

Executive Summary of the FDPA  
Evaluation and Ranking of the Nine  
Alberta Political Parties in the 2008  
Alberta General Election

Evaluation and Ranking Summary Completed by The  
Foundation for Democratic Political Advancement  
(March 1, 2008)

Purpose: Determine a ranking of all Alberta (provincial) Political Parties in terms of the better representative of Alberta as a whole.

This determination is an outside perspective to give the residents, candidates, and parties of Alberta a different perspective on the 2008 Alberta General Election. The views in this Pilot Study are the views of the FDPA. Also, the Determination is an example of a different way to select candidates--through evaluation and ranking instead of voting.

The current Alberta political parties are:

PCAlberta

AlbertaLiberal

Alberta's NDP

Wildrose Alliance

Alberta Greens

Alberta Party

Social Credit Party

Communist Party of Alberta

Separation Party of Alberta

\*Note, though some of the political parties are outside of the mainstream Alberta politics, it is important from an objective standpoint, to be open to all ideas and perspectives. Ultimately, the evaluation and ranking results will determine the merit of the political parties.

Also, the FDPA and its members are in no way affiliated with any of the political parties in this pilot study.

The pilot study represents an independent assessment of the Alberta political parties based on objectivity, transparency, and non-partisanship.

## Methodology for Evaluation and Ranking of Political Parties:

Overall: Establish the basic priorities of the Alberta public as a whole, and use those basic priorities to evaluate and rank the political parties.

The basic priorities of the Alberta public as a whole:

Oil and Gas Royalties (fair distribution of royalties so that the industry remains competitive and yet the Alberta public receives the most return.)

Budget (sound, fiscal management of public revenue and expenditure, and fair distribution of government expenditure to all sectors of Alberta.)

Health: (improved and equality of service across Alberta.)

Education: (improved quality of public education.)

Housing: (increased low income housing and stabilization of rent increases.)

Environment: (more responsible, sustainable management of the Alberta environment, and includes environmental impact of the oil and gas industry, and urban sprawl due to population pressure.)

Democracy reform (making the political system more representative of and accountable to the people of Alberta.)

Methodology for Evaluation and Ranking:

Rank each political party for each basic priority, and then rank overall based on a combination of the results for each priority.

The policy sections to be evaluated correspond to the basic priorities: royalty, budget, health, education, housing, environment, and democracy reform.

Evaluate the policies of the political parties in each section based on a comparison of the political parties' policies in light of the basic priorities.

Two evaluation sub-sections will be adopted for each policy section:

Soundness of policy  
and  
Specificness of policy

Soundness sub-section will have a score from 1-15.

Specificness sub-section will have a score of 1-5.

(The different weights reflect the significance of soundness of policy over the specificness of policy. Viz., there is no point overly awarding a specific policy which is unsound.)

**Information sources:**

Media articles and analysis of political parties.

Political parties policy statements, including policy promises.

Relevant questions answered by representatives of the political parties on a need basis.

Evaluation committee comprised of Stephen Garvey, CEO of the FDPA, Simon Brown, member of the FDPA, and Hillary Brown associated with the FDPA. Moreover, Colin McKenzie, an advisor for the FDA, acted as an independent, final reviewer of the evaluation and ranking results.

# Summary of Evaluation and Ranking Results for Policies

# 1. Royalties

## Evaluation analysis:

As mentioned the evaluation is based on a comparison of the parties' policies based on the basic priority for policy section. The basic priority for the royalty section is:

Oil and Gas Royalties (fair distribution of royalties so that the industry remains competitive and yet the Alberta public receives the most return.)

## Summary notes:

1. PCAlberta: Royalty policy either sound or unsound; poor specificness—"until project costs are recovered" is open to interpretation, thereby vague.
2. AlbertaLiberal: Royalty policy either sound or unsound; less specific than PCAlberta.
3. Alberta's NDP: unsound Royalty approach except for proposed examination of Alaska royalty system, and proposed all party royalty commission—but why not Alberta citizen royalty commission? Also, the Alberta's NDP has very vague proposals for royalties.
4. Wildrose party: unsound royalty proposal, because it favors the oil and gas industry over the Alberta people; very specific proposal.
5. Alberta Greens: no policy listed for royalties, and even after inquiring for one via email from the Alberta Greens.
6. Alberta Party: unsound approach to royalties, because the policy does not really say anything, except for keeping the rates the same.
7. Social Credit Party—indeterminate whether or not its proposal is sound—though slightly more coherent than the PCAlberta and AlbertaLiberal's policies. Though vague proposal.
8. Communist Party of Alberta: indeterminate whether policy is sound or unsound; says less than for example the PCAlberta party's policy. Also, policy is not entirely specific.
9. Separation Party of Alberta: no policy listed for royalties, and even after inquiring for one via email.

## Percentage Ranking of Royalty Policy Section:

Note, soundness has three times more weight than specificity.

	<u>Soundness</u>	<u>Specificness</u>	<u>Total</u>
1. PCAlberta	50%	40%	47.5%
2. Social Credit	53.3%	20%	45%
3. Communist Party	33.3%	70%	42.5%
5. Wildrose	6.6%	100%	30%
6. AlbertaLiberal	30%	20%	27.5%
6. Alberta Party	0%	100%	25%
7. Alberta's NDP	6.6%	20%	10%
8. Alberta's Greens	0%	0%	0%
9. Separation Party	0%	0%	0%

## 2. Budget

### Evaluation Analysis:

As mentioned the evaluation is based on a comparison of the parties' policies based on the basic priority for policy section. The basic priority for the Budget section is:

Budget (sound, fiscal management of public revenue and expenditure, and fair distribution of government expenditure to all sectors of Alberta.)

#### Summary notes:

1. PCAlberta: limited in scope and has nothing on fiscal responsibility. Moreover, somewhat vague policy proposal, because it does not say in detail how proposed government expenditure for infrastructure will actually be spent, or where the money is coming from.
2. AlbertaLiberal: limited in scope and says nothing about fiscal responsibility and fairness—same as PCAlberta. Also, policy is more vague than the PCAlberta's policy. Policy lengthy and generally made up a general statements.
3. Alberta's NDP: says very little about the Budget.
4. Wildrose party: Budget policy great in scope and specifics. Covers many areas and has very good ideas about fiscal responsibility.
5. Alberta Greens: says very little about Budget policy, and what it does says it is not coherent in terms of sound, fiscal management and fair distribution.
6. Alberta Party: says very little about Budget policy, and what it does say is incoherent in terms of sound, fiscal management and fair distribution.
7. Social Credit Party: says similar ideas to Wildrose, but not to same extent and specificness. Very good ideas on fiscal responsibility.
8. Communist Party of Alberta: says very little on budget proposal, and what it does say is incoherent in terms of sound, fiscal management and fair distribution.
9. Separation Party of Alberta: makes very good proposals for fiscal responsibility, but the scope of the policy is less the Wildrose and Social Credit. Also, the policy lacks the specificness of the Wildrose policy, and yet the same as the Social Credit.

## Percentage Ranking of Budget Policy Section:

Note, soundness has three times more weight than specificity.

	<u>Soundness</u>	<u>Specificness</u>	<u>Total</u>
1. Wildrose	93.3%	80%	90%
2. Social Credit	50%	50%	50%
3. PCAlberta	43.3%	60%	47.5%
4. Separation Party	43.3%	50%	45%
5. AlbertaLiberal	43.3%	30%	40%
6. Alberta Party	6.6%	20%	10%
6. Alberta's NDP	6.6%	20%	10%
6. Alberta's Greens	6.6%	20%	10%
6. Communist Party	6.6%	20%	10%

### 3. Health

#### Evaluation Analysis:

As mentioned the evaluation is based on a comparison of the parties' policies based on the basic priority for policy section. The basic priority for the Health section is:

Health: (improved and equality of service across Alberta.)

#### Summary notes:

1. PCAlberta: policy lacks scope, but specific in most proposals. Addresses equality of health service.
2. AlbertaLiberal: greater scope than the PCAlberta health policy platform, and more specific. Addresses inequality of health service and proposes improvement through expansion in most sectors of the health service.
3. Alberta's NDP: less scope and soundness than PCAlberta and AlbertaLiberal in addressing equality of service and improvement of it. Less specific than the AlbertaLiberal.
4. Wildrose party: most scope in addressing the improvement and equality of health service, and yet it is unclear whether or not the policy is fiscally sound. Very specific proposals.
5. Alberta Greens: addresses some of the equality of service issues and makes general proposals, but lacks the scope, soundness, and specificity of the PCAlberta or Wildrose.
6. Alberta Party: says very little—incoherent policy with minimal specific.
7. Social Credit Party: says less than the Wildrose—though similar policy proposal, and less specifics than the Wildrose.
8. Communist Party of Alberta: says very little; generally incoherent policy proposal.
9. Separation Party of Alberta: very coherent policy proposal with very good scope and ideas. Also, the specifics for a non-incumbent party are very good.

## Percentage Ranking of Health Policy Section:

Note, soundness has three times more weight than specificity.

	<u>Soundness</u>	<u>Specificness</u>	<u>Total</u>
1. Separation Party	80%	80%	80%
2. Alberta Liberal	73.3%	80%	75%
3. Wildrose	60%	100%	70%
4. Alberta's NDP	66.6%	60%	65%
5. PC Alberta	60%	60%	60%
6. Social Credit	46.6%	60%	50%
7. Alberta Greens	20%	20%	20%
8. Alberta's Party	6.6%	20%	10%
8. Communist Party	6.6%	20%	10%

## 4. Education

### Evaluation Analysis:

As mentioned the evaluation is based on a comparison of the parties' policies based on the basic priority for policy section. The basic priority for the Education section is:

Education: (improved quality of public education.)

#### Summary notes:

1. PCAlberta: narrow policy proposal; only deals with infrastructure and spaces; past tense expenditure; no future vision.
2. AlbertaLiberal: encompassing the Alberta education needs; policy covers lots of areas; though not as specific as PCAlberta proposal.
3. Alberta's NDP: good ideas on education, and not as encompassing and specific as the AlbertaLiberals.
4. Wildrose party: comprehensive education proposal; it focuses on improvement; clearly Wildrose has paid attention to the issues, and addressed them apart from infrastructure needs. Very specific proposal, though does not show where funding comes from and in what amount.
5. Alberta Greens: no depth to policy—only a few items, and very vague.
6. Alberta Party: lacks even less depth than Alberta Greens' education policy; lacks specifics.
7. Social Credit Party: narrow proposal, which is pushing the conservative-Christian ideology of the Social Credit, instead of constructively improving the system. Alberta's NDP more broader proposal. And less specific than Wildrose's education policy.
8. Communist Party of Alberta: biased to lower income level, and does not appear to be sustainable. Also, the policy is very vague.
9. Separation Party of Alberta: policy broader than the Social Credit's policy, but the same as the NDP's. Both vague and specific in areas, hence given 50% score for specificness.

## Percentage Ranking of Education Policy Section:

Note, soundness has three times more weight than specificity.

	<u>Soundness</u>	<u>Specificness</u>	<u>Total</u>
1. Wildrose	86.6%	80%	85%
2. Alberta Liberal	73.3%	60%	70%
3. PC Alberta	53.3%	80%	60%
4. Alberta's NDP	60%	50%	57.5%
4. Separation Party	60%	50%	57.5%
5. Social Credit	53.3%	60%	55%
6. Alberta Greens	26.6%	20%	25%
6. Communist Party	26.6%	20%	25%
6. Alberta Party	6.6%	20%	10%

## 5. Housing

### Evaluation Analysis:

As mentioned the evaluation is based on a comparison of the parties' policies based on the basic priority for policy section. The basic priority for the Housing section is:

Housing: (increased low income housing and stabilization of rent increases.)

#### Summary notes:

1. PCAlberta: not accepting the provincial government's responsibility for the housing crisis, and it does not deal with them like homelessness and high rent prices. Some specifics.
2. AlbertaLiberal: comprehensive policy proposal with good ideas on dealing with housing crisis, and realization of provincial government's responsibility for dealing with the crisis. Very specific.
3. Alberta's NDP: very limited. No mention of homelessness, and does not put cap on rent increases. Specific in what it proposes, though could be more specific.
4. Wildrose party: no concrete housing policy, similar to the NDP, and policy itself is not specific.
5. Alberta Greens: does not put cap on rent increases, and makes no concrete proposal to deal with the housing crisis. Very vague and more so than the PCAlberta and Wildrose, and the policy is incoherent.
6. Alberta Party: no policy on housing.
7. Social Credit Party: no cap on rent increases, and not comprehensive, and very vague.
8. Communist Party of Alberta: comprehensive by covering main areas of the housing crisis. Though the policy is vague.
9. Separation Party of Alberta: not comprehensive, and very vague.

### Percentage Ranking of Housing Policy Section:

Note, soundness has three times more weight than specificity.

	<u>Soundness</u>	<u>Specificity</u>	<u>Total</u>
1. Alberta Liberal	80%	80%	85%
2. Communist Party	46.6%	40%	60%
3. PC Alberta	40%	40%	40%
3. Alberta's NDP	33.3%	60%	40%
3. Wildrose	40%	40%	40%
4. Alberta Greens	20%	20%	20%
4. Social Credit	20%	20%	20%
5. Separation Party	13.3%	20%	15%
6. Alberta Party	0%	0%	0%

## 6. Environment

### Evaluation Analysis:

As mentioned the evaluation is based on a comparison of the parties' policies based on the basic priority for policy section. The basic priority for the Environment section is:

Environment: (more responsible, sustainable management of the Alberta environment.)

#### Summary notes:

1. PCAlberta: not comprehensive, and does not do enough for the environmental issues. For example, it has no policy on the environment pertaining to the oil and gas sector or urban sprawl.
2. AlbertaLiberal: no policy on oil and gas sector or urban sprawl. Though specific proposal.
3. Alberta's NDP: touches on core environmental issues, and some aspects vague and others specific.
4. Wildrose party: no policy on greenhouse gas emission controls or oil and gas sector, and urban sprawl. Though policy more comprehensive than the PCAlberta, and policy lacks specifics.
5. Alberta Greens: lacks any comprehensiveness, and very vague.
6. Alberta Party: like the Greens, policy lacks any comprehensiveness and very vague.
7. Social Credit Party: less comprehensive than PCAlberta and Wildrose, and no policy on oil and gas sector, urban sprawl, and greenhouse gas emission. Vague proposal.
8. Communist Party of Alberta: narrow policy proposal Though it identifies the importance of cleanup and corporate accountability. Vague policy.
9. Separation Party of Alberta: not comprehensive, and very vague.

## Percentage Ranking of Environment Policy Section:

Note, soundness has three times more weight than specificity.

	<u>Soundness</u>	<u>Specificness</u>	<u>Total</u>
1. Alberta's NDP	80%	60%	75%
2. Alberta Liberal	66.6%	80%	70%
3. Wildrose	53.3%	60%	55%
4. PC Alberta	46.6%	60%	50%
5. Social Credit	33.3%	40%	35%
6 Separation Party	20%	20%	24%
7. Communist Party	13.3%	20%	15%
8. Alberta Greens	6.6%	20%	10%
8. Alberta Party	6.6%	20%	10%

## 7. Democracy Reform

### Evaluation Analysis:

As mentioned the evaluation is based on a comparison of the parties' policies based on the basic priority for policy section. The basic priority for the Democracy reform section is:

Democracy reform (making the political system more representative of and accountable to the people of Alberta.)

#### Summary notes:

1. PCAlberta: no policy on democracy reform, even after asking for one via email. No response to email.
2. AlbertaLiberal: comprehensive though nothing on empowering the Alberta citizens. Specific proposal.
3. Alberta's NDP: touches in only democracy issue. Specific proposal.
4. Wildrose party: close to AlbertaLiberal's in comprehensiveness, and very specific.
5. Alberta Greens: not entirely coherent proposal, and lacks the comprehensiveness of Wildrose's proposal, and very vague.
6. Alberta Party: addresses four points on empowering the Alberta citizen, but does not say anything else. Very vague.
7. Social Credit Party: comprehensive proposal, with many good ideas. Very specific and says similar ideas to Wildrose, but not to same extent and specificity. Very good ideas on fiscal responsibility.
8. Communist Party of Alberta: narrow proposal with only one valid idea, and very vague.
9. Separation Party of Alberta: comprehensive proposal though not as much as Social Credit's policy, and not as specific as Social Credit but more so than Alberta's Liberal.

## Percentage Ranking of Democracy reform Policy Section:

Note, soundness has three times more weight than specificness.

	<u>Soundness</u>	<u>Specificness</u>	<u>Total</u>
1. Social Credit	86.6%	100%	90%
2. Separation Party	80%	80%	80%
3. Alberta's Liberal	80%	60%	75%
3. Wildrose	73.3%	100%	75%
4. Alberta Party	66.6%	20%	55%
4. Alberta's Greens	53.3%	60%	55%
5. Alberta's NDP	26.6%	60%	35%
6. Communist Party	20%	20%	25%
7. PCAlberta	0%	0%	0%

## Overall Ranking of Alberta Political Parties:

Combine the percentage scores in each section "Royalties, Budget, Health, Education, Housing, Environment, and Democracy reform," and total (giving equal weight to each section), and divide by seven, to get the average percentage score for each party.

Highest percentage score determines highest ranking and top evaluated political party.

	<b>Royalt.</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Health</b>	<b>Edu.</b>	<b>Hous.</b>	<b>Envir.</b>	<b>Dem.</b>	<b>Totals</b>	
PCAlberta	47.5%	47.5%	60%	60%	40%	50%	0%	305%	43.6%
AlbertaLiberal	27.5%	40%	75%	70%	85%	70%	75%	442.5%	63.2%
Alberta's NDP	10%	10%	65%	57.5%	40%	75%	35%	292.5%	41.8%
Wildrose	30%	90%	70%	85%	40%	55%	75%	445%	63.5%
Alberta Greens	0%	10%	20%	25%	20%	10%	55%	140%	20%
Alberta Party	25%	10%	10%	10%	0%	10%	55%	120%	17.1%
Social Credit	45%	50%	50%	55%	20%	35%	90%	345%	49.3%
Communist	42.5%	10%	10%	25%	60%	15%	25%	187.5%	26.8%
Separation	0%	45%	80%	57.5%	15%	24%	80%	301.5%	43.1%

## Overall Ranking:

1. Wildrose Alliance (63.5%)
2. Alberta Liberals (63.2%)
3. Social Credit (49.3%)
4. PC Alberta (43.6%)
5. Separation Party (43.1%)
6. Alberta's NDP (41.8%)
7. Communist Party (26.8%)
8. Alberta's Greens (20%)
9. Alberta Party (17.1%)

## Analysis of Overall Ranking of Political Parties:

Though Wildrose Alliance is ranked number one, the difference between AlbertaLiberals is very insignificant (i.e. .2%). Therefore, Wildrose Alliance and AlbertaLiberals are virtually tied in this evaluation and ranking.

However, to distinguish Wildrose Alliance and AlbertaLiberals, or in any other scenario in which parties are tied or near tied, we recommend examining their results for the budget section. The Budget in our opinion is the most significant policy section, because budget expenditure is the financial basis for all policy sections.

To factor Budget Policy scores in, we double their weight and add them to the overall percentage for all policies.

	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Overall Score</u>	<u>Adjusted Overall Score</u>
Wildrose Alliance:	90%	445% (63.5%)	535% (66.9%)
AlbertaLiberals:	40%	442.5% (63.2%)	482.5% (60.3%)

Adjusted overall score:

1. Wildrose Alliance (66.9%)
2. AlbertaLiberals (60.3%)

There are three tiers to the ranking:

1. Wildrose Alliance and AlbertaLiberals (over 10% difference to nearest other party).
2. Social Credit Party, PCAlberta, Separation Party and Alberta's NDP are grouped within 7.5% of each other.
3. Communist Party, Alberta's Greens, and Alberta Party are over 10% away from the second tier group, and within 10% of each other.

Limitation to report: the riding representative of the top ranked political party may not be the better representative for a particular riding.

Though in cases where the candidates are close in a particular riding, the top ranked political party should prevail, assuming the difference with second ranked political party,

for instance, is significant. Viz., two parties that are ranked very close in actual numbers, would leave it open as to which party would prevail in a particular riding that was close.

The report will take on greater meaning in the next general election by holding the successful party accountable for their policies and promises.

Note, video of the evaluation committee working on health policies can be viewed at:

[http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Or\\_c-2NhuBY](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Or_c-2NhuBY)

Video of the evaluation committee working on environmental policies can be viewed at:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AVKzayMxjoQ>

## Assessment of Evaluation and Ranking Report:

The evaluation and ranking report is limited to the policies of the political parties. In subsequent reports, the evaluation and ranking could include an evaluation and ranking of the political leaders of the parties, and the parties themselves in terms of their background, political experience, membership etc.,

The committee, which was limited to four persons, could be expanded to eight persons.

Also, three or more committees, independent of each other, could be formed, and their results compared to determine an overall ranking. Three or more independent committees would help minimize human error. Moreover, public feedback before finalizing results may be helpful to get the most accurate result.

The evaluation committee would likely function better with the use of a blackboard to keep track of the scores each political party receives.

The evaluation committee should keep better record of all correspondence with political parties, so that all correspondence is displayed in the Full Evaluation and Ranking Report.