

Chapter 1
GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Working Group Members: Rindy Crampton
Terry Weninger
Carole Whitmer
Sylvia Fowler

INTRODUCTION

The governance of the College is primarily determined by the College and Institute Act. Historically, colleges and institutes were governed by their respective Boards with power assigned by legislation. In 1996 the College and Institute Act was amended and powers before vested solely in the Board, were given to an Education Council.

It is recognized that there are other sections to the College and Institute Act, as well as other legislation that have an impact on the Board, Education Council and the operation of the College. However, the College Board powers and responsibilities are found primarily in Section 19 of Chapter 52, Part 4, of the Act; the powers and responsibilities of Education Council are found in Section 24 of the same Chapter.

With two legislated governance bodies, Working Group 1 divided its task into two subcommittees - Governance, College Board; and Governance, Education Council.

A. GOVERNANCE, COLLEGE BOARD

Role of the Board

The legislated role of the Board is found in various sections of the College and Institute Act. Section 19 outlines the powers and responsibilities. Also under Section 35, the Board is directed to appoint

“a president who is the Chief Executive Officer and who must under the directions of the Board, supervise and direct the institutional, administrative, and other staff of the institution and exercise powers and perform duties assigned to him or her by the Board.”

The Board, in fulfilling its role, has developed by-laws and policies. The by-laws provide direction to the Board for the conduct of its business and conduct of individual members.

The policies provide specific direction on how the Board executes its role and responsibilities. The policies that apply to the role of the Board are:

- Policy #1.0 College of New Caledonia Board Responsibilities
- Policy #3.0 College of New Caledonia Goals (short and long term reviewed annually)
- Policy #5.0 Monitoring Executive Performance - President

A copy of the College and Institute Act, Board By-laws and Board Policies are attached as Appendices A, B, & C.

In summary, the College Board has delegated the appropriate authority to the President in order to carry out the responsibilities found in the College and Institute Act. The Board provides direction by establishing short and long term goals that are reviewed annually. The Board also monitors the performance of the President against progress made in fulfilling the short and long term goals.

The Board has a standing committee on Presidential Performance that meets with the President on a monthly basis. Also, progress on the goals is formally presented to the Board at mid term (February meeting). Additionally, in fulfilling its fiduciary responsibilities the Board has a Finance Committee. The Finance Committee is responsible to monitor financial aspects of the operations of the College. Appendix D outlines the mandate of the Finance Committee which also meets monthly.

The other committee of the Board is the Committee of the Whole. This Committee meets monthly and is established to cover a wide range of topics and to direct the Board and Administration in the preparation of policy position and Board agenda items.

Board Policies

The stated purposes for the Board are outlined in the Board Policies (Appendix C) and are reviewed annually. This annual review process complies with one of the policy statements.

Board Planning, Progress, and Review Initiatives

Board planning and review occurs on an annual basis. The process includes an assessment of the previous year's goals, data indicating relevant indicators and trends throughout the institution and determining the goals for the upcoming year. Progress on the goals is reviewed semi-annually as well other progress reports.

For the purposes of this Institutional Self-Study the progress on planning and review initiatives will be examined from 1995 to the present. At the Board Retreat in August of 1995, the Goals for the College Board (1994 - 1995) were reviewed, and current issues and the development of policy were discussed. A revised policy format was developed which resulted in policy statements that reflected the College Goals for 1995/96 as determined by the College Board. Included in Policy 3.0: College Goals is the theme, specific goals and strategies to achieve these goals. The major themes identified for

1995/96 were: Education, Community Involvement, Internal and Labour Relations, Students, and Funding. Board Committees (including senior administration) were created based upon the identified themes. The committees met monthly and progress reports were included in the public session of each Board meeting. Reports by the President were also included.

Prior to the subsequent retreat in November of 1996, an evaluation (Appendix E) was completed by Board members to assess the awareness of the Board, as a collective, of the goals and the progress being made in implementing the goals. The following questions resulted:

Were five goals too ambitious for a Board this size?

How can real Board ownership be created in each goal if there are too many?

What is the role of the Board?

The planning session in November 1996 was unique in that a panel presentation with representation from the Student Association, Education Council, Support Staff and the Faculty Association attended part of the Board retreat. These representatives provided their perspectives on the major issues and challenges facing the College and any suggestions for the Board to address these issues and challenges. Based upon the review of the 1995/96 goals and the input provided by the panel presentations and discussions, the Board identified additional strategies to each of the goals framework of 1995/96 with an additional goal on “Student Centeredness” resulting in 1997 College Goals. The policy development format was reviewed, changes were implemented, and the respective goal committees were responsible for implementation of the additional strategies.

In response to *Charting a New Course*, in January 1997, the College Board invited Kathy Conroy, a member of the “College and Institute Strategic Plan Provincial Table” to make a presentation providing an overview of the Strategic Plan. The College Board then embarked on the task of receiving input on the Mission and Goals of the College from community members and constituent groups and members from around the College region. In March 1997 to October 1997, the Education Goals Committee engaged in a consultation process which included 10 focus groups from the external community as well as the internal college community. The results of these focus groups and a discussion of the Committee of the Whole of the Board in January 1998 produced the Education Goals document approved by the Board in March 1998. This document outlined specific action items to implement the needs identified by the consultation process. The theme areas are: Quality, Relevancy, Vision, Cooperation/Coordination, and Accountability. Although a specific Board Retreat was not held in 1997, the development of the Education Goals clearly resulted from goal progress and review, community consultation, Board discussion and planning.

During this time, a feeling was evolving that there needed to be more ownership of goals by the whole Board and not just by the individual committees. The Committee of the Whole was developed in November 1997 which allowed discussion of the entire Board,

outside of public and private sessions to accommodate increased knowledge and ownership of all issues for all Board members.

After discussions by Board members and the President it was determined that the Board retreat should be held in June to better accommodate institutional planning. The 1998/1999 Board Annual Action Plan (Appendix F) was developed at the Board Retreat in June 1998. The goals from 1996/97 were reviewed, presentations were made by constituent group members and the issues facing the college were discussed. Two paramount themes were identified: “communication” and “student focus”. The policy format was revisited again and resulted in an improved format. The major issues identified were: implementation of the Education Goals, financial/insufficient funds, role of the board, student focus, and a healthy atmosphere. For each issue a specific goal was identified and included: the issue, the goal, responsibility, implementation plan (including time lines and progress report dates), activities, effects on students and other information.

In November of 1998, a report (Appendix G) was submitted to the Board outlining progress on the strategies developed to meet the goals as outlined in *Charting a New Course*.

In February of 1999, the Board reviewed the progress being made to fulfill the 1998/99 Action Plan. The report included progress (Appendix H) on the 11 action items included in the Education Goals and the four other Board goal areas. Included, as well, were progress goal reports by the President and President’s Advisory Group (PAC), Vice-President Academic and Educational Administrative Team (EAT), Vice-President Administration, Director of Student Services, Director of Community and Continuing Education, and Associate Director of Resource Center.

At the Board Retreat in June of 1999, the Board will examine the Board policies and long and short term direction for the College.

Board Operations; Improvements

Currently there is not a formal process to determine the effectiveness of the actual functioning of the Board, other than the annual review/planning sessions. In the past, we had an evaluation of each meeting but found this was not really an effective method of operating the operations of the Board. There is regular informal evaluation of the operations and a willingness to discuss and try different procedures.

The Board has instituted many changes to its operations in the past several years as part of an evolving process. Examples include:

- a) a formal agenda committee consisting of the Chair, Vice Chairs, President and input from PAC, instead of only the President and the Chair,

- b) formation of the Committee of the Whole to accommodate more in-depth discussion of issues and broader involvement of all Board members instead of several smaller committees who often worked somewhat in isolation,
- c) a Board member as a member of the College Bargaining team,
- d) constituent representation at Retreat planning session to ensure stakeholder consultation in development of Board goals,
- e) a calendar of College events reviewed monthly to assign Board member(s) to attend to ensure representation and involvement by the Board,
- f) development of an improved Presidential evaluation process,
- g) Relationship by Objectives (RBO) - to improve labour relations within the institution after a labour dispute in 1995,
- h) annual employee appreciation function sponsored by the Board,
- i) staff Christmas in the Atrium social function,
- j) letters of congratulation to recognize employee achievements,
- k) development of a standard presentation format for the Board package.

Board Initiatives/College Operations

Examples of Board initiatives which resulted in direct effects on College Operations are:

- a) budgetary support for the development of International Education programs,
- b) development of a Community and Continuing Education Division in Prince George,
- c) building of the Student Residence,
- d) decision to operate in a deficit budget position rather than eliminate any educational programs.

Address Questions Provided by Provincial Institutional Evaluation Subcommittee

It is the opinion of the Governance: Board Working Group that the relevant questions are addressed in the body of the report or in the recommendations. A summary of responses to SCOEA's Criteria is included. (Appendix I)

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based upon the Self-Study review process and are intended to improve the Board of Governors' operations.

Recommendation 1.1: Receive the recommendations from all of the Self-Study working groups and develop a work plan which includes implementation strategies, responsibilities, time lines and progress reports.

Recommendation 1.2: Development of a Board Operations evaluation.

Recommendation 1.3: Formal succession planning for Board members.

Recommendation 1.4: Ensure Board member representation at Education Council.

Recommendation 1.5: Mentorship of new Board members.

Recommendation 1.6: Develop an evaluation process for the Board retreat.

Recommendation 1.7: Develop Critical Success Factors for CNC.

Recommendation 1.8: Standardize the format for Board direction to Administration.

Recommendation 1.9: Improve the process that the Board receives information on relevant trends and indicators.

Recommendation 1.10: Periodically review the legislation and the extent to which the Board is fulfilling its roles and responsibilities.

List of references/supporting material:

Appendix A - College and Institute Act

Appendix B - Board By-Laws

Appendix C - Board Policies

Appendix D - Finance Committee Mandate

Appendix E - Evaluation Tool - November 1996

Appendix F - 1998/1999 Board Annual Action Plan

Appendix G - Progress Report on Implementing "Charting a New Course"

Appendix H - Progress on Board Annual Action Plan - 1998/99

Appendix I - Responses to SCOEA's Criteria

A. GOVERNANCE, EDUCATION COUNCIL

Introduction

A. History of Education Council

The history of Education Council at the College of New Caledonia starts before the formation of this present governance body. On January 19, 1991 the College Board passed a motion (#91.12) “establishing an Academic Council subject to the Terms of Reference dated January 10, 1991, for a period of not less than two years”. This Academic Council subsequently formed standing committees, such as Admissions Committee and Program Committees, which were seen as integral parts of this body with substantial responsibilities. The main aim of this organization was to provide avenues for consultation between all parties. At that time, the climate of our College was open to this type of organizational structure for there were significant senior administration changes and an enthusiastic movement within the faculty to have a say in the workings of the College. Much credit for the concept of this council should be given to representatives of the Faculty Association, Support Staff (PPWC) and the President. Academic Council and its committee structure functioned well until Bill 22 was implemented at the beginning of April 1995. This legislation, College and Institute Amendment Act, 1994, established Education Councils, so at CNC, the Academic Council was to be known as Education Council. Most of the structures of CNC Academic Council were retained but some aspects of the membership, such as the ‘provision for a Board member to be a non-voting member of Education Council’ (Board package Bill 22 Implementation-Education Council February 2, 1999) were changed. The newly created Education Council fulfilled the legislated composition, duties, etc. as stated in the College and Institute Amendment Act, 1994.

Education Council has been fulfilling its role at this College since April 1995. The niche in the governance of CNC that this body fills is that of evaluation and acceptance of matters educational in nature. This council has been legislated to and accepting of the responsibility for ‘educational values’ at the College. It has divorced itself from budgetary or financial matters as interpreted from the College and Institute Act, now Chapter 52. The procedures and activities of our Education Council reflect the educational concerns of members and the college community in general.

B. History of Self Evaluation

The history of self-evaluation of Education Council and its predecessor, Academic Council, has also been as long as the existence of these organizations, although not specifically noted as such. The exercise of evaluating processes and procedures has been carried out under different names and for different designated reasons. ‘Changes as needed’ have resulted from activities such as reviewing procedures and processes to write Education Council Guidelines, developing and rewriting handbooks, and writing Bylaws. There was no predetermined schedule of these activities to date.

The CNC Education Council Bylaws were a requirement of the Ministry (Bill 22) and were approved and accepted by such in February 1997. To establish these Bylaws, a committee was formed and met frequently. During these meetings there was much

discussion on the workings of Education Council, its mandate, and its role in the college community, so in a way this was an informal evaluation, as well as establishing rules and guidelines for our Education Council.

Most years since January 10, 1991 members or committees of Academic Council and Education Council have met to review and revise the Handbook. Dates of these activities are indicated by the printing of the Handbooks:

Academic Council Handbook	1991 & 1992
Academic Council Handbook	1992 & 1993
Academic Council Handbook	1993 & 1994
College of New Caledonia Information & Guidelines	Sept 1995
College of New Caledonia Education Council Handbook	1996
CNC Education Council Handbook	Revised 1998

The Handbook writing exercise (Academic Council) and the subsequent Handbook reviews for the purpose of updating the book (Academic Council & Education Council) were performed by committees. These committees met many times to formulate guidelines for the smooth functioning of Education Council. These committees were sensitive to the needs of the council and the college community so in the act of reviewing the Handbook for needed changes, etc. these groups also performed duties which could be broadly described as an evaluation.

Since the beginning, both Academic Council and Education Council have tried to clarify their roles, mandate, and responsibilities and establish processes and procedures that, when published, were available to all. Such information has been collected and housed in our Handbook. Although evaluation criteria are not stated as such, measurable reference points have been determined at times by interpreting and adjudicating this document. So until now, CNC Education Council has not undertaken a formal evaluation review but it has a history of introspection, subsequent adjustments and significant change(s) when precipitated by validated observations through various activities. Certainly a “culture of evaluation” has prevailed for many years to facilitate improvements of our Education Council.

Education Council Planning

C. Education Council

In earlier times, the establishment of Guidelines, Handbook, and Bylaws promoted activities that were more 'proactive' in nature so one could say that planning was a vital part of Education Council. However, the Education Council, at least the group of constituency members that are appointed or elected and meet monthly, has appeared to be primarily 'reactive' in the past few years. It has been responsive to items and submissions that have been put forward but it has not been the originator of much activity and/or planning. Schedules of upcoming Academic years do come to Education Council and some discussion may arise, but this is mainly a review and verification process. Schedules for Program Reviews also are established through Education Council, but again this is often only a formality as a sequence or rotation of such and is ongoing. Through a recommendation of the Spring 1999 Review, it is hoped that the establishment and review of annual Goals & Objectives will provide a basis for future planning.

Recommendation 1.11: Education Council annually set and review formalized and published Goals and Objectives.

The format and presentation of the Spring 1999 Review may signal a shift in attitude and activities that will facilitate more planning in the future as far as review of progress on recommendations at a later date will provide for an organized basis for planning. This report, through these recommendations, strongly suggests elements of planning that are more 'proactive'.

Recommendation 1.12: Education Council establish an Orientation Process for newly elected and appointed members.

Recommendation 1.13: Education Council improve communication with the following stakeholders:

- a Students
- b Program Committees
- c OMC (Operational Managers' Committee)
- d Faculty in general

Standing Committees of Education Council, such as Program Committees, have been and are 'proactive' in nature. Planning is a major activity of these groups, for example new course and new program submissions. The role of these committees will not change in the future but the methodology of planning is individual and independent for each group.

D. Budget Planning

At present there is no evidence of results of an Education Council review, such as the Self Evaluation, May 1999 being used in budget development as this topic was not analyzed. Our Education Council has no direct input into the development of the CNC Budget but over time a process of review and information sharing has been established. Budget Assumptions are presented to Education Council, as well as reports during the developmental phases of the Budget. Our Education Council, through interpretation of the legislation, Bill 22, has determined that our area of authority and advisory role should focus on educational matters and not financial ones, so budgetary reports from the administration are for information only (FYI).

E. Institutional Planning

The involvement of Education Council in institutional planning was reviewed during the study of Education Council's mandate and our relationship with the CNC Board. An arrangement which facilitates communication and involvement in the planning process is the representation of Education Council and the Board at each table, i.e.: the Education Council Chair serves as a non-voting member of the Board and a Board representative attends Education Council.

Education Council has the mandate under the Powers of the Education Council section 24, (1) & (2) of the College and Institute Act to deal with many matters which effect students and are educational concerns, i.e.: set policies concerning exams, set policies concerning student withdrawal, set criteria for academic standing, set curriculum content for the course, etc. All these legislated responsibilities influence the planning within the institution. Also, the formation of new Education Council standing committees, such as new Program Committees, facilitate the work of developing new courses and programs (i.e.: Wood Technology Program Committee) at CNC.

Many issues that fall within the Advisory role of the Education Council, Section 23 (1) to (4) of the College and Institute Act, Chapter 52, also illustrate how Education Council is involved in institutional planning. Curriculum content falls within the jurisdiction of Education Council but Admission & Selection Criteria for courses and programs leading to certificates are brought forward to the Board by Education Council in an advisory capacity. Program Reviews come to Education Council and then are subsequently carried to the Board. Through the Education Council Self Evaluation study, Spring 1999, a concern surfaced about the responsibility and need to monitor and adjudicate the results and implementation plans put forward in a Program Review so this may be an issue for further consideration in the coming year (Goals & Objectives of Education Council or Annual Evaluation). A quarterly report of Continuing Education courses is presented to Education Council. Prioritization of Locally Initiated Curriculum Projects (LIC) are set by a committee of Education Council (including the Vice President Academic), presented to Education Council and then forwarded to Centre for Curriculum, Transfer and Technology (C2T2). "Letters of Intent" are presented to Education Council and if necessary are prioritized before submission by Education Council to the Board and then the Ministry.

The involvement of Education Council in the institutional planning is complex and often subtle. Although the acceptance of educational merit of a new course or program by Education Council in no way guarantees the presentation of the course or program at CNC, once financial/budgetary obstacles are satisfied and the course or program falls within the established Board direction for the College, then the course or program usually proceeds.

The Education Council Self Evaluation exercise, Spring 1999, did not recommend any need for changes to the involvement of and/or protocol for Education Council's activities and participation in institutional planning.

Review Initiatives

F. Spring 1999 Review

This spring Education Council undertook a self study or review which was completed by an Education Council committee. The Task Force was established by a motion at the February 1999 meeting and was given instructions to present a final report in May of the same year. Since this was a self study, the final report was addressed to the CNC Education Council but was available to all stakeholders and interested parties.

The purpose of this review was to evaluate operations; processes and procedures; roles; mandate; and communications of Education Council for its improvement and renewal. This review was conducted independently of SCOEA's Guidelines and therefore shows only some aspects of the presently prescribed Annual and Periodic Reviews (see Institutional Review, Guidelines by SCOEA). However, it did attest to the development of an institutional 'culture of evaluation' which is meant to facilitate improvement and renewal of areas within CNC.

The methodology, established for this review only, was to ask pertinent questions, attempt to answer these questions using data and measurable criteria and then formulate recommendations facilitating needed changes. It was determined that the main focus of the evaluation should centre on such questions as "Is Education Council functioning effectively as an operational unit?", "Is Education Council fulfilling parameters (ie. Goals & Objectives)?", and "How well is Education Council communicating with stakeholders?" The scope of the review was adjusted to fit the timeframe of about two months so not all topics were investigated to the fullest. The final report with Recommendations, Suggestions and Responsibilities was presented to Education Council as a whole on May 18, 1999 for acceptance and subsequent action (Appendix G).

Data was collected and adjudicated in many ways. More concrete or operational circumstances, such as evaluation of meetings, Bylaws, and legislative mandate, were carried out by reviewing Minutes of Meetings, Bylaws, legislation, Bill 22 or College and Institute Act Chapter 52. The analysis of this data lead to only one recommendation specific to Education Council. Other areas of investigation, for example effectiveness of communications, required information from and discussion with other stakeholders and

participants such as a student representative, Vice President Academic, submission presenters, and the College community in general. One facilitated Focus Group was held with Program Committee Chairs. Midway through the process, all members of Education Council were given an opportunity to participate in this evaluation when the Task Force presented an Interim Report on CNC Education Council Evaluation (April 1999). Comments and input were used by the Task Force to adjust and formulate other recommendations. It should be noted that the Task Force discussed the use of surveys, other focus groups, and solicited comments or interviews as appropriate methods of data collection for some topics but due to the limited time decided to forego these options. However, the Task Force saw value in these methods and would recommend such investigative options to Education Council in the coming years.

After applying these investigative strategies to the evaluation, the Task Force concluded that Education Council at CNC is functioning well. There are a few areas of concern, however, that need various degrees of improvement so the Task Force presented to Education Council recommendations and suggestions for consideration.

G. Annual Reviews

SCOEA's Institutional Evaluation plan suggests that the purpose of an annual review is to promote 'continuous monitoring and adjustment'. The three aspects of the review are 'measurement of institutional critical success factors, examination of indicators and trends, and the review of previous recommendations'. At the moment we at CNC have a difficulty because critical success factors are dependent on an institutional strategic plan and we, at this time, do not have such a formulated plan. The Task Force established to carry out a self-study in the Spring of 1999 did offer some advice, formulated recommendations and gave suggestions regarding subsequent annual reviews.

A major suggestion of the Self-Evaluation of Education Council Spring 1999 was in regard to Annual Reviews:

Suggestion:

A Standing Committee of Education Council on evaluation be established to conduct annual reviews of Education Council.

Responsibility:

The Chair will assure the formation of a Standing Committee for Evaluation. This Standing Committee will assume the responsibility to develop a process and carry out an Annual Review of Education Council.

The Task Force responsible for the Spring 1999 review felt that the scope, methodology, data collection and criteria for subsequent yearly reviews be determined by the committee established in the fall of each year responsible for a final report to Education Council in the spring of the same academic year. The Task Force does recommend that SCOEA's

criteria, etc. be followed as appropriate, that other pertinent problems be addressed and that recommendations be forwarded to Education Council for action that may bring about 'changes as needed'. A format for annual reviews should be established, however allowing for variations each year as needs arise. There was one major recommendation from the Spring 1999 Task Force that would give specific direction to upcoming annual reviews. The recommendation to incorporate in all annual reviews in subsequent years, measurable parameters such as Goals & Objectives for Education Council.

Recommendation 1.11: Education Council annually set and review formalized and published Goals & Objectives.

Suggestions:

- i The establishment of Goals & Objectives take place at the first meeting of Education Council each academic year.
- ii A review of annual Goals & Objectives be part of the April meeting of Education Council each year.

Responsibility:

The entire Education Council is responsible to participate in the discussion and review of previously set Goals & Objectives, as well as formulate new Goals & Objectives for the coming year.

These Suggestions, Recommendations and the general body of the final report may give direction to upcoming committees established to carry out an annual review. Besides these, supporting documents, detailed notes and 'minutes' of Task Force meetings are on file with the Recording Secretary to aid those assigned with the task of annually evaluating Education Council for the purpose of monitoring and adjusting activities and conditions and understanding ongoing operations and results. The selection of appropriate indicators and trends dealing with educational programs and services (ie Institutional KPIs, institutional Student Outcomes data, program and education services reviews) should be the decision of the committee formed for each annual review. However, such decisions should be based on the College's strategic plan (yet to be determined), the role of Education Council in the institution, the internal concerns of Education Council, and the perception of Education council within the college community at that time. It is suggested that a review of Annual Goals & Objectives be undertaken at the April meeting of each academic year as an evaluation tool and that the Recommendations, Suggestions, and Responsibilities section of the previous year's report be evaluated at some time during an annual review.

C. Periodic Reviews

SCOEA's plan for institutional evaluations does encourage 'a culture of evaluation' throughout a college and is valued for providing meaningful data by which the health of the institution can be measured and plans formulated by the institution (and parts thereof) for improvement. This type of evaluation will be more in-depth than an annual review.

The timing of such Periodic Reviews will depend on many factors, but the reviewing of Education Council to this degree will be subject to the periodic review of governance throughout this college.

Suggestions about the format and scope of such a review of Educational Council was not fully discussed and such decisions would be for an evaluation committee to determine. However SCOEA's suggestions and present or upcoming (modified?) criteria will be an important part of the final product.

OTHER QUESTIONS YET TO BE CONSIDERED

(Note: Many of the questions from SCOEA's template have been answered in the body of this report, however some not yet addressed will be considered below.)

How much time and personnel have Education Council reviews taken?

If we agreed that Handbook creation, review/revisions and writing of Bylaws were forms of Education Council reviews then an approximate value can be given. Most committees were comprised of 3 to 6 members. Much of this work was completed through, often weekly meetings (1 to 2 hours) during the spring of each year (February to June). The individual committee members also contributed their time or related activities outside of these formal meetings.

The present Spring 1999 Review was carried out by a five member committee, representative of the constituent groups of Education Council, as well as a student representative as needed. (No student volunteered for a full commitment to this committee because of their academic workloads at this time of year but one was called upon to provide the appropriate perspective as topics arise at meetings.) One hour meetings were setup on a weekly basis - March 11, 18, 25 and April 8, 15, 22, 29 and May 6 (8 hours). In addition to these meetings, some members of the committee attended other meetings with organizations throughout the College and a 1.5 hour Focus group with Program Committee Chairs. All committee members put in additional hours of work reading material, reviewing material (ie Bylaws, Bill 22), processing information and evaluating ideas, etc. One individual spent time accumulating information and recommendations and formatting the report but all members had input into the final report.

Cost

Most hours of work of the Task Force members were in addition to their other duties. One member of the committee, however, was given release time to attend the hourly weekly meetings during her work day. All members of the committee accepted the responsibility of serving on this committee as volunteer time to Education Council business. A dollar value is impossible to calculate because of different pay rates, etc. but the total number of hours spent on this project would be in the neighborhood of 100 person hours. Some copying costs were incurred but they were minimal.

Does such a review comply with SCOEA's criteria for Cyclical Evaluation?

This is in answer to our present review:

Education Council's Goals & Objectives - none stated as yet, however the establishment of such is a recommendation of the review.

At present there is no institutional Strategic Plan so consistency with such is not measurable.

The process of establishing Goals & Objectives is yet to be determined but it would be hoped that stakeholders (perhaps by constituent representatives or invited representatives) will be involved.

Not yet reviewed or revised on an annual basis prompted by annual indicators and trends, etc.

The relevant indicators and trends which can be collected annually and which may be useful to a review of our Education Council are still under discussion. Our committee did look at KPI's and categories of other data that may be useful and influential to an annual review process but came to no definitive solution.

Part of our Spring 1999 Review looked at our operations, procedures, practices, and policies but not in light of our goals and objectives for they are not yet formalized. We evaluated our operations (mechanics of meetings, etc.) by standard Board protocol and our procedures by their effectiveness to the legislation (review of our mandate) and persons utilizing them. Relationships and relations with the Board, administration and within the Education Council were looked at under our theme of communications. Systems of measurement of such factors will be discussed with the entire Education Council or specific Task Force established in the coming year(s).

The Spring 1999 Review did not invite stakeholders, other than student representatives and Program Committee Chairs to the table or to evaluate us. This was mostly because we did not fully discuss stakeholders within or without, who, why, etc.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This Institutional Evaluation, CYCLICAL REVIEW portion, was a valuable exercise and an opportunity to study and assess the various tools and mechanisms that we have and do not have at CNC to evaluate parts of and the entire institution. This review and subsequent reviews (Annual and Periodic) will foster a "culture of evaluation" throughout this institution which should result in appropriate, validated changes as needed to improve the "health of the institution".

Recommendations pertinent to the workings of Education Council were the product of the Education Council Self Evaluation Report (Appendix J) and exercise, Spring 1999, and are contained within the said report. The only recommendation coming from this

section of the Institutional Evaluation and pertaining to Education Council as a governance body is:

Recommendation 1.15: That the Board and Education Council maintain their excellent working relationship, facilitated through representation of the CNC Board on Education Council and Vice Versa.

List of Task Force Members:

Melhina Dragusica

Melba Holm

John Ibberson

Jenny Rivet

Rindy Crampton