999 was the product of the Government of Canada, Canada Post and three provincial
governments called, *Citizens First*. This survey of 34,900 households of which 2,900 responded assessed the quality of government services as perceived by citizens. In the survey the quality of government services compared favourably with the private sector. The study found that the drivers of citizen satisfaction were in order of priority: timeliness, staff competence, courtesy, fairness and outcome. Several governments in Canada have now set standards based on the survey. For example Ontario requires all telephone calls to be answered within three rings 80% of the time and that there be two contacts 80% of the time. The province hires an external agency to make mystery calls to judge how it is doing. Prior to this date emphasis was placed on courtesy training (the extra mile, the extra smile) not realizing that timeliness was by far the most important driver of citizen satisfaction. For the 2000 citizen survey IPAC became the lead organization involving the federal government, all provinces, one territory and the three largest cities. There were over 6,000 responses and overall satisfaction with government services increased slightly. The largest increase was for Canada Customs and Revenue Agency perhaps reflecting the fact that Canadians can now file their tax returns electronically. The 2000 *Citizens First Report* is available on the IPAC website at www.ipaciapc.ca.

There have been many submissions about one-stop shops as a way of improving service to the customer. The inaugural gold award winner in 1990, Accès Montréal, established 14 Accès bureaux across the city beginning in 1987. The bureaux act as clearing houses of information for a whole range of city’s activities, from purely administrative matters through to general information on libraries, sport and leisure activities and special events. In 1990 they allowed citizens to perform all kinds of transactions (payment of fines and taxes, requests for permits and licences, etc) and made computers available to search municipal databases. Since this was one of the first one-stop shops Accès Montréal drew a lot of attention across Canada and abroad.

Victoria Connects, winners of the bronze award in 2001, is a one-stop-shop run by three levels of government, including fourteen municipalities, to provide business start-up and development services to the Greater Victoria region of Vancouver Island. Services are delivered electronically, by phone, or in person at the Victoria Connects Centre. The Centre responds to the needs of the business community by offering seamless, one-stop service delivery and regulatory services including business registration, licensing and tax payments, and business development support including information, training, workshops and counselling.

One-stop-shops have proven to be very popular with Canadian citizens. IPAC conducted a study for twelve government departments and agencies representing the three levels of government. The study consisted of a telephone survey (4,806 completions and an overall response rate of 70.2%) of both businesses and citizen clientele in the summer of 2001. The key findings show that Canadians appreciate single-window (one-stop-shop) services. Overall more than four in five (81.7%) clients are satisfied with the services provided. The report, *Clients Speak: A Report on Single-Window Government Services in Canada* can be viewed at www.ipaciapc.ca.

**Empowerment**

Kenneth Kernaghan notes that empowerment has both external and internal dimensions. External empowerment, according to Kernaghan, “involves an organizations’ efforts to empower citizens and clients by involving them in the decision-making process.” One of the finalists of the 1992 award, the British Columbia Ministry of Social Services designed an At Home Program to assist families to care for their severely disabled children at home. The government allocated $15 million to the program. All of the money was provided directly to parents. There was no allocation for staffing or administration costs. To carry out the program the Ministry formed a partnership with parents of handicapped children, community representatives and charitable organizations who form the admissions committee. As a result the Ministry gave up control of the gateway to the partners who determine admission to the program.

The Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, the gold award winner in 1992, gave five examples of their new partnerships. One of these partnerships, a waste-disposal site, led to the empowerment of the local citizens. Rather than close the site that was plagued by illegal dumping, the Ministry worked with 700 residents to develop various options. More than 70% selected user pay. Because there was no local government, the site was
then turned over to a local charity who employed a disabled person to supervise the site. Illegal dumping declined, the cost of operating the dump fell, and the citizens started a waste recycling program.17

Empowerment inside organizations, Kernaghan remarks, goes beyond delegation to enabling staff.18 British Columbia Hydro, the 1991 gold award winner, saw their empowered work teams as unleashing the talent within its organization. In the fifteen months since its inception in 1990 almost half of Hydro’s regular employees had volunteered to try to implement the team concepts. In a short period of time employee ratings of managers and of the general job were both up, turnover, absenteeism and accident rates down, and the organization accomplished all of its targeted industry efficiency accomplishments.19

Partnerships

The Computers for Schools Program of Industry Canada was the recipient of the gold award in 1998. The initial challenge faced by the Program was to find a cost-effective way to provide substantial numbers of surplus computers and software free of charge to Canada’s schools and public libraries through partnerships. Partnerships involve all Government of Canada departments, all provincial and territorial governments and more than eighty private sector partners as well as hundreds of volunteers.20 The Program has delivered over 350,000 computers throughout Canada; established non-profit organizations in every province to deliver its program; worked with northern territories to service remote communities and address the needs of the digitally excluded population. Although the primary beneficiaries were children, it had an unexpected benefit of diverting more than 23,000 tons of IT waste from landfill sites. As well, the Department has helped other countries set up similar programs. As jury member Dr. Peter Aucoin remarked

“… the program has demonstrated how partnerships can both create public value by enlarging commitment to a national objective and, at the same time, expand markets for the private sector.”21

The Province of New Brunswick won the bronze award in 1995 for its literacy program that is based on partnership. In 1991 the Province had an illiteracy rate of 24%, and only a small number of literacy classes with drop-out rates of 50%. The Province formed Literacy New Brunswick Inc., a non-profit, private sector organization to draw diverse private, community and voluntary sector partners into the funding and delivery of literacy training. The resulting Community Academic Services Program (CASP) is innovative in its non-traditional use of a diversity of resources, talents, training delivery and inclusion of client groups. One-third of the program is paid by Literacy New Brunswick Inc.’s more than 400 private sector partners, 45% by the province and the remainder from other sources. Literacy co-ordinators at community colleges coordinate with literacy volunteers to establish classes. Community committees raise the local share of the program cost, find rent-free classrooms and supplies, employ a local teacher and administer the program. The Program’s 400 volunteers include members of parliament, church leaders, business people, service groups and individuals. In the first four years of operation CASPS were established in 111 cities, towns and villages in the remotest areas of the province, resulting in 10,000 learning opportunities. As the result of non-traditional community based training, the drop-out rate has decreased from 50% to 7%.22 This is a remarkable story of partnership and community engagement to reduce illiteracy.

Technology

Technology has played a part in virtually all of the 1,291 submissions received to-date. This section will report on examples of entries that deal with remote electronic transactions and electronic kiosks. The Open Bidding Service of Government Services Canada was a finalist in the 1993 award competition. The Open Bidding Service (OBS) provides open access to all Government of Canada procurement to all Canadians through the application of information technologies and private sector partnerships. It is funded through user fees for electronic documents. The OBS was implemented to maximize openness and competitiveness in public sector procurement while minimizing the cost of bid solicitation. It offers an electronic bulletin board permitting suppliers to browse through hundreds of opportunities on the board. With the push of a button electronically, suppliers can order the documents they need to bid on contracts in which they are interested. The OBS services
are provided by a private sector contractor under licence to the department.  

Personal Property Registration of the British Columbia Ministry of Finance and Corporate Relations was the winner of the gold award that year. The remote personal property system was developed and implemented in eighteen months at the cost of $1 million Cdn. Clients of the Registry are companies and individuals who need to register a security interest, or financial charge against the property of a debtor. Clients include sellers and lenders such as banks, credit unions, leasing companies, etc. Clients of the Registry also include companies or individuals performing searches on personal properties to determine whether any charges are registered against them. The new system permits remote registering, remote searching, automatic payment of fees, automatic calculation of fees and refunds, automatic edits/corrections/rejections, document control and tracking and remote discharge. Within the first eighteen months staff have been reduced from 36 to 18 and the ratios of gross profit to expenditure has risen from to 5.6:1 from 3.5:1.  

Examples of electronic kiosks are taken from submissions of the Government of Ontario. The Ministry of Transportation brought together IBM Canada, five other government ministries and two municipalities to develop self-service kiosks for the delivery of government services. In just six months from the signing of the contract the first kiosk was launched. It featured touch screen activation, in both English and French, product dispensing, credit card payment and receipt dispensing. The initial product included: vehicle renewals; driver, vehicle and carrier record searches; address changes to both Ministries of Health and Transportation; used vehicle information packages; ability to order personalized plates; payment of court fines and fines to the cities of Toronto and Ottawa. By 1997 there were 58 kiosks in shopping centres throughout Ontario and two in government offices. Customer acceptance is high with about 53% of business occurring after regular business hours and on weekends. The technology was developed by IBM Canada which recoups its costs through a transaction fee.  

The Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations, in order to reduce red tape and government paperwork to establishing a business in Ontario, worked closely with other government ministries, Revenue Canada and business representatives to launch a client-oriented business registration service, called Ontario Business Registration Access (OBRA). The OBRA’s single window concept gives entrepreneurs and existing corporations an easy-to-use, bilingual computerized registration system to prepare, transmit and comply with necessary government regulations from one location. What used to take many weeks to establish a business now can be done in less than 30 minutes from one of the many Ministry electronic kiosks located throughout the province. This submission won the bronze award in 1996.  

Results Oriented  
Each year the Government of Alberta and each of its ministries develop a three-year plan with a set of financial and non-financial objectives. Four cabinet-approved cross-government priorities are identified in the process. The plans are made public, permitting citizens to see what the government intends to do over the next three years, the way the objectives will be achieved and related costs. The Province publishes an Annual Report three months after the end of the fiscal year, that includes the consolidated financial statements of the province as well as Measuring Up, dealing with the degree of the achievement of non-financial objectives and sub-objectives. The generous bonus scheme for deputy ministers (heads of departments) is linked to the achievement of cross-government priorities (75%) and the objectives of the ministry (25%). The Province of Alberta won the silver ward in 1999.  

Innovations in Canada and the United States  
To study innovations in Canada and the United States, Professor Sandford Borins based his research on award programs. He compared innovations identified by the Innovations in American Government Award, funded by the Ford Foundation and managed by the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard with innovations from the IPAC Award for Innovative Management. The U.S.A. Award averages 1,500 submissions per year compared to IPAC’s 100. Semi-finalists in the U.S. award are required to complete a very detailed questionnaire. A similar
questionnaire was sent to the top entries to the IPAC Award as identified by the award’s pre-screeners. Professor Borins found that innovations in both countries were remarkably similar as follows:

a) Applicants said that what made their program innovative was a system approach, co-ordinating the activities of a number of organizations or providing multiple services to a target population; these characteristics were found in 55% of the Canadian applications and 61% of the US applications.

b) The most frequent initiators of innovations were career public servants (55% Canada, and 48% US) rather than politicians and agency heads leading to Borins’ notion of “local heroes”.

c) The most frequent catalysts for innovation were internal problems found equally in Canada and the United States about 50% of the time which Borins notes calls into question the belief that innovation in the public sector occurs primarily in response to a crisis.29

d) Political initiatives were seen as a catalyst in about 20% of the cases in both countries followed by new leadership in less than 10% of the cases.

e) With respect to whether innovations are achieved through careful planning or “groping along”, comprehensive planning alone was cited in 56% of the US cases compared to 42% in Canada; “groping along occurred in 27% of the US cases compared to 24% in Canada but a surprising 30% of Canadian cases reported both comprehensive planning and “groping along” compared to just 3% of the US cases.

f) Obstacles to innovations in both countries arise primarily within the public sector rather than at the political level or the external environment.

g) Tactics used to overcome obstacles were similar in both Canada and the United States namely, persuasion (demonstrating benefits, demonstration projects and marketing), accommodation (consultation, training, co-optation/buy-in, compensating losers, making the program culturally or linguistically sensitive.

h) About 88% of the awards in Canada have received some media attention compared to 46% in the US.

i) A total of 61% of the Canadian sample has been replicated internationally compared with 42% of the US.

j) A total of 21% of the Canadian sample has been replicated compared to 1% of the US. Borins cites Ontario Office of Seniors’ Issues (silver award, 1992), sensitizing people to the difficulties of the aged has been adopted in the U.S., UK, Japan and New Zealand; the Canadian ultraviolet index (1994 submission) has been adopted in US, UK, Denmark and Germany; the United Nations has adopted Parks Canada’s accessibility program (submission, 1992) as the basis of its international standard.30

Concluding Observations

The following are some observations based on my association with the award since its inception. They relate to leadership, the influence of the government agenda and the importance of publicity and especially the academic literature to set the environment for replication.

I have had the good fortune to be able to attend the jury interviews of the finalists and winners since the inception of the award and to observe the qualities of the leaders of the various innovations.
I have been struck by how positive, charismatic and articulate these leaders are no matter where they are placed are in the hierarchy. They have great pride in public service and enjoy the challenge and risk involved and bubble with enthusiasm. In this regard I would like to mention a forthcoming publication by IPAC on *Continuously Innovative Public-Sector Organizations* by Peter Edward Baker that deals with institutional and individual characteristics with respect to innovation.

Government agendas in the early nineties emphasized making government smaller, doing better with less. It pushed a number of activities outside of government departments (alternative service delivery mechanisms). In addition combined with a focus on service to the citizen it forced government and government departments to cross boundaries and to collaborate and sometimes integrate programs. All of this was facilitated by the creative use of technology. It seemed to me that the really big changes took place in the first half of the decade of the nineties and that current innovations are primarily variations on earlier themes. But juries still seem dazzled by submissions. The 2002 jury chair, President of Canadian Exporters and Manufacturers, remarked that it’s too bad that other members of the private sector can’t see this.

The vast majority of submissions have dealt with public sector management issues. Recently governments have put more emphasis on policy development and IPAC has tried to attract more submissions dealing with policy issues. In the years 2000 and 2001 we crafted themes “Collaboration: New Approaches to Policy and Management” and “Developing the Public Service of Tomorrow” in the hopes of attracting more policy focused submissions but without any discernible success. In 2002 we selected the theme “Outside-In: Changing Government to Meet Clients Needs” believing it to be very close to our very first competition “Service to the Public”. However the three winners, Alberta on youth justice committees, Saskatchewan on a new policy framework for Métis and non-status First Nations and Ontario on cross-border scams all have a heavy policy content as do several of the other 2002 finalists. Perhaps the renewed focus of Canadian governments on policy is starting to be reflected in award submissions.

The IPAC Award for Innovative Management has brought to light many of the exciting public sector innovations taking place among all orders of government in Canada. In so doing it has facilitated the process of change and the spreading of new ideas and best practices across Canada and internationally. An unexpected result has been its contribution to the scholarly literature and to the teaching of public administration, a result that has also helped to promote change and the replication of public sector innovations. The Award is one of the means by which the Institute of Public Administration of Canada achieves its goal of improving the quality of public administration in Canada.

---
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