YVES SAVOIE

OPTIMIZING OPPORTUNITIES FOR COLLABORATION WITHIN THE CPF NETWORK

Summary Report:
Key Informant Interviews
July 2022

Yves Savoie, BA, MBA, MManagement
Founder and Principal
Yves Savoie | **Governance** | **Strategy** | **Impact**

This report is a summary of insights developed by its author building on confidential interviews with leaders of the CPF Network. I am grateful to the many individuals who contributed their thoughts, experiences, concerns, and aspirations with me in conversation.

The report was not reviewed, edited, amended, or approved by representatives of CPF at any level. The views it contains are solely those of the author and the responsibility for errors are his alone.

The author cautions that this report should not be construed as policy of Canadian Parents for French. The author does not presume that the report's content will generate consensus and hopes that some of its ideas might form part of future CPF action plans.

The hope is that this report will serve to fuel important conversations about a better future for the CPF Network and its impact in the lives of young Canadians.

This summary report marks the culmination of an engagement to explore options to strengthen collaboration within the Canadian Parents for French (CPF) pan-Canadian Network. I was commissioned by Canadian Parents for French National[1] to explore options related to collaboration in networked organizations and to conduct confidential key informant interviews to measure the readiness and appetite of CPF senior staff and volunteer leaders to deepen collaboration, and to identify pathways for action in this context. While I was commissioned by the backbone organization, my role is to serve as a source of independent advice to benefit the CPF Network as a whole.

The research was conducted during May and June 2022 using semi-structured confidential interviews with the president and executive director of each CPF branch and its National Office. Interviews were conducted using loosely structured confidential qualitative probes (Appendix 1). The Conversation guide was shared with participants (Appendix 2) approximately one month before the first interview allowing the leaders of each branch and the National Office the opportunity to solicit the views of their respective boards ahead of the confidential interview. Eleven interviews were conducted with the president (or vice-president) and executive director for each unit except that in one case the president was unable to attend at the last minute. In conversations, I observed a high level of agreement between the presidents and executive directors of each unit. Participants welcomed the opportunity to be in conversation.

Interviews ranged in duration from 60 to 75 minutes; they were conducted in English or in French according to the preference of the interviewee. Participant consent was documented using the scheduling application Calendly. My notes from the conversation were analyzed. Consistent with the commitment to protect the confidentiality of individuals and their affiliations, no comments are attributed directly to individuals or to their respective branch or the National Office in this report.

This work provided the insights, data and a full range of diverse perspectives which form the basis of this report. The report was commissioned to form the basis for discussion among CPF leaders about the action steps which might be implemented in the future. I was not commissioned to draft such an action plan. Rather, I choose to provide some broad *pathways for action* which may serve as raw material in the development of CPF's action plan. Importantly, I did not seek to verify the level of agreement with these pathways for action nor did I limit my discussion of potential pathways for action to ideas which generate perfect consensus among Network leaders. The pathways for action therefore constitute my best advice loosely based on the generous input of participants throughout the process.

---

[1] In this paper, references to Canadian Parent for French, National means the national backbone organization headquartered in Ottawa and incorporated under the Canadian Not-for-Profit Corporations Act. 'Branch' denotes the provincial or territorial members that are typically incorporated by provincial/territorial statute. 'Chapter' denotes unincorporated local structures accountable to the branches. 'CPF' denotes the sum of the backbone organization, its branches, and chapters.

CONTEXT

In conversations with participants, some themes recurred consistently and merit a brief discussion before probing the data for opportunities to strengthen collaboration. Access to French as a second language education (FSL) has changed dramatically since the founding of CPF in 1977. While there are still important gaps in access, participants acknowledged that access has improved significantly since that time. Many identified this improved access as a source of pride when they reflected on their association with CPF citing the important efforts deployed by CPF to broaden access. Others recognized that the struggle to improve access incrementally or to safeguard hard-won rights may prove very difficult, even more difficult than it was to seek guarantees for those rights in the first instance.

Many also commented on the changing reality of Canada's linguistic duality, painting a more complex picture than that of half a century ago. A gradual decline in the share of those speaking French outside Quebec and the growing 'separateness' of Quebec's cultural and political life were noted by many. 'The share of the population outside Quebec with French as its mother tongue has declined from 8 per cent in the 1940s to less than 4 per cent today[2].'

The global reckoning with issues or racism and decolonization has inspired a groundswell of reconciliation efforts with the Indigenous peoples of Canada. These efforts have highlighted the importance of preserving indigenous languages many of which are at risk of disappearing. In some jurisdictions, educational administrators are struggling to release resources to meet the growing demands for indigenous languages instruction.

Others noted Canada's strength as a country of immigration and noted the growing number of Canadians who speak a language other than French or English at home. The growing ethno-racial and linguistic diversity of Canada – in particular, of its large urban areas – has spawned the need for important anti-racism and anti-oppression work in communities, workplaces, and institutions. This reckoning and the important demographic and social changes which have fueled it invite Canada's earliest European settlers to ponder what its means to be among 'Canada's founding peoples.' As the Globe & Mail highlighted in a recent editorial, 'in an increasingly multicultural and multiracial Rest of Canada, there is a tendency to see French as just another tile in the mosaic. That misreads both Canada's history and its ongoing linguistic duality[2].'

For historical reasons or because of patterns of immigration, others noted significant regional differences in the experience of linguistic duality. New Brunswick stands out in this context as Canada's only officially bilingual province with a strong Acadian community and a vibrant fabric of francophone economic, cultural, and recreational organizations. Others explained that the work of CPF in provinces or territories where the percentage of those speaking French at home is very low can be very lonely and may not benefit from the same level of social or political acceptance.

Many commented that CPF is typically associated with its important work to improve access to French immersion programs. They also described the growing perception that French immersion programs are elitist at a time of growing interest in inclusive practices in education. This interest mirrors a broader

---

[2] The Globe & Mail (Ontario Edition). The French fact outside of Quebec. Saturday, June 25, 2022. P. 58.

societal interest in issues of diversity, inclusion, and equity. Yet, 'research continues to show that streaming English language learners and students with learning exceptionalities out of French immersion remains an ongoing practice in Canadian schools[3].'

The notion of equity was also surfaced by me in the context of CPF resource allocation decisions or practices within the Network. When I probed to understand perceptions of 'internal' equity, I realized there was no shared understanding of the meaning of the term. Often equity was understood to be synonymous with equality as in cases where participants from smaller branches compared their staffing levels to those of larger branches with no explicit recognition that larger branches serve more populous jurisdictions. Equity was never framed in terms of the ability of a given branch to deliver comparable impact or outcomes on young people in each jurisdiction. Two other issues significantly impacted the perception of internal equity within the Network. The first is the question of whether branches enjoyed access to the public education system through its department of education, school boards, and local schools. Some branches enjoy access at all levels while others rely on personal connections for uneven access to some local schools only without more formal or structured access to the public education system. Formal access to the education systems correlates well with another marker of internal equity which is the availability of project funding from provincial or territorial jurisdictions to supplement core funding from Heritage Canada. Some branches enjoy significant funding beyond the core funding from Heritage Canada while others rely largely on Heritage Canada and on very small amounts of membership and fee income.

Yet, when participants were probed directly to share their understanding of the impact of CPF in the lives of young Canadians, many spoke of the significant progress highlighted earlier in improving access to FSL and to French immersion programs in very personal ways. Some explained that they had benefited from access to FSL while others commented that their children benefited from access to quality French immersion programs. Several participants feel a debt of gratitude to CPF for the ability to continue to use French as a second language as adults acknowledging that this would not have been possible without CPF.

A final element of context was surfaced by many respondents. They spoke of a duality in the mission of CPF which, at times, pits advocacy and programming at odds with each other. Advocacy seeks system-level changes through policy, administrative or legislative changes which leverage impacts in the lives of large numbers of young people through public education systems (e.g., funding, programming, and curriculum). Advocating for system-level change requires long-term efforts without a guarantee as to the timing or the specific outcome of the advocacy efforts. By contrast, delivering programs to children in communities drives impacts on much small numbers of young people in real time. Programming activities are tangible, and their impacts are more easily circumscribed. Programming is often attractive to funders and does not require the same commitment of resources and tenacity to fight over the long term. Many commented that this dynamic tension between programming and advocacy within the CPF Network is not well resolved.

---

[3] Canadian Parents for French, The State of French Second Language Education in Canada 2019: Focus on French Second Language Programs. P. 4. Accessed at https://cpf.ca/wp-content/uploads/State-of-FSL-Education-Report-2019-WITH-Bibliography.pdf

STRATEGY & CULTURE

I now turn my attention to a discussion of the data and rich insights as they relate to opportunities to strengthen collaboration within the CPF Network. This exploration first addresses questions relating to strategy and culture.

Strategy implementation

There is a shared understanding of CPF's higher-level strategy, but this consensus about the broader vision of CPF is not reflected in the consistency with which strategy is implemented on the ground. High level strategy appears to break down when difficult decisions are required to allocate/share resources to drive forward the implementation of strategy. The result is that strategy is executed in a piecemeal way and reflects a patchwork of operational priorities. This strategy implementation challenge is deeply rooted in different perspectives on the value of the pan-Canadian CPF Network.

In conversations with participants, I paid special attention to the perspective each used on an unaided basis in answers to my probing. The perspective of branch leaders varied significantly with some focused on the broader interest of the CPF Network while others were neutral or passive in their views about the pan-Canadian context. A small sub-set were openly antagonistic to efforts being made to strengthen collaboration often equating stronger collaboration with a loss of local autonomy. I analyzed the data from confidential interviews to classify the number of units (branches or backbone organization) in terms of their overall readiness to embrace a pan-Canadian Network which is more collaborative. The analysis reveals the following breakdown of the 11 interviews conducted:

Detractors	15-20%
Promoters	20-25%
Passives	55-65%

Detractors openly resist efforts to collaborate. Their priority lies in the programming needs and unique political/linguistic circumstances of their jurisdiction. They are frustrated by what they perceive as a growing concentration of resources in the backbone office (without seeing the additional scope of work undertaken by the backbone office) and the accompanying administrative burden imposed by new administrative or reporting processes. They are prepared to collaborate informally but see few opportunities to entrench collaboration more deeply by sharing staffing resources or by clarifying roles and decision rights. Detractors fear the proposed affiliation agreement for the perceived loss of control which they believe it represents. They tend to be obstructionist in their response to proposals to deepen collaboration.

Promoters are keen to accelerate efforts to collaborate and to share staff resources for improved efficiency. Their frame of reference is often pan-Canadian. They are responsive to initiatives lead by the backbone organization. They also conceptualize the possibility that leadership for specific activities or roles could be exercised on a pan-Canadian basis by branches prepared to do so subject to the Network providing the resources for those branches to exercise such leadership. Promoters often acknowledge what they perceive as important advances which have been made since the appointment of Nicole Thibault as National Executive Director in terms of shared services provided by the backbone organization. They welcome the process to formalize roles and accompanying decision rights, including exclusive domains of responsibility

for different parts of the Network, in a proposed affiliation agreement. They accept the fact that deeper collaboration requires relinquishing leadership or control of certain areas of activity. They politely express frustration at the lack of concrete action to deepen collaboration noting the absence of consensus to do so. They tend to be pro-active and intentional in the pursuit of opportunities to deepen collaboration.

Passives are the largest group of respondents and are more tentative in their responses to increased collaboration often expressing important caveats. Some fear that increased collaboration will limit flexibility in programming to respond to the unique characteristics of their branch. Others fear the loss of opportunities to provide meaningful input in areas of activity which have been/might be ceded to the backbone organization or to another branch. Yet, Passives recognize and celebrate opportunities for collaboration which are sprouting informally throughout the Network including in staff roles which are shared by more than one branch/backbone organization. They also acknowledge important progress in building a common architecture in areas such as IT, web, and HR. They are tentatively open to deepening collaboration but want assurances that the processes to enable such collaboration will be well designed and respectful of unique regional differences and differences in the scale of the branches. They tend to be reactive and cautiously opportunistic in the pursuit of opportunities to deepen collaboration.

Passives and Promoters share a willingness to entrench more opportunities for staff sharing across branches and/or the backbone organization. In exploring opportunities for more staff sharing, they both express the caveat that each branch should continue to have at minimum one or more staff persons located in its jurisdiction. The importance of having 'staff' on the ground is seen by all as a vital force of the CPF Network and one of its important distinguishing features.

The analysis above borrows the language of the net promoter score[4], a metric well known in commercial organizations used to systematically evaluate the satisfaction of customers. The net promoter score builds on well know research evidence which shows that negative word-of-mouth is more powerful than positive word-of-mouth. In very simple terms, because customers are more prone to share negative experiences, one needs more promoters than detractors to have a good 'net' promoter score.

I submit that this powerful axiom also operates within the CPF Network with the effect that a disproportionate amount of leadership time is focused on detractors thereby limiting the potential to build a more cohesive and collaborative network. This surfaces two important questions: Does the Network have to wait for the Detractors to be on side before implementing additional steps to deepen collaboration? Could an alternative path be forged to shift leadership time and energies away from the detractors to focus on those who are eager or open to consider deeper collaboration?

Strategic performance monitoring

Many participants commented on the significant efforts which are being deployed to better describe the impact of CPF. This is not only consistent with efforts to drive strategy forward but also a reflection of the demands of sophisticated funders including Canadian Heritage. These efforts are a source of frustration for some who experience a growing administrative burden. Others are keen to address the challenge of producing better long-term impact data which they see as a necessary ingredient to retain funders and attract new ones.

---

[4] For additional reading about the net promoter score, visit https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Net_promoter_score .

There are important gaps in the ability to measure traction on the strategic goals related to advocacy and system change. Informal comments suggest that the investments approved at a high level in the last strategic plan have not yielded concrete action in all branches. In reporting impact data, there appears to be a focus on programming data which benefit relatively small numbers of participants. The more complex task of producing data to reveal system- and population-level impacts does not appear to have significant traction.

Pillar B of the strategic plan with its focus on building member, donor and volunteer engagement is seen as having not yielded concrete and visible action plans with accompanying results. Except for the growth in the number of members resulting from a period of free membership during the pandemic-related restrictions on in-person programming, there is little confidence expressed in the progress made on this front. Most respondents confirm the overall trendline of decreased memberships and flatlining of revenues (decreasing in real term) over the last five years. Not surprisingly, these discussions revealed that Network leaders experience a 'resource squeeze' which results from years of revenues not growing in pace with expenditures.

Culture and values

There is acknowledgement that significant efforts have been implemented to build and to engender trust across the Network. There are some signs of development of an organizational culture that spans the entire pan-Canadian network although this is incomplete. Several participants commented that several recent staffing changes in branch and National Office staff offer opportunity to strengthen efforts to build and engender trust across the Network and to cement a more collaborative culture.

Leaders play a critical role in modeling the values of an organization. Competency-based performance management systems, recruitment and training programs are important tools in cementing shared values. There are early efforts to formalize these approaches which are met with varying levels of support and enthusiasm. Some fear the proposed systems and programs are administratively burdensome and unnecessarily bureaucratic.

Several participants commented on the backbone organization's growing role in HR especially in situations of crisis. They welcome the important contribution made by the National Office in those situations. Some board leaders openly acknowledge that HR crises emerge in part because of the lack of board focus on and rigour as to the implementation of HR processes. Other board leaders acknowledge the challenge of placing the responsibility for the implementation of these processes on the shoulders of volunteers and thus welcome the support of the backbone organization.

These reflections invite consideration for a greater role of the backbone organization in HR. Yet, the data reveals several participants who conceive such an expanded HR role as the harbinger of diminished autonomy of branch executive directors.

There is broader consensus and embrace of the backbone organization's role in the onboarding of board volunteers including those who are joining branch boards. This offers opportunity to provide consistent training and educational opportunities to branch and National board volunteers while also creating opportunities for branch board volunteers to be connected to the larger pan-Canadian organization.

Governance and decision-making

Respondents openly acknowledge or describe CPF as an organization that is not effective in its decision-making, over-governed, slow to marshal resources and to act, and encumbered by the lack of consensus (or the asymmetry which is tolerated) to move forward in new ways.

Others celebrate the fact that CPF remains an organization with a strong grassroots base present in every part of the country. They celebrate the fact that CPF can respond to regional and jurisdictional particularities.

While many celebrate the grassroots elements in the network's decision-making processes, others recognize an important challenge in decision-making at the pan-Canadian level which is that action relies on the consensus of all members of the network. Many recognize that for CPF to reach new heights in terms of impact, its decision-making will have to be modernized.

This surfaces the question of whether one might conceive a new CPF organization with more effective governance and decision-making while preserving rich grassroots engagement and an appropriate level of regional and jurisdictional responsiveness.

Currently, decision-making and governance at the pan-Canadian level relies on tireless engagement efforts in the hope of achieving consensus. Interestingly, this need for a high level of consensus appears to operate both in terms of broad elements of strategy as well as in the implementation of those strategies. Nowhere did I find evidence of clarity as to decision rights. Such clarity would help to distinguish between those who have the right to be consulted or to provide advice in the development of strategy and accompanying action plans, and those who have the ultimate right to make decisions to implement action plans respecting the advice and input received through consultation. The challenge of strategy implementation owes its existence in no small part to the absence of clarity as to decision rights. Clear decision rights allow those entrusted with the responsibility to implement with the flexibility to act even when the advice and input received through consultation is not perfectly coherent. The absence of clear decision rights for the leaders tasked with implementing strategy unnecessarily delays the pace of implementation of initiatives of various kind.

In conversation with participants, I used Canada's constitutional arrangements to illustrate the notion of shared and exclusive areas of jurisdiction. Participants had a ready appreciation of our constitutional arrangements which assigns exclusive jurisdiction in education to the provinces, in defense and global affairs to the Federal Government, while permitting shared jurisdictions in areas such as health. I also illustrated this notion of clear delineation of roles with a commercial example citing franchise agreements which grant exclusive control over certain activities to the franchisee and others to the franchisor.

Participants were quick to identify several areas of exclusive jurisdiction for the backbone organization in respect of its responsibilities for developing research and policy reports on FSL in Canada, procurement of extended health benefits and directors and officers' errors and omission insurance, administration of the membership database, management of CPF's brand and visual identity guidelines, and management of the basic informational technology infrastructure. Similarly, there was clarity as to the exclusive responsibility

of branches for provincial or territorial advocacy and for relationships with the education systems in each of those jurisdictions.

A more complex picture emerged in respect of the very substantial areas of shared jurisdiction in programming, in communications and marketing, in revenue development, in financial administration and reporting to funders, and in human resources. Some viewed the National Office as having a role which was limited to policy and planning while for others the role of the National Office extended beyond these to include roles in implementation.

A few cited the role of branches in providing leadership on a pan-Canadian basis. The example of the British Columbia & Yukon Branch in respect of virtual programming was often cited in this case although this role appears to have evolved organically rather than deliberately. Others noted the leadership of the National Office in enabling the shift to virtual programming during the pandemic when adjustments to programming modalities were made very quickly. With the return to more normal circumstances, people see a role for virtual programming but fear the loss of hybrid or in-person programming. Clarifying the role of National and the opportunity for pan-Canadian leadership to be exercised by some branches that have clear strength in programming is an opportunity recognized by many.

Volunteer participation trends: implications for governance

Many participants spoke of volunteer burnout and of the challenge of attracting volunteers. Their experience is corroborated by national pre-pandemic data on rates of participation in volunteer activities which show that the percentage of Canadians volunteering in formal activities is decreasing while the overall number of hours is remaining stable. This challenge is felt acutely in smaller communities and in the recruitment of leadership volunteers for chapters. Reflecting these challenges, several participants commented on CPF being 'over-governed' and expressed a resolve to transform the semi-autonomous governing structure of chapters. Advocates for a less complex chapter structure envision a future where chapters would be a nimble platform designed to attract volunteers interested in local programming or advocacy (and not in governance, finance, risk management or administration).

A smaller number of participants, including some from larger branches, advocated for the transformation of the branches to reduce the burden of governance without losing their distinct legal structure. Those who advocated for a reduced burden of governance at the branch level also envisioned clearer roles in a more coordinated pan-Canadian CPF Network. Interestingly while only a smaller number of participants envisioned a transformed governance structure at the branch level, many more acknowledged the challenge of attracting and retaining volunteers with the requisite talents to branch boards.

Many participants commented on their lack of connection to the National Board. While the fact is that almost all current members of the National Board have prior branch governance experiences, many perceive the National Board as having lost its connection to the grassroots. Some remarked that the loss of in-person gatherings such as the national conference may have contributed to this growing perception. No one advocated for a transformation of the model of governance at the National level, a model which prevents directors from serving concurrently on the boards of CPF National and that of one of its branches.

Consultative bodies

There is a great deal of confusion as to the purpose and authority of the Council of Presidents (CoP) and the Council of Executive Directors (CoED). While these bodies are consultative, there appears to be confusion as to their role in decision-making. Some question whether CoP and CoED perform 'top down' or 'bottom up' functions or whether they should be equipped to do both. A common theme in the criticism off these structures is that too much time in meetings of these bodies is focused on receiving information rather than in being solicited for input or participating in discussions. No one advocated for the elimination of these structures, but many advocated for greater clarity as to their roles. Many acknowledged that these structures perform an important role in lubricating informal personal relationships with peers.

Promoting compliance and addressing non-compliance

Participants are clear that boards have responsibilities to assure compliance through their oversight function. They accept that the National Board has the highest level of responsibility in this context as it oversees the branches and the backbone organization. The National Board has important powers which reflect this acknowledged role and authority.

While the broad policy frameworks are well understood, in practice most respondents were quick to acknowledge that some participants in the Network knowingly flaunt the rules and policies and are therefore non-compliant. Because my role was not to investigate such instances, I did not obtain detailed information about the individuals or parts of the Network which are alleged to be non-compliant. My interest lies in the fact that non-compliance is observed. This confirms that efforts to promote compliance or to sanction non-compliance are not successful. There is recognition that the National Office has shown a resolve to deal with non-compliance although the tools to do so may not be proportional (i.e., tools with dramatic consequence are currently the only tools available to deal with matters of non-compliance, however small, so that issues of non-compliance are left to pile up or to become more serious before they can be successfully addressed). Others fear that instances of non-compliance take a long time to surface and to come to the attention of the National Office or the appropriate boards. There is no evidence of compliance reporting systems which is implemented on a uniform pan-Canadian basis. Others lament the fact that situations of non-compliance which involve specific individuals are not dealt with privately in ways which protect the rights of those who may have been alleged to be non-compliant. Yet, others acknowledge that protecting the confidentiality of such matters is difficult as the evidence of non-compliant behaviors may surface in group settings. Many comment that the knowledge of non-compliance by individuals (or parts of the Network to which such individuals are linked) can be very de-motivating.

Importantly, no participant acknowledged non-compliant behavior as their own. And the perception of non-compliance by others has not been tested in a proper investigation which would give both the person alleging that such behavior is taking place and the respondent an opportunity to be heard. This important caution explains why I cannot illustrate this section with examples which were freely provided to me.

My reading of current formal policy and governance documents reveals the National Board's power to remedy serious instances of non-compliance. My view is that the current powers available to the National Board to deal with these matters are not useful to deal with smaller but nonetheless important matters of non-compliance. There is growing evidence that the National Office is relying on its involvement in performance management and its role in human resources to address issues of non-compliance.

The Charities Directors of the Canada Revenue Agency offers an interesting example of a framework to promote compliance and to remedy matters of non-compliance in a timely and proportional way[5]. For instance, a charity which includes false information on an official receipt will not likely see its charitable status revoked but it might receive an education letter or see its receipting privileges withdrawn for a limited time. Before the introduction of this modern framework to promote compliance, the charity regulator had a single tool to promote compliance: revocation of charitable status. The formal compliance framework in place today at CPF provides a single tool to deal with all matters of non-compliance: branch dissolution. Branch dissolution is not the right tool to deal with small matters of non-compliance nor can it be applied in a timely way.

Resources, resource allocation, efficiency

My conversations reflect significant concerns with issues of resources and resource allocation. Generally, much greater emphasis is placed on questions relating to the 'sharing of the existing pie' than to initiatives which might offer hopes of 'growing the pie.' Except for a few branches which have experienced significant success in diversifying revenues beyond the core operating grant from Canadian Heritage, discussions focused on questions of perceived equity or inequity in the apportioning of the Canadian Heritage grant and less so on ways in which those resources might be deployed more efficiently or augmented with funding from other sources.

I have noted before that there is no shared understanding of the meaning of the word equity.

Many comment that they have little clarity about the basis upon which Canadian Heritage funding is shared although this does not appear to be because such information has not been made available. There is evidence that information about the basis upon which the Canadian Heritage grant is apportioned is readily available. I suspect these challenges reflect the complex criteria which are the basis for the apportioning of the grant and the equally complex mechanisms for accountability both regionally and federally.

Improved efficiency in deploying resources

There is a chorus of voices from smaller and mid-size branches about inadequate resources. A few of the respondents from the smaller and mid-size branches want to seize upon opportunities to share resources. Those who are keen to share more resources see the benefit of more specialization (say by sharing staff with experience in social media, finance/impact reporting, or in advocacy).

Larger branches acknowledge the privilege of more adequate resources. Many continue to be open to sharing of resources with other branches and to greater experimentation in this context. Those who benefit from provincial government funding for specific projects know that it may be less easy to share the resources tied to those programs but are nonetheless open to resource sharing beyond those limits.

Some highlight the pro-active role of the National Office (and of the current NED) in building shared infrastructure for the network and in pooling resources for greater efficiency in IT, HR, membership administration, financial management, etc.

---

[5] For additional reading about the compliance framework of the Charities Directorate of the Canada Revenue Agency, visit https://www.canada.ca/en/revenue-agency/services/charities-giving/charities/policies-guidance/guidelines-applying-sanctions.html .

Some comment that this pro-active role which brings clear benefits is also a source of significant administrative burden for branches which are not all equipped to participate in or comply with initiatives/directions. A few comment that some National initiatives place too high an administrative burden on them and offer that such initiatives need to be conceived from the start as more 'light touch.'

There is broad agreement that staff can be shared across jurisdictions (including EDs in smaller branches) although this is accompanied by a universal view that it is critical to continue to have some staff in all provincial jurisdictions. There is much less clarity about the feasibility about having CPF staff in each territory.

The approach to sharing of staff resources is a reactive one (seizing opportunities available when staff currently in place are suited to these arrangements or when a vacancy in one area invites such collaboration). Very few voices identify sharing of staff resources as an option on a pro-active basis.

While some of the pressure on resources may be related to a decline in real terms in revenues available to the Network, others offer an added explanation which is in the challenge of attracting enough volunteers to design, implement, and deliver programming and advocacy initiatives locally and at the branch level leading to additional pressures on staff to do so. The trendline in levels of volunteer participation and engagement could worsen this reality as volunteer participation rates are declining in Canada.

Growing revenues

There is little evidence of a strategy to grow revenues outside of opportunities available to increase revenues from governments. The National Office is systematic in pursuing opportunities to grow funding from Canadian Heritage while many branches multiply efforts to grow project funding from provincial governments.

There is also acknowledgement that governments may be forced to scale down public expenditures as they retrench from increased levels of public expenditures during the pandemic to address issues of public indebtedness.

Many people identify the need to develop, resource, and implement a strategy to grow fundraising, and sponsorship revenues. The branches have few resources alone to make significant inroads in this area; they recognize that to realize significant potential in this area requires a coordinated pan-Canadian approach and a policy framework. Most look to the National Office to exercise leadership to frame a strategy and related policies for such a coordinated approach. The crux of the challenge in addressing this opportunity is that the investments required to build the strategy and capabilities in sponsorship and fundraising will not pay back quickly.

Conversations reflected widespread dissatisfaction with the current membership model. These conversations also revealed little consensus about the justification for the current model. All acknowledge legacy elements of the membership model including the role of members in the governance of CPF; all agree that this legal legacy element would not be easy to change. Yet, many are unclear that current levels of efforts should continue to be expended to maintain membership levels at current levels. Many are not clear that the current membership model is the best tool to mobilize citizens in CPF's advocacy efforts at

the local, provincial, or national levels. Many offer the view that social media platforms offer more reach, agility, and power in mobilizing citizens around policy change.

Few imagine the membership model as a source of significant growing revenues. Many are concerned about the efforts required to sell membership which confer few benefits (except for the requirement to be a member to participate in summer camps). Yet, many recognize that the modest revenues currently generated through membership sales are an important and often the only source of revenues for local chapters.

Pathways for better collaboration

Before turning my attention to a discussion of pathways to collaboration, I return to the earlier discussion of the perspective of conversation partners in terms of their disposition to greater collaboration within the pan-Canadian network. It is abundantly clear that the opportunity for greater collaboration does not generate consensus among the members of the CPF Network. More importantly, I remarked that a disproportionate amount of leadership time is focused on those who are openly antagonistic to efforts being made to strengthen collaboration.

If one presumes that future action to strengthen collaboration within the Network requires the perfect consensus of all members of the Network, then there are few pathways available for forward motion. Rather than being stymied by this realization, I offer a different possible future. This different future establishes two tracks for concrete action.

A first track sees the CPF Network enshrine in a membership or affiliation agreement the minimum requirements for membership in the Network and introduces a range of proportional and timely sanctions to ensure those minimum requirements are applied consistently to all parties to the affiliation agreement including to the backbone organization. The first track brings a sharp and determined focus to issues of compliance and risk management.

The second track is complementary to the first but does not presume to include all members of the CPF Network. It provides supplementary opportunities and mechanisms for collective action by those who are desirous of deepening collaboration within the CPF Network to amplify impact on young Canadians and generate growth in revenues to fuel ambitions plans. The supplementary opportunities and mechanisms for collective action would take the form of agreements among different sub-sets of members of the CPF Network. The second track brings a focus to collective and measured risk-taking to amplify impact and grow revenues.

My view is that strategy implementation in its current mode is hampered by the assumption that perfect consensus is required as the norm for all initiatives. I have therefore organized the discussion of pathways in two parts. Part A focuses on the membership agreement for all Network participants. Part B outlines bold ideas for deeper collaboration and embraces the asymmetry which would welcome different sub-sets of participants in each supplemental agreement.

Part A

Focus membership agreement on risk management and compliance

Implement a membership (or affiliation) agreement with a narrow focus on risk management and compliance which establishes the minimum obligations and requirements of all branches and the National Office in the CPF network. Ensure the membership agreement defines the basis upon which all parties to the agreement shall report on their compliance with the agreement at least quarterly. Use the membership agreement to reserve certain activities to those who are parties to supplemental agreements effectively creating incentive to collaborate.

The minimum obligations and requirements should cover the following areas: governance, financial management and reporting, fundraising, programming and advocacy, brand management and crisis communications, website and hyperlink conventions, volunteer management, human resources policies and performance management of branch executive directors.

The membership agreement should entrench areas of exclusive jurisdiction for the backbone organization including responsibility for developing research and policy reports on FSL in Canada, procurement of extended health benefits and directors and officers' errors and omission insurance, administration of the membership database, management of CPF's brand and visual identity guidelines, and management of the basic informational technology infrastructure. Similarly, the agreement should entrench the exclusive responsibility of branches for advocacy in each provincial or territorial jurisdiction, and for relationships with the education systems in each of those jurisdictions.

The development of the membership agreement should offer the opportunity to cement current shared services approaches to the management of activities which are not community facing (i.e., HR policies, payroll and benefits administration, IT, membership administration and accounting). Responsibilities for these functions should be housed in the backbone organization with a small de-centralized staff team. Ensure that the membership agreement clarifies decision rights so that users of shared services have the right to provide advice and to be consulted while the rights to implement plans and strategies are delegated to the backbone organization. Care should be taken to lighten and to automate the reporting and other administrative requirements for the use of these services. Subscription-based applications in the cloud which are intuitive to use should be favored in place of developing manual processes.

It is important to underscore the importance of the notion of minimum obligations which are expected of all members. These requirements should be tested so that they can be easily met by the smallest Network members without undue administrative burden. Consistent with this approach to minimum obligations, the membership agreement should not impose on members of the Network the requirement to participate in shared programmatic or advocacy initiatives. Shared programmatic or advocacy initiatives should be covered separately on a coalition-of-the-willing basis by supplemental agreements (see Part B below).

The membership agreement should preserve the legal form of the CPF Network with the backbone organization and the branches as parties to the agreement. It should also contemplate the need for flexibility in certain areas as some but not all Network participants may supplement the membership agreement to innovate in key areas (e.g., redesigning governance of branches and chapters, piloting new membership model).

The membership agreement should encompass or include as a schedule a license agreement through which CPF National licenses the use of all its trademarks including all logos, designs, and words whether or not registered under the Act which are used to convey a unified image of Canadian Parents for French.

The membership agreement should place limits on members in respect of activities which would be governed by supplemental agreements. For instance, the membership agreement should prohibit branches from requesting funds from the Federal Government and its agencies and crown corporations and from soliciting funds kind from national corporations. It should also require that any unsolicited gift or sponsorship of $5,000 or more from a national corporation or the Federal Government be cleared with the National Office before acceptance. The membership agreement should reserve the right to invest in search engine optimization and search engine marketing to those Network members who participate in collective efforts to manage the digital ecosystem (see below). It should also limit the ability of Network members who do not participate in collective efforts to manage the digital ecosystem to use email marketing lists unless they can ascertain the province of residence of each of those emails. The opportunity to use the much more readily available email marketing lists without the requirement for appending a province of residence to those emails would be reserved for those who are part of collective efforts.

Introduce proportional and timely sanctions for non-compliance

Ensure the membership agreement includes a range of sanctions including intermediate sanctions which will be available to respond in a timely and proportional way to instances of non-compliance by any of the parties to the membership agreement. These intermediate sanctions should build on the powers already available to the National Board to suspend a branch. For example, failure to provide timely financial reports or reports required to satisfy Canadian Heritage contribution agreements could result in temporarily withholding membership fees owed to a branch; failure to use CPF brand assets in ways which reflect its visual identity guidelines could result in hyperlinks to a branch local website on the main CPF website to be temporarily deactivated.

Introduce mandatory arbitration as required step in alternative dispute resolution

Draft versions of the affiliation agreement include a mechanism for alternative dispute resolution (ADR) which allows disputes between parties to the agreement to be resolved without recourse to the courts. The most current draft of the affiliation agreement contemplates the use of mediation only as part of the ADR mechanism. The membership agreement should incorporate mandatory arbitration as an additional ADR mechanism when mediation efforts have failed. For clarity, the mediators are facilitators in dispute resolution; they do not have the power to impose a settlement. By contrast, arbitrators have the additional power to impose a settlement after the parties have exhausted efforts to mediate their differences.

Sharpen focus of backbone organization on strategy implementation with a resolute external focus

Increase vigilance and focus on strategy implementation. Focus the energies of the leaders of the backbone organizations on those who are inclined to more collaboration, effectively decreasing leadership time and energies afforded to the Detractors while ensuring that the compliance regime described above is strictly enforced. Shift leadership energies from building internal coherence to increasing the impact of CPF and growing its revenues.

Transform CoED and CoP into places of engagement and learning

The Council of Presidents and Council of Executive Directors should continue to operate with several important modifications. The Councils should not be settings in which matters of non-compliance are surfaced, aired, or resolved. Those matters should be dealt with privately between the parties (typically the backbone organization and a branch). All participants in the Councils should be expected to 'presume goodwill of others' in their dealings with colleagues in those settings. The chair or co-chair of those Councils should be prepared and equipped to excuse a participant who doesn't exemplify the ability to 'presume goodwill of others.'

Agendas for CoED and CoP should be designed to ensure that some time is allotted for discussions of issues which have relevance to all Network members. Agenda for CoED and CoP should also provide for mechanisms to carve out time for discussion of those opportunities for collective leadership which involve some but not all members of the Network. For greater clarity, meetings of CoED and CoP should have variable membership depending on the actors who are committed to participating in some collective initiatives and not in others. In this way, discussions of deeper collaboration will not be hindered by those not intent or willing to collaborate.

Organizers of the Council meetings should exercise caution not to use such meetings to communicate information which could otherwise be communicated in writing and should reserve meeting time to answer questions arising from materials which have been pre-circulated. As a rule, eighty per cent of meeting time in Council should be focused on highly engaging conversations, lively exchanges, and learning.

Part B:

Introduce 'coalition of the willing' approach to deepen collaboration

Implement a 'coalition of the willing' approach to efforts to deepen collaboration, share additional resources and amplify impact in ways that supplement and are consistent with the membership agreement. These aspirational efforts should be governed by supplemental agreements and may be asymmetric (i.e., they will typically not cover all branches and the backbone organization; in some cases, they may bring together only a few branches and/or the backbone organization). These efforts should not be forestalled by the absence of consensus among Network members.

In developing supplemental agreements to govern these additional collective efforts, decision rights should be made explicit and clear. Importantly, the decision rights of those charged with implementation should be clearly articulated equipping them with the power to move forward after those with the right to be consulted or to provide advice have been heard through meaningful consultation.

Note that collaborations in policy research, programming, and advocacy as well as in sharing of staff resources across different parts of the Network would be subject to supplemental agreements and not covered by the membership agreement.

Develop and implement a sponsorship strategy

Secure funding to develop and launch a sponsorship strategy. Along with digital fundraising discussed later, this is an area of fundraising which holds great promise for CPF in the view of the author. Please note that implementing such a strategy will require patient investment as the payback on the investments of resources required to develop and launch the strategy will be 18 to 24 months. A caution is added here that this initiative should count on the participation of at least four or five branches representing upwards of 70% of Canada's population. To create sponsorship offerings with value requires the ability to deliver activation strategies on the ground in most of Canada's census metropolitan areas[6] (CMAs). The strategy should clarify how incremental sponsorship (net of the costs to implement the strategy and of the sponsorship activation expenses) would be shared by those sharing in this collective leadership opportunity. The sponsorship strategy should also make explicit the basis upon which CPF will ensure a coordinated approach in soliciting national corporations and charitable foundations.

Transform shared website into a multi-pronged digital strategy and pilot new membership model

Build on the success of a collective approach to website management to create multi-pronged digital strategy that includes digital marketing (search engine optimization, search engine marketing), social media marketing, and pro-active and passive digital fundraising. A digital ecosystem requires as its foundation a database of constituents which should be developed on behalf of the participants in this collective leadership initiative. As part of this transformation, pilot for a new pay-what-you-can (PWYC) model of membership. Note that while membership would be offered on a PWYC basis, all communications to current, renewing or prospective members should inspire people to donate with a range of suggested donation amounts reaching as high as $250. Consistent with guidance from the Canada Revenue Agency[7], donation receipts should be issued for the value of the contribution less the value of any consideration which the donor has received in respect of the membership.

Also, note that constituents should be asked pro-actively to donate more than once per year. In effect, this transformation removes the focus on the membership renewal cycle which imposes an artificial ceiling to contribution levels (e.g., the membership fee) and artificially limits the number of solicitation opportunities to the membership renewal calendar. It shifts the membership program from a commercial transaction to a philanthropic opportunity. In a commercial transaction, members are invited to focus on what is acknowledged to be few tangible benefits which are available only to members of CPF. In its place, an invitation to participate philanthropically invites constituents to focus on the higher public benefit of creating a society which values linguistic duality. This strategy would see a marked shift of all membership communications from one which seeks to 'monetize' the little value of membership to one which is aspirational in tone.

Please note that implementing such a strategy will require patient investment as the payback on the investments of resources required to develop and launch the strategy will be 18 to 24 months. This strategy should be developed using digital-first principles and should define how incremental digital

---

[6] Canada's census metropolitan areas (CMAs) are Canada's most populous urban centers which are critically important to marketers including those who make decisions about sponsorships. In effect, most larger retail marketers focused their marketing expenditures in CMAs.

[7] Canada Revenue Agency, Guidance on Issuing Receipts – Split Receipting. See https://www.canada.ca/en/revenue-agency/services/charities-giving/charities/operating-a-registered-charity/issuing-receipts/split-receipting.html

fundraising and membership revenues would be shared by those participating in this collective leadership opportunity.

Pilot new models to mobilize citizens in system change and in promotion of access to FSL

Develop a strategy to mobilize individuals in protecting/promoting rights to FSL education by implementing civic technology applications such as online petition and online advocacy tools. Create a pilot project to test these approaches in one or two jurisdictions (note that a jurisdiction could be an entire province or territory, or a large school board area in a more populous province). Combine digital assets (social media and email marketing with the use of civic technology applications). Please note that policy and system change efforts which rely on the use of civic technology applications shift control of the message to citizens away from organizations.

This proposed pathway reflects commitments already made through CPF's strategic plan to build advocacy capabilities to drive system change. Accelerating efforts in this area is fundamental to amplifying the impact of CPF in the lives of young Canadians as system change alone has the potential to influence large numbers of ultimate beneficiaries.

Develop pro-active opportunities for sharing staff resources across Network members

Develop a strategy for re-design of the management structure of the Network members participating in this initiative with the goal that in 2-3 years no Executive Director has fewer that four full-time equivalent team members accountable to him/her. This strategy will have the effect of reducing the number of Executive Directors accountable for a single jurisdiction and will create opportunities to redeploy salary resources into full-time equivalent positions in the junior and intermediate ranks of the organization. In the view of the author, CPF has too many members of its staff earning higher management salaries, and a corresponding lack of staff in more junior and intermediate ranks doing front-line work. For instance, the elimination of one Executive Director position could lead to the creation of 2.0 FTEs in front-line positions specifically designed to focus on programming and advocacy.

Approaches to staff sharing opportunities must be consistent with the shared commitment to have a permanent staff presence in all provinces.

In the interest of pay transparency and equity, a consistent approach should be used to evaluate jobs and to establish their pay bands and those participating should gradually transition to an approach where pay bands for all jobs are made public. Practices in this area are changing rapidly reflecting more inclusive approaches to HR and the growing evidence that when pay bands are not published, those from underprivileged groups earn less than their counterparts in comparable roles.

Pilot a new governance model for branches that streamlines board responsibilities and eliminates local governance at the chapter level

Pilot a new model of governance for Branch Boards that streamlines the responsibility of Branch Boards by entrusting staff and budget management decision rights to the backbone organization. In this new model, budget and ED performance management, hiring, termination and succession planning decisions would be within the final authority to the backbone organization with Branch Board exercising the right to be consulted and to provide advice in those areas. In such a model, Branch Boards would focus more energy

on programming, system change and policy advocacy while retaining a role in the overall governance of the Branch albeit with significant delegated responsibility to the backbone organization. The model would have the effect of lifting Branch volunteers out of internally facing HR and budget administration tasks in favor of community-facing activities. In this new model of governance, Branch Board should be smaller with no fewer than 3 and no more than 7 volunteers.

A parallel transformation would eliminate the self-governing rights and obligations of local chapters. In place of the self-governing chapter Boards, a Community Council would be assembled bringing together volunteers keen to implement specific programmatic or advocacy initiatives. The net result is the chapter becoming a platform for ready-to-implement programs or advocacy initiatives. These ready-to-implement initiatives rely on toolkits developed for ease of local adaptation and implementation

Expand the range of ready-to-implement programs or advocacy initiatives

Build on existing collaboration in the creation and delivery of programs to pool resources to develop more programs and advocacy initiatives which can be replicated in more than one jurisdiction with adaptations for local context. Priority should be afforded to developing programs which include both virtual and in-person modes of delivery as there is a broad consensus view that these approaches are the most promising.

Different program or advocacy initiatives could each be the subject of a supplemental agreement with the leadership of such collective initiatives placed in different branches or in the backbone organization.

The ready-to-implement programs and advocacy initiatives might rely on customizable promotional, programmatic, advocacy materials and toolkits for easy turnkey implementation. Toolkits should be designed for ease of adaptation to local context.

Create a small number of high-level impact metrics

Building on the output and activity level metrics which the CPF Network members generate for use in reports to funders, develop a small number of higher-level metrics to illustrate CPF's strategic impact over the medium- and short-term. Note that higher level impact metrics often do not rely on operating data sources (e.g., budget, website, or program registration data) and require data to be collected for the specific purpose of illustrating higher-level impact (e.g., percentage of CPF participants who continue to use French as a second language five years after high-school graduation compared to those who did not participate in CPF programs). Collaborations with researchers based in academic institutions can serve as one pathway to build capabilities to tell a story of higher-level impact.

Develop leadership training opportunities for executive directors and board leaders

Pool resources to develop leadership training activities for executive directors with a focus on the culture of collaboration and the values required for collective leadership. Develop training activities and onboarding sessions for board members of the National Board and of branch boards.

CONLUSION

Networks are changing at a frenetic pace. These changes reflect dynamic changes in our environment and public demands for greater accountability and transparency from those who exercise power. The ease and velocity with which information can be shared and the ubiquity of the tools of the information age have fueled new approaches to 'being local' for national organizations.

CPF Network leaders share in the pride in what has been accomplished in the last forty years in terms of broader access to FSL education and programming. But more can be done and, to some, more needs to be done.

This report seeks to harness the energy of those who are determined to impact the lives of more young Canadians by introducing them to the gift of a second language. It offers a range of pathways for action which would amplify the impact of Canadian Parents for French. It invites a more external focus and orientation to position CPF to grow revenues and engage more Canadians in its important work.

APPENDIX 1

Canadian Parents for French
Optimizing Opportunities for Collaboration within the CPF Network

Confidential Key Information Interviews Conversation Guide

INTRODUCTION

Having been engaged by Canadian Parents for French, National to guide and facilitate a structured conversation about ways of optimizing collaboration for impact within the CPF Network,

1. I will gather the views of all executive directors and presidents who will be interviewed in pairs. The invitation is reserved to the executive director and president from each CPF entity and may not be extended to others.

2. The conversation will be recorded via Zoom. All information shared with me is strictly confidential and will be available only to me. No identifying comment or data will be released or published in the findings except for a list of acknowledgements which will appear in the report.

3. Should a Zoom meeting not be favored, the interview can be conducted by phone.

4. The semi-structured probes below will be used as a loose guide for our conversation. You are welcome to share this Conversation Guide via email discussion or at an upcoming meeting of your board to solicit views in preparation for your conversation with me.

5. Please do not come to the interview with a scripted series of answers to these probes. The probes will be used as a guide only. I will no doubt have additional questions that will build on your answers or unearth areas for discussion that I may not have anticipated. These unexpected 'gold nuggets' are key to the richness of these confidential interviews.

6. I will be ready to engage with you in conversation in either French, English or in both languages reflecting your own personal preferences.

Thank you for your participation. I look forward to these conversations. Not only as a strategic advisor to charities and philanthropists, but as I am also passionate about Canada's linguistic duality. I grew up in a small town in northern New Brunswick and am proud to be Acadian. These experiences offer me a rich understanding of Canada's diversity, and unique perspectives on the challenge of running national organizations. Sincerely,

Yves

Participant Name:
1. Describe the impact CPF has in the lives of Canadians? What makes you most proud to be part of CPF?
2. What is the greatest benefit CPF stakeholders draw from belonging to a national networked organization? What is the greatest drawback of belonging to a national networked organization?
3. If you were creating CPF today from scratch, how different would its structure for operations and governance be from what it is today?
4. While CPF is sustained by one major funder, it has experienced little growth in paid membership or revenues from other sources in the last ten years. Is this an issue? Why do you think this is the case?
5. Is CPF sufficiently focused externally to reverse this trend and to position itself against new competitors on the scene? Is it sufficiently nimble to get its message across in a cut-throat media and social media environment?
6. There has been much work done to build trust and to engage people in constructive conversations across the network over the past five years. What do you believe has been helpful or successful? How do you believe CPF needs to build on these efforts to deepen collaboration?

7. When you think of efforts to optimize collaboration, how do you envisage more pooling of administrative or programmatic efforts between branches or with national?
 	
      a. Can you imagine sharing staff resources with other Branches or National? If so, in what areas? If not, what are the barriers or obstacles in the way?
 	
      b. Which Branches might be uniquely positioned to lead a program or administrative function on behalf of the whole Network? What unique strengths can your Branch offer to provide leadership to a program or administrative activity on a pan-Canadian basis?
 	
      c. Which activities could you envisage being led by the national office to allow Branches to increase their focus on program and services delivery?

8. How would you describe decision-making at CPF? Is it effective? Are decisions that impact the whole Network made in a timely way? Is there sufficient clarity about who should be involved in these different types of decisions and the role (e.g., input, advise, decide, veto, implement) each should play in each case?
9. Are there issues with compliance within the CPF Network? Are there cases when people pay 'lip service' to collaboration but don't deliver on their share of the bargain? If so, how can this be remedied? Does CPF have the right tools to deal with any potential issues of non-compliance?
10. Do you have any other comments which I have not solicited in the questions above?
Thank you.

APPENDIX 2

Canadian Parents for French
List of Interview Participants

I am grateful to the following individuals who contributed their thoughts, experiences, concerns, and aspirations with me in conversation. This report and any errors it may contain are my own.

On behalf of	Name	Title
British Columbia and Yukon Branch	Nancy Taylor	President
	Alicia Rooney	Interim Executive Director
Alberta Branch	Emma Piayda	President
	Michael Tryon	Executive Director
Northwest Territories Branch	Maggie Hawkes	President
	Michael Tryon	Executive Director
Saskatchewan Branch	Janet Loseth	President
	Karen Pozniak	Executive Director
Manitoba Branch	Michael Hudon	President
	Janet Steinthorson	Executive Director
Ontario Branch	Myron Karpiuk	Vice-President
	Betty Gormley	Executive Director
New Brunswick Branch	Austin Henderson	President
	Allison Davis	Interim Executive Director
Nova Scotia Branch	Kate Ashley	President
	Rebecca Lancaster	Executive Director
Prince Edward Island Branch	Lucie Lamoureux-Newson	Executive Director
Newfoundland and Labrador Branch	Walter Parsons	President
	Lucie Lamoureux-Newson	Executive Director
National Office and Quebec Branch	Derrek Bentley	President
	Nicole Thibault	Executive Director