

PRESENT: Steve Lane (Chair), Steven Beasley, Eric Demers, Darrel Mansbridge, Lorna Millard, Craig McGuigan, Fred Jacklin, Tina McComb, Graham Pike

REGRETS: Bernie Heise, Nancy Twynam

SUPPORT: Alison O’Beirne

| ITEM | ACTIVITY |
|---|--|
| <p>1. Review data collecting process</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of CAS • Committee’s context-setting questions and guidelines (to be distributed) • timeline |
| <p>2.</p> | <p>SteveL provided an update to the committee. After the last meeting he had drafted a message to send to some key contacts in Student Services that he shared with Darrel. Darrel and Steve were invited to the Student Services coordinators mtg to discuss the CAS instrument. When it was reported out to this group it was pointed out that we had planned some other activities. Lorna and Craig have both talked to Steve about this. Looking to fill in any pieces that we need to do as a group or agree to as a group before we move on. Obviously not all committee members are represented in that coordinators group. Steve asked for feedback from the committee on any concerns.</p> <p>Lorna advised that her area is wading through the CAS instrument adding that it is a lot more work than one would expect. Lorna had also chatted with Jim K from CCC who has a group that has been working on it for 40 hours so far. Lorna looked at the draft and liked the questions, this indicates the CAS questions are not tailored to VIU, i.e. unit leader, who should we be referencing? Did consult with Tina as well.</p> <p>Craig added that each counsellor has done the exercise individually and are now converging scores. Seeing some things that are triggering discussions around the group.</p> <p>Darrel added we’ve known all along certain items may be n/a, it’s the information in the main that becomes very useful.</p> |

Lorna added they are providing the truncated version. Doesn't follow how CAS says to do this. Be reassured how this is going to be used. Concern about giving data that is a truncated version that was intended for one purpose and used for another.

Darrel suggested we should start to look at first draft of writing this up. Generate something. Plug in holes here and there.

Steve's handout discussed, guiding questions that we could use.

Darrel felt they are entirely applicable. Using departmental information, including the strategic direction exercises engaged in recently, CAS info by area and external information and start to move forward with the writing exercise.

Question to committee: Steve and Darrel take back to coordinators group? (yes)

Tina added she likes the questions and the assessment tool (CAS), although unsure if answering the CAS tools lends a full picture, and these questions do fill in this picture. Great to do dept by dept, looking at activity, but it doesn't speak to how the departments integrate and function as a unit, and that is key. This information is useful department by department, and CAS may help point out gaps, but doesn't go far enough to show how far Student Services goes within the institution.

SteveL suggested bullet 4 might address. Trying to get people to think a little bit about how their own unit is organized.

Tina thinks it starts to go there, and may have missed the full reading of that, flush that out a little bit more. How is that integrated within the institution and somebody looking at that from the outside, rather than somebody from SS, either external to SS or the institution, and how the areas could connect.

Lorna suggested Liesel Knack would be a good external.

Darrel added that on May 3 and 4 the CSSAL group will be here for a couple of days, he will take this forward to the meeting.

Tina raised how do we integrate not just SS voices but the other student areas that we would connect with frequently, clients or the users of the services.

SteveL responded that he sees that as the next wave that he and Darrel connect with. Steve hopes by end of May to work on collaboratively with a group.

Craig liked the notion; sees each one of these as little detached units, no lateral connection, common themes developing. This process is isolating us and we already feel isolated from our SS colleagues. Want to work more broadly and collaboratively.

Next step, brief report or summary to these questions. Next task to meet with those areas, so those individuals can see where the themes emerge that are all present everywhere.

Lorna suggested the need to meet hand in glove with registration and other areas, there are other partnerships within the institution that we may benefit from and gather info from other areas by reaching out.

SteveB liked the way the conversation has gone so far, and our considerations, do agree with the other comments the way that you are describing the roles from CAS as it falls to silos, the downfalls. SS is itself an administrative unit, done by lots of people across campus, not just the administrative unit, the rest of the campus are also practitioners in their own right. Should be able to use this process to see how this can be brought in to the administrative unit. Look at SS as a department and how it operates at VIU and is that optimal. Don't want us to be inapplicable, use standards to identify gaps. We don't always fit with other universities, but we have developed in our own way, perhaps we are out of step and that should be standardized. Shouldn't freely dismiss, is this a gap that we should identify.

SteveL agreed, go that extra step and say why, is that an omission or is this something we don't do here. Steve can rework that.

Darrel added that everyone is working on this, should be fairly advanced in terms of moving forward. Line up as major categories, even if we write 3 7 9 or 15, start at that.

Steve asked if the middle of May might see most information in?

Darrel replied that can be advanced. Did a better job of answering questions than the CAS instrument. Lot of information generated and he doesn't want to discount recent activity, information generated is not staledated.

SteveB asked about the student union's role in the document in terms of the services we provide? Do you want information about the pub, the health and dental plan?

Darrel added it is relevant info. More direct information would be around advocacy, working with students on one to ones, entirely appropriate.

SteveL raised the statement of optimal organization relative to other parts of the institution, are areas where they ought to be not where they evolved to be.

SteveB added the services of advising by faculty area, the health and dental plan, it's a student service. Campus life type of stuff; pub, wouldn't necessarily be included.

Tina spoke to the diagram Eric and Nancy drew up, put the environmental scan in there trying to find all the services provided to students. That diagram might be a way to include the scope of things that are happening on campus and influence factors happening in a deeper way.

Darrel added there are individual departments out there, like International, ABE, VIUSU. Advising is happening there as well as front end registration, same in international, all appropriate to describe in here.

Steve L liked the idea of amendments to the diagram with some notes, include inventory from fall as well, identify VIU units that line up with CAS units, that's where he would go to identify where to go next.

Graham added he is struggling to find how international, and maybe aboriginal fit in here, integrated SS unit that is a specialist group and is a bit isolated. What kind of active role is there for us in this process?

Steve L suggested a description and a value statement as to why it is to help place in the context of all the other activity.

Tina pointed out there is a section for international in the CAS document.

Graham felt they may not be able to do that as they are quite busy right now.

Lorna spoke to point 4, optimal organization, could/should connect with other areas in the institution, partnership flow that those areas do with students, like to get information where others areas currently exist or how they should exist and an org structure will flow out of that as step 1. Step 2 optimal org process comes after that. Without that prior question is not as helpful.

Craig felt we have to have some sort of nucleus document as a starting point. Various areas campus wide can respond to. Get something partial, generate some questions. Take to students and faculty areas, other people around campus that informs the process for the next steps.

Steve L suggested we start with something that nobody would pretend was complete and others can respond to, committee can flush out.

Craig something that people can respond to.

SteveB pointed out Tina's reference to environmental scan, what is happening, how does it fit with the standards. From there develop questions arising out of the scan that you ask people to respond to. You can have a focus group, ask for input from externals. And from Graham's comments, before we go too far on to the second part, there needs to be some question as to what the authority is, if there is a document that suggests changes to the SS admin, buy in required, approvals in various ways. Official VIU structure input and external official VIU structure, board of student union for example needs to vote on. Major questions, where does it rest, what's the authority of it and requirements to achieve that level of authority.

Tina added that the top 2/3 of the enrolment plan we could do now, how it fits in with integrated planning, how it speaks to those recommendations, environmental scan as it applies to individual departments, top part of document could be pulled together, models of SS that are out there that might fit in recommendations that we are talking about.

SteveL added when Eric and Nancy and then I took a stab at it, we believed we could get to that top stuff.

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| | <p>Darrel believes moving forward is important. Agree with Tina, there is a bunch of stuff we can start now. Help us with work here as well. If seeing gaps, we need to discuss with others, then we can start to plug information in. SteveL going to start on, there will be some gaps.</p> <p>Tina happy to assist with writing process, pull from some other documents that exist.</p> <p>Lorna volunteered to do some editing.</p> <p>SteveL waiting for details for refining the environmental scan, look at top and look at diagram that Eric and Nancy worked on and start filling it in.</p> <p>Looking at Steve's questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Priorities for change? Craig suggested. Pt. 4 covered. -Tina questions related to challenges, come after #2, how are you challenged to meet those best practices? -Graham, what is #2 meant to elicit? Steve replied mentioned in the AP document, there is a sort of standard or level of service that should be provided, not sure it's universal, is there a benchmark? Could be a yes/no answer. -Tina suggested referring back to CAS. -Steve L – more than a yes/no. -Graham are the rest of the questions dept or area specific, #3, is that in your area? Steve replied yes. -Lorna, #3 question of future student needs, Steve open to input. Leave as is, see what comes. Future service needs. -Tina move #4 to last. |
| <p>3. Next Meeting</p> | <p>Moved to Thursday, May 17, 2012; 2:00 – 3:30 pm; B. 300 R109, (moved from Tues due to TAT on the 15th)</p> |