

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

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

Recommendation 1.14: Education Council annually set and review formalized and published Goals & Objectives.

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.

Recommendation 2.1: Environmental Scan at CNC: the Institutional Strategic Plan Committee suggests that the environmental scan should be a single document, reviewed annually and revised periodically, to include data and analysis of areas such as:

- Σ complexities of being a “comprehensive” college in the BC system
- Σ regional economic situation
- Σ demographics
- Σ geographic realities and challenges
- Σ literacy levels and educational achievement within the region
- Σ results of program reviews
- Σ changes in governance
- Σ internal College information, including staffing, student demographics, success rates
- Σ partnerships
- Σ competition factors
- Σ status of Aboriginal communities specific to the above
- Σ CNC dependency on “soft” funding for services; financial environment and sources of revenue

Recommendation 2.2: If an Environmental Scan becomes a primary planning document, from which plans are developed/measured against for feasibility and implementation strategies, the Scan should be widely available. Also widely available should be the reports on the various strategic plan outcomes (ie. A summary document indicating CNC’s achievements measured against Institutional Critical Success Factors, Board Goals, *Charting a New Course*, Presidential Goals).

Recommendation 2.3: That the Institutional Evaluation Steering Committee recommend that ICSF be developed for CNC, recognizing the uniqueness of CNC as a community college in the north, and including measurements that will assist CNC in lobbying for its self-determination within the provincial system and goals. ICSFs should support us in measuring the priorities as established by the Board in light of the Environmental Scan and their discussions, as well as in measuring system goals. CNC goals in the past have included qualities such as partnerships, transfer success, and the impact of the College on its communities (social, economic and political).

Recommendation 3.1: Examine the time it takes to complete a program review. The person given release time to lead the review has an enormous responsibility without necessarily having the resources to assist with the responsibility

Recommendation 4.1: Greater attention to orienting departments to the purpose, methods and uses of the survey.

Recommendation 4.2: Inclusion of staff, faculty and administration in a department in the formulation of survey questions and selection of target groups.

Recommendation 4.3: Provision of opportunity to fully review the significance of survey results, to use the information constructively to set goals and objectives, to influence direction, and to establish priorities.

Recommendation 4.4: Formal reporting of results and recommendations and follow-up action.

Recommendation 4.5: Developing of alternative, functional ways of achieving ongoing evaluative feedback concerning the quality of services offered.

Recommendation 4.6: Revision of the process to address specific concerns raised by departments: student input for Security, supplier input for Purchasing, Regional input, consistent rating scales, more drop-off locations, more drop-off locations, more flexibility in distribution methods, and concerns about negative comments.

Recommendation 5.1: The College produce a single document called the Strategic Plan.

Recommendation 5.2: Ensure communication and distribution processes are clearly outlined and followed.

Recommendation 5.3: The list of College Advisory Committees be updated more regularly.

Recommendation 6.1: Policies respecting Employee Relations require a standard format.

Recommendation 6.2: Complete policy binders should be available to all employees. Distribution should include copies for support staff and faculty unions, deans and directors secretaries, and the library. Ideally, each employee should have a copy of policies with respect to employee relations.

Recommendation 6.3: College policies on employee relations should be reviewed every four years by tripartite committees.

Recommendation 6.4: On a regular basis, the college should coordinate education campaigns for policies utilizing such approaches as posters, brochures, e-mail, web pages, articles in college, union, and student newsletters, etc.

Recommendation 6.5: The application of the Self-Funded Leave Program should be clarified.

Recommendation 6.6: There is need for a disability management policy.

Recommendation 6.7: The Employee Relations Climate Surveys with faculty and support staff groups suggest:

- the need for more communication, consultation and involvement in decision making
- Σ the need for all employees to show respect and recognition to other employees
- Σ the need to improve performance evaluation procedures for both faculty and support staff

- Σ the need to make the college a safer and healthier environment to work in
- Σ the need to make college policies more public and to apply them consistently
- Σ the need to be more respectful of collective agreements

Recommendation 7.1: We recommend the procedure for selecting/recruiting members for Advisory Committees be reviewed to ensure student participation is actively solicited.

Recommendation 7.2: We recommend the CNC Harassment Policy and procedure be reviewed to ensure it is current. Further we recommend the procedure be widely communicated to all stakeholder groups.

Recommendation 7.3: We recommend the Student Association include policies and practices related to student discipline, grade appeals, harassment, etc., in the Student Planner provided by the Student Association.

Recommendation 7.4: We recommend the Student Association consider surveying its membership for needs and satisfaction.

Recommendation 7.5: We recommend a student representative on the program review committee of Education Council.

Recommendation 7.6: We recommend more opportunities for regional students to participate through focus groups, regional advisory committees or options which fit the culture of the region they live in.

Recommendation 8.1: We recommend that each area:

- establish written measurable goals and objectives for managing the following functions/areas:
 - facilities management (Physical Plant)
 - infrastructure components:
 - data communications services (Computer Services)
 - telecommunications services (Computer Services)
 - CATV services (Instructional Media Services)

Recommendation 8.2: We also recommend that the departments named in Recommendation 8.1 recommend/create a set of relevant indicators that will reflect utilization factors and status factors for each facility and infrastructure component so that progress towards goals and objectives can be determined. An explanation of possible factors follow:

Utilization Factors:

- to answer the questions for each facility or infrastructure component:
 - how much is it used (e.g. room utilization, bandwidth utilization)
 - how much is if available for use? (Accessibility)

- what percentage of time is it unavailable when it is in fact needed? (Uptime, downtime)
 - how much could it be used? (What is its capacity?)
 - to answer the following questions for relevant infrastructure component:
 - what is its penetration across the campuses of the College (e.g. what percentage of offices have CATV, Aspen telephone service, computers, Internet access)
- Status Factors:
 - to answer the following questions for each facility and/or infrastructure component:
 - what condition is it in?
 - what does it cost us to maintain? (As a percentage of original cost and/or replacement cost)
 - when will it need a major overhaul?
 - when will it need to be replaced? (Expected life cycle when purchased, and expected life now?)

Recommendation 8.3: For each department to conduct an annual internal review

- utilizing the set of indicators selected in 6.1.2 above to determine where improvements have been made or need to be made
 - evaluating the usefulness of the indicators and where appropriate establish new ones
- identifying important areas for improvement through capital acquisition or improvement

For the Five Year Capital Plan

- we see this document being the carryover document for not only the special government funded improvements but also for our own plans. The large carry-over projects would come from the Master Site Development Plan. Smaller projects might come from annual or other periodic reviews of facilities and infrastructure.

Recommendation 8.4: We recommend that the Master Site Development Plan be updated every ten years to ensure that we have a direction for future expansion. A key input to the Master Site Development Plan would be the Strategic Plan of the College.

Recommendation 8.5: We recommend that the various infrastructure components be reviewed periodically on a three to five year cycle. They might comment upon the usefulness of installed technologies but for future needs these reviews should concentrate on capacity measures and forecasts as opposed to specific technologies as solutions. For example, the addition of two new Technology training programs in the next five years

Recommendation 8.6: We recommend that the annual capital budgeting process be reviewed every five years to ensure that it is meeting the needs of the all the stakeholders who should be represented in the process

Recommendation 8.7: We recommend that the room utilization report (if it is determined to be an important measure) be circulated among those who will be accountable for room utilization with the goal of establishing norms for room utilization.

Recommendation 9.1