
BRIDGING THE GAP: PILOT PROJECT PHASE II

FORMATIVE EVALUATION - **APPENDICES**

AN INITIATIVE OF:

The Random North Development Association

September 2003

EVALUATION COMPLETED BY:



Hollett & Sons Inc. 

Research * Analysis * Planning

Susan Hollett, President

www.HollettandSons.ca

P.O. Box 100 Shoal Harbour NF Canada A0C 2L0

(709) 466-1373-Phone (709) 466-3296 (Fax)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix A - Program Plan Sample	<u>1</u>
Appendix B - Academic Instructors Job Description	<u>3</u>
Appendix C - Roles & Responsibilities for Skill Set Design	<u>7</u>
Appendix D - Evaluator's Monthly Reports	<u>11</u>
Appendix E - Recommendations and Best Practices Full Commentary	<u>26</u>
From the Clients	<u>26</u>
From the Co-ordinators	<u>26</u>
From the Employment Partners	<u>33</u>
From the College of the North Atlantic	<u>38</u>
Student Services Counselors	<u>38</u>
Academic Instructors	<u>40</u>
From the Community Learning Networks (CLNs)	<u>48</u>
From the Site Sponsors	<u>57</u>
Appendix F - Research Instruments	<u>59</u>
CLN Focus Group Questions - Initial	<u>59</u>
CLN Focus Group Questions - Concluding	<u>59</u>
Employment Partner Questions - Initial	<u>59</u>
Employment Partner Questions - Concluding	<u>60</u>
Sponsor Questions - Initial	<u>60</u>
Sponsor Questions - Concluding	<u>60</u>
Academic Instructor Questions - Initial	<u>60</u>
Academic Instructor Questions - Concluding	<u>61</u>
Project Co-ordinator Questions - Initial	<u>61</u>
Project Co-ordinator Questions - Concluding	<u>61</u>
Interviews with the College Associate District Administrators - Concluding Only	<u>61</u>
Client Attitude Assessment - Initial & Concluding	<u>62</u>
Appendix G - Social and Economic Landscapes	<u>65</u>

Appendix A - Program Plan Sample

The following is a sample of a section of the program plan for Coastal Growers. It is a detailed analysis of the work functions required at the work site, in logical and/or chronological order.

1. Sterilization
 - a. Sweep and clean floors
 - b. Sterilize bench covers, irrigation system and tools.
 - c. Clean greenhouse structure
 - d. Cleaning materials (chlorine, pesticide bombs)
 - e. Safety with respect to cleaning materials
 - f. Knowledge of pesticide and cleaning function of chlorine

2. Bench Coverings
 - a. Remove bench covers
 - b. Clean
 - c. Re-attach
 - d. Staple Gun
 - e. Bench covers (top white) reflect heat and light up to plants and keeps roots cool
 - f. Prevents weeds from growing in the grow benches
 - g. Keeps roots in the dark

3. Stringing Operation
 - a. Standard sag in support wires
 - b. Attach strings to grow benches and support wires with correct tension
 - c. Attaching techniques (rolling hitch, length of strings and judging tensions)

4. Maintenance of Equipment (On-Going)
 - a. Greenhouse Structure (Quanzit and Gutter Connected)
 - i. Repair tears in the Durafilm
 - ii. Tighten/ replace loose bolts
 - iii. Build up sinking floor as necessary
 - iv. Remove snow
 - b. Fans (ventilating and circulating)
 - i. Inspect and replace worn belts
 - ii. Adjust tensions
 - iii. Oil motors and bearings
 - c. Furnace
 - i. Inspect and clean/replace nozzles, electrodes, filters, fuel lines, vents
 - ii. Adjust fuel and air intake if necessary
 - iii. Adjust electrodes if necessary
 - iv. Check fuel supply system
 - Main Storage Tanks
 - Interim Storage Tank
 - v. Check fuel supply
 - d. Pumps
 - i. Clean filters and remove debris
 - ii. Replace faulty pumps
 - e. Irrigation System
 - i. Inspect and clean filters
 - ii. Inspect all pipe and tubing lines for leaks
 - iii. Replace broken drippers
 - iv. Test run to verify function of drippers

Appendix B - Academic Instructors Job Description

Recruitment Guidelines:

1. Ensure the questions that are developed for the interview match the selection criteria
2. The College in Clarendville to work in partnership with Random North Development Association to develop these questions and these questions would then be used by all campuses who are hiring Learning Instructors for BTG
3. A job description would be included as part of the advertising package
4. The sponsor would sit in on the interview for the Learning Instructor
5. An interview must take place and references checked
6. The person selected for the position must fully understand their roles and responsibilities, are capable of doing the job, and be willing to sign a letter of appointment which outlines expectations and requirements to be fulfilled in this position

Selection Criteria to include:

- Curriculum Development, Design, and Delivery (Mandatory)
 - * would like to see examples and references to support this
- Prior Learning Assessment and Recognition (Mandatory)
- Experience in Research Techniques and Strategies (Mandatory)
- Computer Software (Mandatory)
 - * we need to identify types of software required
- Organizational and Management Skills (Mandatory)
- Analytical Skills (Mandatory)
- Supervisory Skills (Mandatory)
- Oral Communication Skills (Mandatory)
 - *to do some type of presentation

- Written Communication Skills (Mandatory)
 - *do some type of test to assess these skills
- Ability to establish and maintain effective working relationships (Mandatory)
- Knowledge of Social and economic development needs of the region (Preferred)
- Knowledge of the Bridging the Gap Model (Preferred)
- Knowledge of Industry Sector (Preferred)
- Reference checks
 - * one reference to be from a former student

Duties and Qualifications

Duties: In partnership with training participants, company personnel and college staff, facilitates the development, implementation, and monitoring of individual learning plans for individuals enrolled in ***the Bridging the Gap Type of Skills Development to insert here***; incorporates all practical workplace learning activities with respect to ***insert type of Skills Development here***; works with the training participants to develop individual portfolios using prior learning assessment and recognition, especially as it relates to skill sets required by the workplace; accompany training participants in all academic and practical aspects of ***insert type of Skills Development here*** and continually support training participants while acting as a liaison with all stakeholders.

Qualifications: Candidates must possess a thorough knowledge of curriculum development and design; prior learning assessment and recognition; research techniques and strategies; computer software; knowledge of the social and economic development needs of the region and of the Bridging the Gap: From Education to Employment concept would be definite assets; candidates must possess effective classroom management, analytical, supervisory, and communication skills; the required knowledge and skills would normally have been acquired through a Bachelor of Education Degree and Bachelor of Arts Degree with a major in English, Math, or Science and related experience in curriculum development and design and in facilitating learning to meet the needs of individuals who have varying academic skills.

Letter of Appointment

- Duties/Job Description
- Two weeks prep time before Skills Development Component commences
- Prep time and when lesson planning can occur
- Roles and responsibilities of the Learning Instructor
- Member of the Skill Set Design Team
- Instruction time

- A good understanding BTG and the flexibility around academic and practical applications

Job Description

Primary Objectives:

- To facilitate the design, development, implementation, and monitoring the success of individual learning plans for individuals enrolled in the Bridging the Gap Name of Skills Development Here.
- To incorporate all academic and practical learning activities that meets the needs of the participants and employment partner.

Duties:

- To develop skill sets that are both individualized and group orientated
- To incorporate all academic components based on practical applications within the context of math, science, language, communication, personal development, etc.
- To ensure that all skill sets are adaptable to all areas related to the workplace situation
- Create schedule of academic/practical training for participants in partnership with the employment partner representative
- To ensure that the skill sets for academic and practical applications will be an ongoing process and will be developed in partnership with the training participants, the private business partner, union if applicable, sponsor for the BTG initiative, and College community relations officer
- Document and may be required to prepare pre and post learning assessments for the participants
- To take the lead role in skill set (curriculum) design and development
- Research any workplace documents relating to the current work related duties
- To work with the training participants to develop their portfolio using prior learning assessment and recognition, especially as it relates to skill sets required by the workplace.
- Monitor participants on a daily basis – establish that the current shift is working well for them, ensure that there is a comfort level between participant and current worker/practical instructors/consultant, document presence/absences for weekly time sheets, keep an eye on work/personal issues that may affect their job performance in relation to the BTG program.
- To ensure training participants gain confidence in their abilities to learn, which will assist the participants in attaining their educational and career aspirations
- Build a good relationship with participants and be available to them as issues/concerns develop
- Help assist participants in their search for higher academics (ABE, GED)

- To accompany training participants in all aspects of *Name of Skills Development Here*
- To continuously support training participants while acting as a liaison with all stakeholders
- To prepare a Policy and Procedures Guide for the private business partner which includes all job activities and Occupational Health and Safety Regulations
- To attend all Skill Set Meetings
- To prepare a final report which include the process taken to develop and deliver the curriculum, how the Learning Instructor integrated workplace skill set training with basic (reading, writing, and numeracy) and essential skills (teamwork, problem-solving, etc.) development, how the Prior Learning Assessment Portfolios were prepared/designed, their role with the Skill Set Design Subcommittee and partnerships created, a basic outline on the characteristics of the participants and any changes (negative or positive) noted (ie, self-esteem, self-confidence, attitude, academic progression, etc.), role in the evaluation including pre and post workplace assessments and consultations with the evaluator, any issues/concerns about the program, and recommendations to improve the program.

Appendix C - Roles & Responsibilities for Skill Set Design

Roles and Responsibilities for the Academic/Practical Skill Set Development Component

1. BTG Co-ordinator
2. Community Relations Officer (College of the North Atlantic)
3. Academic Instructor
4. Employment Partner
5. Union (If applicable)

BTG Co-ordinator

Main contact if issues/concerns develop around the skill set development component - first the BTG Co-ordinator would try to address the situation themselves. However, if a major issue develops and the BTG Co-ordinator does not have a comfort level with the situation, then the situation would be addressed to the sponsor organization. The BTG Co-ordinator and the sponsor organization would also inform the Skill Set Design Subcommittee.

Roles and Responsibilities regarding the skill set component

- To conduct 1-2 site visits per week (more if deemed necessary)
- During the weekly visits to skill set site consult with the participants, company representatives, current workers, any practical instructors, and academic instructors on how the program is progressing
- To conduct monthly one-on-one assessments with each of the participants and document
- Responsible for all aspects of the bookkeeping duties regarding the skill set development component in relation to the participants (on-site skill set materials and supplies, etc.)
- To order and purchase any skill set site materials and supplies relating to the participants
- To organize the 6 week sessions for the Skill Set Design Subcommittee
- To document correspondence from each of the 6 week sessions and distribute to subcommittee
- To work with the company representatives regarding the contracting of any practical applications
- To maintain daily interaction with the Academic Instructors via telephone, fax, e-mail, or in person regarding the participants
- Work in partnership with the Academic Instructor to design the skill set component into a format

that can be used by the employment partner as a policy and procedures guide

- To inform the sponsor organization and the Academic Instructor of their daily schedule if they are going to be away from the office for an extended period

Academic Instructor

Main contact if issues/concerns develop around the skill set development component - The Academic Instructor would first contact the Community Relations Officer (CRO) or the Instructional Co-ordinator at the College Campus, who in turn would contact the BTG Co-ordinator. If the Academic Instructor cannot contact the CRO or the Instructional Co-ordinator immediately, they would contact the BTG Co-ordinator.

Roles and Responsibilities regarding the skill set component

- Prepare skill set design around job related stations
- Research any workplace documents relating to the current work related duties
- Create schedule of academic/practical skill sets for participants in partnership with the employment partner representative
- Work with the participants to develop their prior learning assessment portfolios
- Build a good relationship with participants and be available to them as issues/concerns develop
- Monitor participants on a daily basis:
 - establish that the current shift is working well for them
 - ensure that there is a comfort level between participant and current worker/practical instructors/consultant
 - document presence/absences for weekly time sheets
 - keep an eye on work/personal issues that may affect their job performance in relation to the BTG program
- Help assist participants in their search for higher academics (ABE, GED)
- Determine skill set site materials and supplies for participants and then contact the BTG Co-ordinator with this request. The Academic Instructor can not go directly and purchase supplies because a purchase order number is needed.
- Document all correspondence relating to pre and post learning assessments regarding the participants - securing a good relationship with the individual will help Instructor get to know them on a personal level, thus help with pre and post assessments
- Provide the necessary information relating to the skill set component to the External Evaluation Consultant, Susan Hollett

- To attend and participate in the 6 week Skill Set Design Sessions
- Work in partnership with the BTG Co-ordinator to design the skill set component into a format that can be used by the employment partner as a policy and procedures guide
- To ensure good working relationships with the company/union representatives
- It is the responsibility of the Academic Instructor to notify the CRO or the Instructional Co-ordinator and the BTG Co-ordinator if they are going to be away from their office for an extended period (more than 2 hours.)
- The Academic Instructor is required to submit a final report to the CRO or the Instructional Co-ordinator. This final report must include:
 - the process taken to develop and deliver the skill set component
 - how the Academic Instructor integrated the workplace skill set components with basic (reading, writing, and numeracy) and essential skills (teamwork, problem-solving, etc.) development
 - how the Prior Learning Assessment Portfolios were prepared/designed
 - their role with the Skill Set Design Subcommittee and partnerships created
 - a basic outline on the characteristics of the participants and any changes (negative or positive) noted (ie: self-esteem, self-confidence, attitude, academic progression, etc.)
 - role in the pan provincial evaluation including pre and post workplace assessments and consultations with the evaluator
 - any issues/concerns about the program
 - recommendations to improve the program

Community Relations Officer (CRO) or the Instructional Co-ordinator (College of the North Atlantic)

Roles and Responsibilities regarding the skill set component

- To address any issues/concerns as they develop with the Academic Instructor
- The CRO, who is also a member of the Community Learning Network, would attend and participate in the 6 week Skill Set Design sessions
- The Community Relations Officer or the Instructional Co-ordinator is the direct liaison with the Academic Instructor.
- The CRO or the Instructional Co-ordinator is responsible for ensuring all learning aides (office equipment, computer, etc.) are at the skill set site when the skill set component commences

- It is the responsibility of the CRO to ensure the Academic Instructor understands all requirements pertaining to co-ordinating/delivering the skill set component
- It is the responsibility of the CRO or Instructional Co-ordinator to notify the Academic Instructor if they are going to be away from their office for an extended period. In their absence, if there is an issue/concern, the Academic Instructor will contact the BTG Co-ordinator
- It is the responsibility of the CRO to submit the Academic Instructor's final report to the BTG Co-ordinator

Employment Partner

Main contact if issues/concerns develop around the skill set training component - the Employment Partner representative would contact the Academic Instructor because he/she is the direct liaison with the participants. It is the responsibility then of the Academic Instructor to follow-up with the CRO or the Instructional Co-ordinator and BTG Co-ordinator.

Roles and Responsibilities regarding the skill set component

- To attend and participate in the 6 week Skill Set Design sessions
- To consult with the Academic Instructor and the BTG Co-ordinator regarding practical applications and scheduling for the academic/practical components

Union

Main contact if issues/concerns develop around the skill set training component - the Union representative would contact the Academic Instructor because he/she is the direct liaison with the participants. It is the responsibility then of the Academic Instructor to follow-up with the CRO or the Instructional Co-ordinator and BTG Co-ordinator.

Roles and Responsibilities regarding the skill set component

- To attend and participate in the 6 week Skill Set Design sessions

Appendix D - Evaluator's Monthly Reports

Bridging the Gap

External Evaluator Monthly Report

August 1 - August 31, 2002

Activities:

- Finalized all arrangements for site visits to Burgeo and Port Hope Simpson.
- Drafted all research tools, including:
 - Interview question areas for the Employment Partners, Academic Instructors and Co-ordinators
 - List of question areas for the opening focus groups with the CLNs
 - Participants pre- and post attitude assessments
- Met with Walter Smith at the College in St. John's and discussed his perspective on the process to date.
- Completed "Pre" attitude assessments with participants in Newfoundland Hardwoods and the Lethbridge Farmers Co-op.
- Worked with Provincial Co-ordinator on some issues surrounding the Academic Instructors preparing and implementing the pre & post workplace assessments. Helped worked through the issue with the Hardwoods instructor in particular.
- Prepared and forwarded evaluative questions for circulation to the Employment and Union partners at the Catalina Project.
- Introduced the Project Co-ordinator to the consultant working with the Voisey's Bay Project who may be interested in the BTG project.
- Assisted the Project Co-ordinator in her dealings with the issues at the Burgeo site through a number of discussions.
- Received and reviewed a variety of reports from the five sites.

Plans for September:

1. Complete and write up site visits for Port Hope Simpson and Burgeo. Ina Marsh will be travelling with me as well as Michelle Brown for the Burgeo leg of the Journey. Current plans are:

Monday, 16th (Port Hope Simpson)	
0.375	Meet with Co-ordinator to review arrangements
9:30 am - 11:30 am	CLN PHS Focus Group
1:00 pm - 5:00 pm	Meet with Participants (30 minutes each)
Tuesday, 17th (Port Hope Simpson)	
9:00 am - 2:00 pm	Meetings with Employment Partner, Sponsor, Co-ordinator, and Academic Instructor (30-45 minutes each).
Wednesday, 18th (Burgeo)	
0.4375	Meet with Co-ordinator to review arrangements
11:00 am - 2:00 pm	Meetings with Employment Partner, Sponsoring Organization, Co-ordinator, and Academic Instructor (30-45 minutes each).
2:30 pm - 5:00 pm	Meet with Participants (30 minutes each)
Thursday 19th (Burgeo)	
9:00 am - 12:00 noon	Meet with Participants (30 minutes each) Cont'd
1:00 pm - 3:00 pm	CLN Burgeo Focus Group

2. Complete outstanding meetings for Zone 15 (Co-ordinator, Employment Partners, Union, and Academic Instructors).
3. Prepare for and conduct Zone 15 CLN Focus Group September 10.
4. Finalize plans for Baie Verte meeting for Oct 9-11, 2002.
5. Prepare for Evaluation Committee Meeting on October 1, 2002.

Bridging the Gap
External Evaluator Monthly Report
September 1 - 30, 2002

Activities:

- Started to use WEB CT.
- Met with Program Co-ordinator and two Academic Instructors from Zone 15
- Held Zone 15 CLN Focus Group
- Met with union and employment partners in the Newfoundland Hardwoods site.
- Completed site visits and meetings with partners and participants in Port Hope Simpson and Burgeo. This was quite the trip! Ina Marsh travelled with me which made it very pleasant and Michelle joined us for part of the Burgeo leg. I was unable to meet with the project sponsor in Port Hope Simpson as she was on vacation, and the Guidance Counsellor in Goose Bay, but we will arrange for teleconferences in October. It was great to put a face to the names and voices.
- Worked through several issues with the provincial co-ordinator, including the issues around sponsorship in Burgeo, and one participant leaving the Clarenville Project.
- Assisted in writing the agenda for October 1 Evaluation Committee meeting.
- Organization and preparation for Baie Verte meetings.
- Prepare for quarterly evaluation meeting on October 1.
- Received and reviewed a variety of reports from the 5 sites and the Provincial Co-ordination Team.

Plans for October:

- Quarterly Evaluation Meeting
- Meet with Lethbridge Employment Partner
- Teleconference with Port Hope Simpson Employment Partner
- Teleconference with PHS Guidance Counsellor in Goose Bay
- Baie Verte/Triton Site Visit October 9,10,11 (Agenda follows)

Bridging the Gap
External Evaluator Monthly Report
October 1 - 31, 2002

Activities:

- Quarterly evaluation meeting held on October 1. There was a good discussion of the status and progress of the evaluation as well as looking at some of the issues which are arising.
- Discussion with Provincial Program Co-ordinator about the advantages and disadvantages of having the College as the training partner. This was in preparation for her teleconference with the College Community Relations Officers.
- Discussion with Provincial Program Co-ordinator about her being invited by Minister Rock's office to the Innovation in Learning Summit in Toronto. I agreed to send her some background documentation I have on it.
- Evening meeting with the Employment Partners in Lethbridge
- Developed an interview guide for Provincial Program Co-ordinator to talk to the Port Union Participants from the original Pilot Project.
- Interviewed Sharon Woodward, the Guidance Counsellor for Labrador
- Interviewed Chris Mercer, Co-ordinating Guidance Counsellor. He will send me the minutes (or recommendations) from the teleconference they are having with all of the Guidance Counsellors on the BTG project.
- Interviewed Sharon Veley, Counsellor for the Baie Verte/Triton Project.
- Set up and completed the site visit to Triton. This went very well - the site is full of enthusiasm and there are no major issues to be addressed. It was a delight to meet all of the participants, the Co-ordinator, Academic Instructor, the Project Sponsor and the Employment Partner.
- This completes all of my "pre" site visits.
- Used WEB CT on a regular basis, although I can't say I am yet a convert to this process - I still find it duplicates a lot of my communications.
- Received and reviewed a variety of reports and minutes from the five sites, the Program Co-ordinator and the Provincial Co-ordination Team.

Plans for November:

- Interview Roxanne Notley, Eemployment Sponsor in Port Hope Simpson.

- Meet new Academic Instructor for Lethbridge Site
- Start follow-up telephone meetings with Co-ordinators and Participants. These are meant to be brief "check in" types of meetings to see how things are progressing and if there are any issues they wish to have identified.
- The pace will slow down somewhat in November and December in order to conserve my time for the second half of the project.

Have a great day and *Happy Hallowe'en!!*

Bridging the Gap
External Evaluator Monthly Report
November 1 - 29 2002

Activities:

- Monitored the changeover of the Academic Instructor in Port Hope Simpson
- Reviewed recommendations from conversations with Instructional Designer (Walter Smith) and Michelle Brown
- Reviewed some recommendations and commentary from the Provincial Co-ordinator, Financial Manager and Zone 15 Co-ordinator.
- Planning the Quarterly Evaluation meeting for January, 2003 with Provincial Co-ordinator
- Used WEB CT on a regular basis, still am not a fan.
- Received and reviewed a variety of reports and minutes from the five sites, the Program Co-ordinator and the Provincial Co-ordination Team.

Plans for December:

- Meet with Provincial Co-ordinator and Financial Manager (Ina Marsh) to review project progress
- Interview Roxanne Notley, Employment Sponsor in Port Hope Simpson. (Carry forward from October)
- Meet new Academic Instructor for Lethbridge Site (Carry forward from October)
- Start follow-up telephone meetings with Co-ordinators and Participants. These are meant to be brief "check in" types of meetings to see how things are progressing and if there are any issues they wish to have identified. (Carry forward from October)
- The pace will stay the same (or lessen) in December based upon project activities and requirements of the evaluators.
- Celebrate Christmas and New Year's!!

Have a great day and an early Merry Christmas to you all if I don't make contact with you again before the holidays

Bridging the Gap
External Evaluator Monthly Report
December 1 - 31 2002

Activities:

- Attended a meeting with the Zone 15 CLN and Ken Clements, the Director of the Labour Standards Board. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss and get Ken's perspectives on what are the requirements and legal limits of the ability of the CLN and the employer to screen people for physical and mental competencies.
- Met with Provincial Co-ordinator and Financial Manager to review the project progress.
- Following and documenting evidence around the BTG progress and impacts - including the linkages between the BTG participants and the industry and customers of their employment partners. The Triton site is attending the Boston Seafood Show primarily compliments of the employment partner (Jason Roberts) providing the bus, and the local HRCC covering a lot of the other costs. Participants are also doing their own fundraising.
- In Lethbridge, the participants are bagging and selling their hampers of vegetables and are able to retain the \$3/hamper commission as an incentive to sell. It gives them good hands on exposure to what the market is looking for in terms of price, quality, packaging, sales convenience, etc. They have also been given exposure to the owners/produce managers of stores and what they see in the local vegetable markets.
- Reviewed the assessments that Michelle did on the participants from the Catalina BTG project.
- Completing the first draft of the Social and Economic Landscape. Some of the questions are proving problematic for statistical reasons. At this point, it doesn't appear the SSP Regional Planners schedule for doing their Landscapes and ours will coincide, so we will complete ours as best we can, given the information available.
- Reviewed new job advertisement for the Academic Instructor with the Provincial Co-ordinator
- Reviewed (again) Michelle, Barb and Ina's "Observations and Recommendations" file. E-mailed the other Co-ordinators for their thoughts in a similar format as well
- Planning the Quarterly Evaluation meeting for January, 2003 with Provincial Co-ordinator
- Used WEB CT on a regular basis, still am not a fan. I listened/lurked on a chat room of Michelle and the BTG Co-ordinators in December and this may be a redeeming feature of WEB CT! It is much less expensive than a conference call, the meeting discussions is captured as people type, and it keeps people focussed on the issues. Requires good keyboarding skills though.
- Received and reviewed a variety of reports and minutes from the five sites, the Program Co-

ordinator and the Provincial Co-ordination Team.

- Dropped into Random North and they gave me a lovely Christmas Present!! Something to do with Moose poop!

Plans for January:

- Quarterly Evaluation Meeting on January 10th.
- Interview Roxanne Notley, Employment Sponsor in Port Hope Simpson. (Carry forward from November)
- Meet new Academic Instructor for Lethbridge Site and Port Hope Simpson (Carry forward from November)
- Start follow-up telephone meetings with Co-ordinators and Participants. These are meant to be brief check in@types of meetings to see how things are progressing and if there are any issues they wish to have identified. (Carry forward from November)

Have a great day and we will talk on Friday, January 10 at the Evaluators meeting.

Bridging the Gap
External Evaluator Monthly Report
January 1 - 31 2003

Activities:

- The major activity from the evaluation perspective was the quarterly evaluation meeting. The meeting went well and several issues around the evaluation were debated. Specifically, these included the first draft of the Social and Economic Landscape, how to measure the key indicators for success for the project and what were comparable programs which we could compare BTG results, how we measure BTG results and others. (I also baked cookies for this meeting – the things I do for this group!!)
- Requested the thoughts of the Co-ordinators on their "Lesson's Learned" to date.
- Working with the Financial Co-ordinator to determine the cost per participant of BTG. This is an ongoing process and requires inputs from several different places.
- Received and reviewed a variety of reports and minutes from the five sites, the Program Co-ordinator and the Provincial Co-ordination Team.
- Making plans for site visits to Burgeo and PHS in May.
- Met up with Debbie Earle, Bob Simms of the College, as well as Roxanne Notley and had a brief discussion on the status of BTG while in Happy Valley - Goose Bay on other business.
- Went to Qatar for the last two weeks of January, so my contact with the project was less than normal. (Had a great trip – 9 nights in a five star hotel, by myself, 25 degrees – what's not to like??)

Plans for February:

- Receive and review the Co-ordinator's thoughts on "Lessons Learned"
- Revise and complete the Social and Economic Landscapes for the 5 sites
- Meet with Michelle Brown to discuss the project
- Continue to work with the Financial Co-ordinator on a financial analysis of the project
- Meet with College representatives and Michelle Brown to discuss the College's role in this and future BTG project.
- Interview Roxanne Notley, Employment Sponsor in PHS.

- Meet new Academic Instructor for Lethbridge Site and Port Hope Simpson.
- Complete follow-up telephone meetings with Co-ordinators and Participants. These are meant to be brief A check-in types of meetings to see how things are progressing and if there are any issues they wish to have identified.

Have a great day and again, sorry about the delay in getting this report to you all.

Bridging the Gap

External Evaluator Monthly Report

February 1 - 28, 2003

Activities:

- Reviewed the thoughts of the Co-ordinators on their "Lesson's Learned" to date. This will be compiled into one document
- Working with the Financial Co-ordinator to determine the cost per participant of BTG. This is an ongoing process and requires inputs from several different places. We now have more of a final document on this.
- Received and reviewed a variety of reports and minutes from the 5 sites, the Program Co-ordinator and the Provincial Co-ordination Team.
- Reviewed and commented on Michelle's draft "Roles of the Skill Set Designer" document.
- Met with the Provincial Project Co-ordinator on a variety of issues around the project. We had a good discussion around the future structures for BTG based upon the lessons being learned from the current pilot. We also reviewed suggested changes to the Social and Economic Landscape documents
- Met with the Provincial Project Co-ordinator and representatives of the College of the North Atlantic (Brenda Reid, Clarendville ADA, Marilyn Coles-Hayley, Regional DA, and Blake Cryderman, Chair of International and Contract Training) regarding whether the College is interested in participating in further BTG based upon their experience with this pilot. There are several issues here, not the least of which is financial. I am interested in knowing whether the College is making, losing or breaking even on this project. There are many "uncounted" costs they are able to incur (teleconferences, for example) that are explicit costs to them and are in the budget as "Contribution in Kind" when they are there at all.
- Established times and processes to meet (over telephone) with the Co-ordinator, Academic Instructor and the students in Port Hope Simpson
- Monitoring several issues, including Worker's Compensation and the way operations in Burgeo always seem to be "different" than elsewhere – it will be important to tease out and understand why this happens.

Plans for March:

- Compile the Co-ordinator's thoughts on "Lessons Learned"

- Incorporate the suggested changes to the Social and Economic Landscapes for the 5 sites
- Continue to work with the Financial Co-ordinator on a financial analysis of the project
- Interview Roxanne Notley, Employment Sponsor in Port Hope Simpson.
- Meet new Academic Instructor for Lethbridge Site and Port Hope Simpson.
- Complete follow-up telephone meetings with Co-ordinators and Participants. These are meant to be brief. A check-in types of meetings to see how things are progressing and if there are any issues they wish to have identified. Port Hope Simpson is organized, and emails are to go out to the others shortly.

Have a great day!

Bridging the Gap
External Evaluator Monthly Report
March 1 - 31 2003

Activities:

- Spent a fair bit of time discussing how the function of Curriculum Development Specialist can be carried out (Walter Smith at the College). This is an important process item for future BTG initiatives.
- Set up the logistics of meeting with all participants. Throughout the month I touched base with participants, Academic Instructors and Co-ordinators in all sites except for Triton which had to be re-scheduled due to sickness. That is re-scheduled for April 4th.
- Did the post attitudinal assessment with the Newfoundland Hardwoods participants, Academic Instructors, Employment Partner and Union Partner.
- Received and reviewed a variety of reports and minutes from the five sites, the Program Co-ordinator and the Provincial Co-ordination Team.
- Wrote/edited the combined recommendations of the Project and Provincial Co-ordinators and circulated to the Evaluation Committee
- Editing the Social and Economic Landscape document. A draft will be ready for discussion at the April 30th Evaluation Committee meeting.
- Review Provincial Co-ordinator's draft of criteria/guidelines for selecting private businesses for BTG and provided my comments.
- Reviewing and making travel arrangements with the Financial Co-ordinator for final visits to PHS and Burgeo in May.
- Review with Michelle the agenda for April 30th Evaluation meeting

Plans for April:

- Complete the editing of the Social and Economic Landscapes for the five sites (and review the provincial landscapes as released by the SSP)
- Interview Triton Participants, Academic Instructor and Co-ordinator
- Prepare for Evaluation Committee Meeting

Have a great day!

Bridging the Gap
External Evaluator Monthly Report
April 1 - 30, 2003

Activities:

- Completed "touching base" with the Participants, Co-ordinators and Academic Instructors for the following Site - Triton
- Completed the editing of the Social and Economic Landscapes for the Clarenville site and reviewed the Provincial Landscapes as released by the SSP.
- Worked with the Provincial Co-ordinator on the Learning Instructor job description and advertisement
- Meeting with Provincial Co-ordinator and Financial Manager to discuss the project and upcoming travel to the sites
- Make final travel arrangements to final assessments at Port Hope Simpson and Burgeo (May 12-15) and Triton (May 22-23).
- Correspond with Project Co-ordinators concerning itineraries for the site visits.
- Quarterly Evaluation Meeting

Plans for May:

- Integrate changes to the Clarenville Landscape Document and complete the documents for the other four sites.
- Complete site visits to Triton, Port Hope Simpson and Burgeo with all concluding Assessments of Participants, Academic Instructors, Employment Partners and Co-ordinators
- Plan final assessment with Lethbridge Site.
- Planning for final evaluation report

Have a great day!

Bridging the Gap
External Evaluator Monthly Report
May 1- 30, 2003

Activities:

- Completed site visits to Triton, Port Hope Simpson and Burgeo with all concluding Assessments of Participants, Academic Instructors, Employment Partners and Co-ordinators. Unfortunately, both Burgeo and Triton ended up being via teleconference due to weather difficulties while in Labrador and evaluator having to take her son for surgery. There are a couple of loose ends (namely 6 interviews for Triton, and the Zone 15 Co-ordinator) scheduled to be completed in June.
- Completed one ADA interview (Bay St. George) and requests in for other three.
- Completed final assessments and interviews with Lethbridge Site.
- Incorporated information from Co-ordinators on their recommendations report
- "Listened" to Chatroom with the Co-ordinators and the Provincial Co-ordinator.
- Reviewed the BTG concept paper and Dean Holloway's final report

Plans for June:

- Complete all interviews at all sites
- Review final reports from other Academic Instructors as well as Co-ordinators
- Complete stakeholder interviews of ADAs and Kevin O'Leary
- Integrate changes to the Clarenville Landscape Document and complete the documents for the other four sites.
- Begin writing final evaluation report

Have a great weekend!

Appendix E - Recommendations and Best Practices Full Commentary From the Clients

Clients, when interviewed, had few recommendations for change. By in large they were delighted with the program. The following is a selection of their comments:

- One of the biggest things I've learned is that we are adults and we can speak up for ourselves without fearing punishment for talking about something. That her opinions are as valid as anyone else that she is a somebody (real increase in self-esteem). Learning how to talk to someone else and without feeling they are looking down on us. This is a new and important skill in her estimation.
- Things are going really well. I'm quite pleased with how things are going. Trip to Boston was a real highlight it was a real learning experience - nice to see how business really works. There were 70 countries represented in 1300 booths with 750 exhibitors. Lots of people and things to see.
- We have learned a lot about each other and how to tolerate our differences and how to deal with other people personalities without taking it personal.
- Funding - everyone should be given the same amount of each individual.
- Academics not as bad as I thought it was going to be.
- The program was really exciting overall. I learned a lot through it. I'd do it again if I could.
- should be guaranteed jobs at the end of it - not just a maybe

From the Co-ordinators

On The Employment Partner

- The company must have a firm grasp of their short term and long term plans and the BTG program must not hinder the Business's Natural Development. The Owner/Manager must continue to focus on running a successful business and not get too caught up in their new role as a practical instructor. Before committing management hours to the practical training function, it must be determined that there will not be any negative impact on the normal day to day operations.
- The company must have strong leadership, organizational, and management skills. These traits will help ensure that both Bridging the Gap and normal business functions can run concurrently without hindrance.
- The company must not be relying on Government Funding for financial stability or potential growth. This dependence on a third party gives such an organization a higher risk factor for future employment potential.
- The success of the entire model hinges on successfully implemented this link. The overall goal of this program is to create sustainable employment for the participants. This goal will not be achieved without choosing the most appropriate industry partner.
- Although, the BTG model focuses on creating a skilled labour pool for a chosen industry partner, it must also be noted that there is an overlap of responsibility to the general business practices. A co-dependant relationship is created between the industry partner and the BTG project. The industry partner is dependant on the program for the labor resource and the program is dependant on the industry partner to succeed in business to ensure the future

employment of the labor force it will create. This co-dependancy makes it necessary that both parties work together for their common goal: long term success and in turn, employment.

- Employment partners have to be a private sector business. Before a Community Learning Network selects their employment partner, it is critical that an interview process be conducted, the business/company fully understand the Bridging the Gap concept and their contribution to the program, and a meeting with the employment partner is held. Bridging the Gap is not about the employment partner, it is about the participants. The anticipated outcomes as a result of the interventions with the participants will be positive and beneficial for the employment partners.
- It is recommended to review the screening/selecting process for selecting the employment partners. Take the necessary time required to meet with potential employment partners to discuss the objectives of the Bridging the Gap Program, their contributions, and overall outcomes. It is essential to always maintain ongoing communication between the selected employment partner and other Community Learning Network Team members. Anything involving safety issues, we need to make sure that the safety inspections are done upfront.

Administration at the Site

- The administrative system must be automated. There is extreme time wastage in manual book-keeping. Most organizations already have electronic book-keeping systems in place and an automated system would allow the administration of the BTG project to be easily integrated into the existing framework.
- There should be more research into the individual site's training requirements before the funding proposal is submitted. This should prevent the need for pursuing additional funding due to elements, such as field trips, not included in the original proposal.
- The Sponsor Organizations should be consulted when preparing the Policy and Procedure Manuals for the Coordinator and Participants. This would ensure that the sponsoring agency would feel engaged in the project from the very beginning and this would allow the Policy and Procedures used by the individuals organizations to be integrated into the BTG model.
- Another recommendation is to have all of the contract agreements signed before the start of the project and before the budget is complete

The Community Learning Network

- There must be more efforts made in the preliminary stages to create buy-in by the CLN team members. A team member with serious reservations and doubts may cause the team as a whole to become dysfunctional.
- All team members need to be engaged in the entire process from beginning to end. Open communication must be maintained to ensure this is achieved.
- The coordinator must be formally introduced to each CLN team member as part of the orientation process. An effective method would be individual meetings with each team members accompanied by a representative of the sponsoring agency.

- It needs to be made perfectly clear to each team member what the roles, responsibilities, and expectations are as a member of the CLN team. It must be specified how the program will fulfill the mandate of the represented organizations. This will allow the team members to take ownership of the project and clearly understand the contributions they will make and their value as a team member.
- It is essential that Community Learning Network Team members are part of the decision making process. Even though there is one sponsor organization per each Community Learning Network Team with Bridging the Gap, Pilot Phase II, it is important that each team member understands their roles and responsibilities. All Community Learning Network Team members make a valuable contribution to implementing Bridging the Gap and should be treated equally. If Bridging the Gap is to be implemented in the future, it is important that the Bridging the Gap representatives meet with the sponsor organization and Community Learning Network team members to explain their roles and responsibilities in implementing Bridging the Gap. This should take place prior to commencing Bridging the Gap Program.
- There must be a healthy working relationship between the various partners in the BTG project: Industry partner, sponsoring agency, Educational Institution, Instructor, Coordinator, and CLN team members. Partnerships are a focal part of the BTG model. When all partners pull together, the participants of the program will reap the maximum benefit.

The Program Participants

- All participants should receive equitable compensation for participating in the program. This training allowance should be industry specific and provide realistic expectations of future earning potential.
- Another recommendation is to pick students that have similar levels of education. In our area, we had a little difficulty in getting enough people for the program and thus had to settle for students with varying levels of education. Now the college instructor is finding it challenging to keep the curriculum interesting for all of the students.

The Information Sharing Session

- There needs to be consistency between volunteers at the information sharing session when helping the applicants fill out the questionnaire. It devalues the information on a questionnaire when it has been fed to an applicant by the interviewer.
- There must be representatives at the Information Sharing Session from each funding agency to clearly explain the eligibility requirements and available compensation to the attendants.
- All verbal information presented at the Information Sharing Session should be handed out to each applicant in written form. This will help reiterate the presented materials.
- All relevant information provided on each questionnaire must be verified for accuracy. This will identify ineligibility due to inaccurate information at the preliminary stages.

Participant Assessment and Selection Process

- At least 25 candidates should be forwarded to the College for assessments to allow the selection committee a sufficient pool of eligible applicants to choose from.
- The assessment process that was followed was too in depth and potentially overwhelming when considering the target group. A one - on - one interview combined with the TABE results would be sufficient to make an informed selection.
- The participants for Bridging the Gap are individuals who have barriers in finding employment. They have many social issues and this has to be recognized. The Bridging the Gap model outlines a very comprehensive assessment and selection process, but based on observations in implementing Bridging the Gap, Pilot Phase II, some participants selected were not the most suitable participants for the program.
- It is recommended to have a probationary period and inform participants that they can be removed from the program based on performance and attitude. Participants should be monitored on an ongoing basis and assessed in the first four weeks of the Program by the participant selection sub-committee.

Design and Adjust the Training Component

- There should have been more clarity surrounding the expectations and role of the College. Beyond hiring an instructor to deliver a curriculum, it should have been clearly communicated that an actual curriculum had to be designed from scratch. It is crucial that the College understand that the instructor is responsible for curriculum design in addition to curriculum delivery.
- The instructors at each site should work more closely together in the preliminary stages to keep each other on the right track and to provide support and encouragement to each other..
- The initial meeting with Walter Smith should have been with all the academic instructors together to ensure that everyone received the same message. This would also help to create consistency between sites.
- The instructors require ample time initially to prepare before training actually begins. The instructors need time to learn about the industry. Also, the instructors need to spend time throughout the program viewing the practical component to be better able to integrate the practical processes and academic concepts.
- Important to take an holistic approach to designing the skill set component. Engage all partners from the Community Learning Network who will be directly involved with facilitating and implementing the academic and practical component of the Bridging the Gap model.
- Have a two-three day orientation session which includes mapping out skill sets that meet the needs of the participants and employment partners, ensure that the academic instructors have a good understanding of delivering holistic education programs, discuss measurements and

indicators of success as it relates to the participants and the impacts this program has made on their personal growth, and ensure all partners have a comfort level with the integration of academic and practical components. It is essential that the academic instructor take all practical learning pieces applied and teaches them academically to participants

- One suggestion is to have a draft of the curriculum complete before doing the budget. In our case the budget was done before the draft of the curriculum was complete and we did not factor in enough money for resource people. Now, in order to accommodate the external courses, that the employment partners would like to see, we have to scrimp on some areas and request that dollar figures be moved from different accounts to the resource persons account. We are unsure at this point if there is enough money in the budget to be able to accommodate the requested external courses.

Literacy/Workplace Skills Training (Delivery)

- The time required to deliver the training component should be dependent on the industry requirements. A standard 40 week program may not best suit the needs of every site.
- The one-on-one interviews with the training participants should be alternated with Focus Group Sessions and written testimonials. This variety may help the participants find their easiest method of communication.
- Effective communication between the Academic instructor, Practical Instructors, and the Coordinator is crucial to creating a proactive approach to problem solving. This will ensure that the needs of the participants are being met.
- It is necessary to document students' progress both academically and practically. A dated checklist serves as an effective tool. These lists can be periodically reviewed with each participants so they can see their progress throughout the program.
- It is crucial that industry related examples be used in the academic setting to show the correlation between the academic and practical components. The students must understand why they need to know certain academic concepts to be effective workers.
- It is important to allow the participants to take ownership of the training component. They can help determine potential areas for training and make recommendations to the Skill Set Design Team.
- One challenge is that we did not budget enough money for our resource persons account and are thus having to request that dollar figures be moved around on our budget.

Ongoing/Final Evaluation

- There should be more regional representation on the Pan Provincial Evaluation Team above and beyond the Coordinators. This would increase the contributions that the local CLN=s feel they are giving to the Bridging the Gap Project as a whole.

Communications

- Communication and support at all levels is key to the successful implementation of the Bridging the Gap Model.
- Another recommendation is that we need to ensure that each person involved in Bridging the Gap knows what their role is from the beginning. We need to set out what is expected of each employment partner before the contract agreements are signed. Perhaps we can have the roles and responsibilities written on paper and signed, that way everyone would know what their role is. This is especially important for the employment partners.

General Approach

- It must be clearly understood by all partners, that doing things differently does not necessarily make them wrong. The nice thing about participating in a pilot project is there is room to experiment with different strategies and ideas to determine what the magic formula will be to make the Bridging the Gap Model a success.

Bridging the Gap Coordinators

- Bridging the Gap Coordinators should have a strong combination of education and experience in coordination. They should also have excellent interpersonal skills. This Pilot Project was administered by Random North Development Association, but subcontracted to the partnering sites. In order for each site to have ownership and control over their individual programs, each Community Learning Network site interviewed and selected their Bridging the Gap Coordinators.
- Because this was a pilot, it was important to be consistent. Unfortunately, not all partnering sites did not follow the same job advertisement and use the same interviewing questions. This resulted in coordinators having different skillsets in different locations.

Sponsoring Organization

- The sponsoring organization should have experience in facilitating community-based initiatives. They should be familiar with working with other community groups/ government departments and taking a team approach to implement programs. They use their own policy and procedure guide but also incorporate the requirements from the funding agency and what the funding agency gets.
- If Bridging the Gap is implemented in the future, it is important that the sponsor organization fully understands the Bridging the Gap concept and are open to sharing responsibilities in implementing Bridging the Gap model.

Financial Partners & Financial Support to Participants

- Human Resources & Employment clients to negotiate training stipends with counselors instead of receiving one set amount. In this pilot, Human Resources & Employment clients are receiving \$306.25 per week. This should also include travel, childcare. This money is coming directly from the Department of Human Resources & Employment. (*Financial Manager's comment: The amount \$306.25 does include travel and childcare. Under Human Resources and Employment \$306.25 is more than normal of what they would give for training. Therefore, they would not be able to cover anything else. That is my understanding of how HRE operates*)
- It is recommended when Human Resources & Employment clients are identified and selected, local/regional Human Resources & Employment offices be contacted and funding sent to the

regional/local Human Resources & Employment office to negotiate and dispense funds (if referable). Right now, sponsor organization informs Random North Development Association is administering pan provincially on behalf of the Department of Human Resources & Employment and they are distributing the funding to local partnering sponsors if they have selected Human Resources & Employment clients. The sponsor (Bridging the Gap Coordinator) is responsible to pay Human Resources & Employment clients/participants every pay period. Because Human Resources & Employment clients are being treated differently than Human Resources Development Canada clients, it has caused some initial conflicts and more questions relating to negotiations of assistance. If Bridging the Gap continues, funding to be administered through local offices. Meeting to be set up with Human Resources & Employment and Human Resources Development Canada to negotiate similar assistance.

- Pilot Phase II was being administered originally Pan Provincially through the LMDA. After the contract was signed, some modifications were made. (NOTE: Random North Development Association did not have a contract for the Skills Development.) The modifications were with the Skills Development component for Pilot Phase II. The main issue was opening/maintaining communication and ensuring the local Human Resources Development Canada offices that were a part of Pilot Phase II completely understood their roles and responsibilities relating to

administration and funding before the Pilot commences. It is recommended to ensure that the sponsor organization and financial partners (if pan provincial) have an information session within the appropriate local partnering offices.

- All local Human Resources Client Center offices follow the same Human Resources Development Canada mandate, but local Human Resources Client Center offices administer programs differently.
- For a concept like Bridging the Gap, it is important to have consistency, especially as it relates to client negotiations for subsidies. For Bridging the Gap, Pilot Phase II, three out of the four Human Resources Development Canada local offices negotiated subsidies, etc. with clients. The fourth Human Resources Development Canada local office provided the same amount of subsidies to all clients with no negotiations. We also recognize that we are not able to change how offices administer their programs; however, we need to ensure that they know about Bridging the Gap and how they fit in.

Public College System

- The College of the North Atlantic has all the necessary services to assist in implementing a concept like Bridging the Gap – including, student services counselors, community relations officers, and curriculum design specialists. They also provide a variety of resources, for example, personal development workshops, access to computers/internet, and resource/library services. In Newfoundland & Labrador, we are very fortunate to have one public college system, and from an administrative perspective this makes it much easier for ongoing communication. Unfortunately each campus has their own methods of administration.
- If Bridging the Gap is implemented in the future, it is important that ongoing communication continue between campuses that are partners in the Bridging the Gap Program. It is important

to have consistency and the availability of all in-kind contributions should be the same at all college sites. It is important that the Bridging the Gap representatives consult with the Public College system regarding their future partnership with Bridging the Gap – this would include both financial contributions required and in-kind services that the college would provide.

- It should be noted that for Bridging the Gap, Pilot Phase II, a letter highlighting in-kind contributions from the College was signed by the College President and copied to all partnering college campus administrators. When Bridging the Gap, Pilot Phase II was funded, partnering college campus administrators should have been briefed and consulted regarding their role in implementing Bridging the Gap. This did not happen and resulted in a breakdown in communication and some frustration from some campuses. When looking at the amount paid to the College, there needs to be a base amount (tuition fee) per student; more inline with regular students at the College.

Academic Instructors

- The College of the North Atlantic (Public Training Institute) is responsible for the hiring of all academic instructors for Bridging the Gap, Pilot Phase II. The public college system is unionized and has to follow proper collective bargaining practices when hiring instructors. Unfortunately, with a program like Bridging the Gap, all staff directly in contact with the participants has to have a strong understanding and appreciation for this client group. The people that are hired for Bridging the Gap can either have positive or negative effects on the final outcomes.
- Review the job advertisement for academic instructors and consult with the College to ensure that the most suitable academic instructors are hired for the Bridging the Gap Program – not selecting instructors just because they are next on the seniority list. Instructors selected should go through an interviewing process. Important for the College to set up some guidelines to say that Bridging the Gap is different from traditional programs, and state that it is a 45-week contract and that the instructor has to commit to the full program. The instructor's length of work day should be the same as the participant's work day. Curriculum design time to be included in the regular work day. There needs to be room for flexibility.

From the Employment Partners

Overall perception of the program

- Pretty good - it is a good program. It would have been nice if we could have started it 10 years ago.
- The clients had a lot to learn. There are a lot of things to learn when farming. You have to be a Jack of all trades. They started at the end of the crop cycle and they are working backwards. Safety is a big issue.
- The screening process concerns them a lot.
- Don't like the difference in wages between HRE and HRCC clients
- I am delighted and amazed by the interest of the clients and how much they have put into it.
- He is very enthusiastic that all of them will hopefully will have a job at that time. Working out better than he had thought. He was a bit leery on it at first. Especially about the education level. They wouldn't have gotten hired.

- I would go through it again if I had the opportunity. It went very well right on through. Sometimes the workers were discouraged, but that is life.
- On every program you can pick holes. It was as good as programs go.
- Gave him a totally different outlook on hiring people and their education levels.
- Great program. The participants are fitting in well. Certain people don't fit in certain classifications at first. He'd like the option to be able to keep people in one area and train them for a specific duty. But he understands they have to train and be exposed to all aspects of everything. Hopefully they will fit in their proper categories they are suited for.
- Excellent. We as a company really enjoyed it. It has been very beneficial to us. Right now we have a trained workforce to draw upon. We are expanding and we will be hiring them. It did give us a feel for working with a large number of employees. All of sudden there were nine in there. This was a learning experience on our part.
- Timing was really good for us - we are growing and we will need more people. There are people trained and interested.
- Once selected, things went very quickly - everyone pulled together as a team very quickly. It proved to him that there was a lot of support for the project and a good team to work with.
- The benefits of this program is the tailoring of the training to his workplace. The [Provincial Co-ordinator] gets 100% for the concept of the integration of the academic and the practical component. It can be a major success and government would get a much better value.
- He'd be delighted to do it again.
- The delight is the training can be tailored directly to the workplace and the personalities of the employees.
- Gives him the ability to size up the people over the 40 weeks. This is a big piece of it. He gets to see their attitudes and how they conduct themselves in the workplace. He gets to see them.
- They find it difficult to do the employment guarantee so far in advance.

Interaction with the participants

- The people in the program don't have much farming experience. Most are starting completely from scratch. There seems to be more potential in the younger ones. The older ones seem to be good at some things as well.
- There are a couple you would hire right off the bat, a couple of more of them would take a while. They are all trying their best.
- Working wonderful - fantastic. He was part of the selection program. They went with 8 people and then added one. They are really eager to learn and work. They are not people we would have hired because they don't have the level of education they would want. Anybody that didn't hire these people are really missing out on good people.
- It would have put those people ahead in a competition for work.
- I wouldn't have hired them without the program.
- I think they got good training. That made us interested to hire them back. We are taking on three more workers and will be taking the Bridging the Gap clients if they want to come.
- Several people have backed out, but they feared the schooling. They had all been out of their schooling for 25-30 years and this was the most intimidating factor.

- He is afraid they won't have enough practical training time. They were expecting more like 30 weeks than 6. Good to have them trained on what they are really working on it.
- They are looking for long term work and I'm hoping to provide it.
- Can't have their Grade 12 should not be a rule. Should not be able to have any post-secondary.
- They are programmed to be "lazy" around a program. They didn't take it to be on the job training. They didn't bend over backwards to impress the employers. There was a little bit of that. They felt the students felt they were guaranteed the job and no longer had to work at it again. We would love to be able to hire them all on.
- Anything they'd do different? The mentality of the students... this is a possibility for a job and you have to really impress. That was the most disappointing thing. They are not oriented in the real world. They got catered to for everything.
- Excellent - they are all great.
- He was part of the selection process – are they people who they would normally have been hired? Yes
- The training they are getting is relevant and appropriate. It should make them well prepared for the work here and will be good co-workers.
- Participants are loyal, dedicated and hardworking. They got a good bunch.
Out of the eight there are some good ones.
- They all worked out well. They all had a lot more self-confidence (those who needed it) some were frightened to death. They might still need a little bit of improvement. They all have come a long way. They gave a presentation at the College that was really impressive.
- Most of them they'd hire. There are a couple (three) who would be on the top of the list.
- They should all have gotten treated fairly with the money. This was really bad. Makes for poor work morale. The ones that got less were the hardest workers and the most commitment. They should have been getting the actual wage of what they would be paid if they go to the greenhouse.
- The participants really understand the business and the industry. They know the big picture.
- She is the first female there and she is doing a good job.
- They are productive. They will come looking for work.
- The union had been asking the company for more staff and then this program came along.
- They are on time and are really trying to prove themselves.
- They were excellent. The dedication and the interest in the company was really good. I was surprised about how committed they were to the success of the company. It was very positive. They felt they had a stake in the success of the company.
- I will be drawing upon these participants.
- We didn't have a whole lot of involvement in the selection. He would like the testing personalized to each situation.

Interaction with the College

- The Curriculum development process was useful to them because they looked at it all from a different perspective to see how everything comes together in the business.
- The curriculum design specialist from the College was a real asset and quickly came up to scratch. He likes that everything is planned. Students know what is on the go in advance. There is a lot of care and detail. They are really productive. They are more productive now than they were in the beginning.
- The college is doing exactly what it should be doing. The training is well-suited to the workplace.
- The skill set design is a positive thing.

Interaction with the Academic Instructor

- We had a little bit of a scenario with the academic instructor. The collective agreement was too restrictive and they stuck to it. For the same money, we could have gotten similar skills that would have worked more with the project.
- Overzealous if anything – he is great.
- Change the working hours of the Academic Instructor.
- Excellent. He checks in to see if everything is OK and they will work together on some future curriculum.
- The Academic Instructor was great. They did a lot of work and had to pick up from the Instructor who left. Too bad we never had [the second instructor] in the beginning. He was a bit nervous at first.
- The Academic Instructor was excellent. Very experienced in teaching adults and understood adult experiences. She was fantastic.

Interaction with the Project Co-ordinator

- She is very on the ball - determined and organized. She will do a good job and doesn't mind telling it like it is.
- Couldn't have any better. She was there when we needed her and when we didn't need her.
- The Project Co-ordinator was helpful and did what was required.
- Good overall. Doesn't deal with her very much. She is very thorough - on top of things. Very responsive.
- Excellent - can't say anything else about her. Everything is done when it is supposed to be done. Very organized (laugh) No back doors with her. Really good to work with.
- I see her at the meetings and I find her good.
- The co-ordinator is a little immature. Not overall bad. She tended to treat the participants in an immature way (all the participants were older than her.)
- Not bad, but she couldn't speak up to the sponsor. She couldn't make any decisions. It got a little annoying at times. Hopefully now with a new sponsor it will be better. I think she is

capable of doing the job if she is allowed to. Communication was an issue and can be aggravating. Couldn't have the co-ordinator undermining him, but the communications were poor. Most of the root was in the sponsor.

- More than adequate. From her side - great to have the liaison. A little too much - overkill. Definitely makes it easier for him - like having an Executive Assistant beside him to help with him. As an individual she is great - superb. She is very direct and he likes that. The realities of having two projects for one co-ordinator is the realities of the demands of travel. It enables him to be a partner and not a manager of the project.

How can it be improved? If you were going to do it all over again, anything you would do different, or and advice you'd pass along?

- 60/40 practical to academic components would have been better than 50/50 would have been better
- Some of the academics probably weren't necessary
- Need more practical.
- Nothing. He would (personally) have a different outlook on it. I'd definitely recommend it to other employers.
- Look at doing a co-operative approach with other employers.
- We should have asked them for a medical certificate for a clean bill of health.
- They should have done their field trips in more of the employment partners down times.
- Should be a little longer to go right through the agricultural year. Based on that sector. Farming is 12 month anyhow. And we can't get them the work until the fall now. Another timing issue.
- 50/50 academic/practical split was fine
- Would do it all over again - Yep... no hesitation.
- They were paid different rates by HRE and HRDC which should not have been allowed. They should have gotten EI stamps for the practical side of it. They had no income at the end. Not a work ethic instilled in it.
- I would recommend again definitely.
- It is a bit of a concern whether they will be able to spend enough time in all of the areas to be fully functioning
- I'd like the participants to be able to concentrate on a certain position instead of all cross-training. Not everyone is good at everything. Hopefully if they get on they will be able to move into something they were good at.
- I wouldn't take on a student who has a family member at the work place. Not causing conflicts, but it has increased their expectations.
- The participants won't have any income after they finish - the TWS might cover this off. HRDC is being very flexible. The concern is they will lose people. This could probably not have been changed or anticipated. If there was some way there could be a cushion at the end, it would have been better.
- I would recommend it - it is win-win with the employer. Especially if you have an aging staff.

- Everything is so organized. Normally government programs are just toss the money at you and there is little follow-up, support or accountability for results. This was different.
- Everybody knew the Project Co-ordinator was only a phone call away and the Academic Instructor was only a minute away.
- Change the screening process to include a full medical - both occupational therapy and the medical.
- The testing is often a pleasant surprise to people and it prepares them for the academics of the program. It is a nice challenge
- Need to better judge the work ethic and initiative and working under pressure is a key component.

Meetings and everything not too onerous?

- No - I am kind of used to it, were we have been so involved with so much government funding. There were not a whole lot of meetings. They were not too bad.
- No not too bad. I don't mind it - gives me a break.
- Main thing is to get them back on.
- The meetings and management of the process was not onerous. We knew what was involved up front.
- Meetings shouldn't be during their busy time.
- The Project Co-ordinator did all the paperwork.
- Meetings not too onerous.

Did you get what you expected?

- It was more than I expected. I figured it would be like an average make work project, but it wasn't. It was a lot more educational. They want to get something out of this, they want the job.
- Even with the TWS, they have to hire their own workers on layoff first as well.
- Don't want the participants to get discouraged and the best of them will be gone. Middle of August ending would be the best.
- Yes - and then some. It became an experience for us. We formed a bond with these people and learned about working with that number of people and the challenges that brings.
- I'd like to extend the program for another 40 weeks!!

From the College of the North Atlantic Student Services Counselors

- Most of the counsellors think there was too much testing. It is more than they would for other students. Realistically it wasn't relevant. What did it tell you?

- Nobody seems to be able to explain what are the goals in testing.
- What purpose did it serve them? She sat individually with every single person to discuss their results. How to screen for learning disabilities.
- The testing added extra undue stress to the participants.
- All that needed to be determined was achievement in terms of their reading level. Why is it so intensive? At most it would be math and reading. What is required for the employment? Once that is determined, you can get it from talking to a student about themselves and their experiences.
- College accepts people into an engineering program with only an achievement test which is so much less than the Bridging the Gap project piece.
- What are the benefits and the pros and costs? What do the negatives cost versus the positives?
- There needs to be physical fitness, vision, manual dexterity testing as well.
- What was the use of the interest test? (Self-directed search) It might have been more useful as a self-development tool throughout the program. Their desire is a self selection. Not as meaningful as a selection tool - the participants didn't get out of it what they could have. Especially for some of the younger people who may have re-training options.
- Testing was unnecessary - a week long was unnecessary. Was there a reason? Could they have tested for specific aptitudes?
- The College can go in and do an inventory of skills and aptitudes and test for that the same way as they can go in and determine what is the curriculum involved. The two can be done together.
- Goals and objectives of the BTG project are very sound and timely.
- Would like to have seen more consultation from the educational perspective. I would like to have seen more educational consultation up front.
- Purpose for an assessment needs to be crystal clear. In this case the objectives were defined, but the curriculum development process needs to be defined up front. There needs to be a very different testing process – one which is tailored specifically to those workplaces.
- Critical to be able design the testing to the levels of the population you are testing. Sometimes the levels are two diverse.
- There is a disconnect between the professional knowledge and issues of the Counsellors at the College and the goals and activities of RNDA. Why is that?
- There was a point in the process where we were saying we don't know why they are doing what they want us to be doing.
- Nothing went wrong that they didn't predict would go wrong. "They felt they were performing a service and were not to be engaged as much as if they were part of the planning team as consultants."
- They needed to be asked earlier to help with the design of the tools and the process.
- Need a more consultative approach.
- Issue of passing confidential information back to lay people without being able to put it in context.

Academic Instructors

Overview

- Overall, I think the program is going well.
- Really enjoyed it overall.
- A learning experience.
- Once we got into it and I figured out my roles and expectations it started to go great. This is a great program and there are people in our communities that are lost - they don't want to upgrade and go on and do a trade. With the economy the way it is, most of them are involved in the fishery. This program gave them at least a chance to get out of the lifestyle they found themselves in since the fishery closed. They could focus on a job they could depend upon every year.
- You'd be surprised at the things that they tell you. They were excited about the possibility of getting out of the dependency and the uncertainty. There was a real reward to helping them achieve their goal.
- Challenge in that she didn't know much about the forestry industry. There is a certain amount of knowledge you need to have to develop the curriculum for this type of project.
- Frustrating times: a lot of long hours at night to learn about the industry.
- There are too many people involved in this project. HRDC, ACOA, HRE, RNDA, Employment Partner, ITRD,
- The inflexibility and inconsistency of funding is a real issue.
- The program is really good. Great. The premise seems fine. At least the money spent on the students won't be wasted instead of a make work project.
- Her background in ABE has been very helpful to her for materials and experiences.
- She wishes she could spend more time in the work site. She doesn't have the opportunity to spend more time in the greenhouse. If she had had three weeks in the work site, then she could have had a better chance to tailor the teaching to the work site.
- Would have liked more time at the beginning to get familiar with the program.
- No preparation time. Not one free hour for prep. He started face and eyes into it. He stays the extra time, but he begrudges the lack of prep time.
- I think they all enjoyed it. At the end most of them were really glad they had did the program and had a great sense of accomplishment from doing it.
- One participant got all kinds of gifts and cards from her family. Really a big deal. They all got graduation cards from their families.
- We had a few rocky patches along the way, but we worked it out through the end.
- The next time around it will be a whole lot better - there is a steep learning curve.

If you had it to do all over again, what would you do differently?

- Practical component able to be integrated up front
- More prep time
- Time to access resources throughout the session

- Phone lines, internet connection done up front.
- More of the college "life skills" workshops closer to the academic portion of it all.
- The biggest problem I had was finding the materials for the curriculum in the beginning. This meant I didn't have things tailored enough.
- I would have liked to have seen more about the process about screening the applicants. There were great educational gaps among the clients and this is a real challenge as an instructor. She tailored work to the more advanced student. And to a less advanced student. Focus on the improvement of each and not getting to a specific level.
- I had no phone or internet or anything. I didn't feel I was prepared enough.
- I should have made time to make more contact with the other instructors - the couple of times this happened, it was really useful. I should have made more effort there.
- Skill set design meetings were difficult – it was due to the delay for the plant starting up on time- this made the planning very difficult. I liked the concept of these meetings, but the reality was it didn't work because of the newness of the company.
- I wouldn't change it for the world, in terms of the teaching experience. This one is a real jewel.
- I would definitely be interested in doing another one. It keeps you on your toes as an instructor. I learned as much or more about the industry as did the students.

Do you think BTG was successful? Why or why not?

- I feel it was. I've seen a lot of big improvements in their work and their attitudes, but if they don't get the work, it won't be successful. The worse thing that could happen is to bring these people out of their life - give them a taste of another, working life- and then take that away from them again.
- Good. I think it was a success. I think every participants benefited in their own way from the program, even if it was self esteem and self confidence. I think it was a great success overall.
- They didn't get enough experience actually working in the plant. Lateness and the like didn't get the chance to correct that type of behavior. Ideally, there should be a lot more practical integrated and then that enables a lot more feedback and corrective action.
- It was a totally positive experience, apart from incidents within the group.
- I would do it again. To meet the participants and help them and understand them better was great.

Did the partners (College, Employment Partner(s), CLN, Provincial co-ordination team fulfill their roles? Were they a help or a hindrance to the project? Any changes recommended on their roles/responsibilities?

College:

- She had a few issues because they were a remote site
- Classroom wasn't ready - 2 weeks getting a phone and 5 weeks getting internet. But every time she ID'ed something she needed the CRO (Linus Doyle) found it for her. But she can't go out and find the resources because she is so remote.
- Would have liked more time at the beginning

- They are very supportive.
- Only one conference call in February of all of the Academic Instructors. Should have been more.
- Triton has no Library just a CAP site which is difficult when you are trying to get resources.
- College has been great - the CRO has been excellent. Most of what was needed he has gotten.
- The CRO has been excellent. No matter what I wanted or needed in terms of support or resources, she facilitated getting it. She got lots of industry-related resources and sent them down to me.
- Everything worked out excellent. The Campus Administrator ranks right at the top, in my opinion. They were fully supportive of the group and anything I could want was there.
- College is fine. They are very committed. Although I think they didn't understand what it was at first.
- They were pretty good. The distance caused a bit of a problem. I couldn't go and peruse the library and it was difficult to talk to the co-ordinating instructor or the CRO sometimes. Overall they were fairly supportive. Supplies and the like aren't a problem and the librarian has been really good.
- Basically the College almost gave me too much support. I almost had to apologize for being so demanding. It was one of the hardest things I have ever done. Personally very stressful, and very difficult. I don't normally need so much input.
- The College has been good. He would like to have had a reading specialist. Almost someone in there quarter time.
- There was supposed to be another AI Teleconference. It would have been nice to have had more of them.
- It might be nice to have access to the other Academic Instructors and their work.

CLN:

- Didn't really play a role in my work, except for the meetings, and the like. I would have liked there to be someone on the CLN from the Industry. There was no one on the team who had industry experience.
- The problem I had with the CLN is that most meetings were scheduled when she was in class. So she only received the minutes most of the time. Sometimes I just went in and did my update and then went back to the classroom. This was a disadvantage because it slowed down my learning curve. Other than that, the concept is excellent as a support system for the entire program. The meetings make you realize the CLN members were so committed to the students.
- It would have been nice to have a couple of meetings where the participants met with the CLN. It would have been good for the students to see the number of people working on their behalf.

Project Co-ordinator:

- Not much involvement with the provincial people (Ina and Michelle)
- PC is excellent. She has done everything she has asked her to do for her.
- The co-ordinator is top notch. They have had some disputes that have been resolved.

- PC has been great. She is very demanding which sometimes works well and sometimes I feel the pressure. She didn't always appreciate that my first priority was the classroom, then preparing for the next day, and then to look at emails and her requests for info. But this is minor in the overall picture.
- I could not have been able to do the co-ordination in addition to the instruction. There is no designed curriculum so that takes up all your time. I don't know where I would begin to find the time to do what the PC has done in addition to instructing.
- If it wasn't for the PC - I'm not sure what we would do. She is excellent to deal with.
- Great - very responsive and she has been right there and on the ball all the time. Anything he asked for she has provided.
- She was very helpful. We had our moments over the year over different issues.
- PC is nice to work with.
- The PC added to the AI's stress and was the cause for a lot of it. She was treated like a 4 year old and not a 44 year old. Our co-ordinator was very controlling. Bossy. If one of our students said they weren't in - she treated them like a 4 year old.
- I think I'd do it again. But, if the same PC were going to be there, I wouldn't even apply for the position.
- The PC is out of this world for sure. You could never ask for a better co-ordinator.
- With the type of group, I need the co-ordinator. I just don't have the time to be doing what she has done. I needed someone to qualify/enforce my dealings with the group. This group needed a co-ordinator and I needed a co-ordinator!

Employment Partner

- The employment partner has been good - provided for their comfort and lets them use a lot of the equipment.
- Really cooperative. They have listened to any suggestions he has made and have integrated him into the staff.
- Union - the workers have taken students under their wings and there have been no issues so far.
- The Employment Partner is good - a very busy man. He is very committed. He works well with the participants. They seem to like him and he has a lot of patience. All three seem to be good. Easy to show them what to do and he is a good trainer.
- Employment partner was good: I had a good relationship with them. It would have helped if they were more organized, but they are still so new. They couldn't plan things out much in advance due to their lack of experience. They were very flexible and easy to get along with.

Participants

- Most of them signed up for the practical more than the academic, but they have been very cooperative. She has tried to bring in as much of the potential processing but nothing compares to the hands on.
- They are getting along great - especially with such close quarters. No conflicts other than a few personality clashes.

- Excellent group - quite impressive. Good work ethic and the like. Occasional moaning and groaning, but I couldn't have picked a better group overall. Very competent and have lots of life skills.
- I formed great relationships (I think) with the participants. You have to be approachable.
- Their willingness to learn was important.
- Literacy level is at the extremely low end. That will be problematic. When it comes to taking the pesticide program (where the literacy level is much higher than they have). It would have to be a coaching vs. an instructing job. So how do you do the assessment of their skills.
- Overall they are a wonderful group of people. Wonderful, enthusiastic and enjoy the work.
- The class tone has changed - it is more tense and serious. We are looking toward the end. The atmosphere is negative because of the lack of knowing about the jobs.
- We need to have people more closely related in their academic ability.
- Challenges around everybody knowing everyone else (from the same community). Lots of family inter-action. They know too much about each other.
- Great - really cooperative. Easy going. They make suggestions. Their attitude is really good. The selection process seems to have done a good job.
- They were excellent - the brightest spot of the program.
- There was somewhat of a challenge having the different levels - not hard as she had done it before and she could divide them into two groups. The brightest gained a lot of confidence helping the others.
- They are very needy group. A lot of gossip was brought in and was harmful. It was too stressful to enjoy.

Recommendations

- An appropriate physical learning environment is really important to consider up front.
- Need more lead time. The instructor should have been started at least a month earlier (20 working days). Essentially you are designing a completely new curriculum. And it has no text book. The curriculum here is completely new to the College.
- For the instructor - when they are hired or interviewed their responsibilities should be outlined clearly up front. There is no job description. The roles and responsibilities should have been shared with them up front.
- The equipment that you need to do your job needs to be ready as soon as the job is ready. Five weeks into the program before he had the computer and Internet access here at the office which meant he had to go to the College to check his email. And had to do a lot of the course research online and it was on dial-up which made it slower. The money wasn't there for high speed. If recommendation #1 was in place he could have done most of the research then.
- The time to get permission for field trips is way too long. This goes through the funding partners. They need the money for transportation primarily. He tried to do two and could only do one because of the amount of time it takes to get permission. Have the funding built in for others.
- All 8 of them should have the money much more along the same scale. Too many differences.

- Everybody should be given a second chance, but not a third. There was no authority. There was no action. No penalizing part of it all. They had no teeth to get rid of unco-operative clients.
- If I had my time back, I would have had to have had prep time. I needed time. I prepped at night.
- He worked on a 30 hour basis and the students work 35
- When you hire on the next instructor - they want to delineate their job descriptions are. A reading specialist would be the ideal type of person.
- There was no money for field trips. This needs to be there in the future.
- The testing and the interviews are too much. Just a simple CAAT test level B would have been fine.
- Better orientation of the CLN and the sponsor in terms of their roles and responsibilities.
- Not to be part of the selection committee
- Making the pre and post assessments took up more time than anticipated. Didn't know what was expected. In future the pre and post should be circulated that are already done for helpful.
- More flexibility in the program - they can't just up and go to do things. Everything is too rigid. Every hour they spend in the greenhouse they are expected to be in the classroom. There will be fallow times when they will have lots of time for academics. It is rigid that way.
- Maybe on the beginning have all the sites starting the one time and all Academic instructors got together for a full week and better knew what they had to do. They would develop a better relationship with one another. I didn't know the others and there was no relationship there. At least a few more of the teleconferences.
- Might have been a good idea for the students and the AI to have the same amount of hours. There was an extra hour that the participants were in that the AI wasn't supposed to, according to her contract.
- ½ day practical and ½ day academic was a great idea, but there was no preparation time. There were always students.
- Pre- & post assessments and final reports would also have benefitted from more networking and collaboration from among the AIs.
- One co-ordinator could do two projects IF they were close together geographically, had staggered start dates, dealt with the same CLN team and the same HRE and HRDC officials.
- Instructor should not be involved in the student selection process.. This is very unusual and not appropriate. Teachers work with whom they are given.
- We should go by college regulations around attendance. Participants had to call the PC if they were sick. If they had to go get their blood pressure checked for an hour, they would have to come in and work on another day.
-

Associate District Administrators

How did you find the program overall?

- Overall, I am very pleased with this program. The CRO was very busy during this time because he served as CNL team member and co-ordinator until a project co-ordinator was hired.

- The goal of the program was to get people back to work. We started with 12 students and all 12 graduated and started work with the employment partner immediately upon completion of the program. The integration of academic and practical work experience helped prepare the students to become competent employees for the company. They were also excellent College students.
- It went really well. We were really pleased that we had participated in the project. The CLN was a high point. It was a real plus and it kept people informed. It is an excellent model for us to use for other projects. All stakeholders are involved and this is a huge benefit. It removes the isolation and a lot of the geographic challenges. We are so used to participating by video conference and teleconference. We needed to be in the loop.
- With our mandate to provide ABE in the communities, we don't get to get at the lower level ABE's and this gave us a chance to get at that low literacy level client. And that was very positive, plus the link to employment for them. It is inclusive of that target.
- A good project. I wish some work had developed out of it. It wasn't the employment partners fault.
- CLN: They are quite used to the concept - there is a more mature and experienced group for CED than other regions.
- RNDA - there are a good crowd. The problem wasn't with them other than the provincial co-ordinator is so committed and she would get drawn into the zany politics of the piece with good intentions. Instead of ignoring it. The book-keeper/financial manager is relentlessly thorough. However, There was a feeling of being led along the babysteps.
- I thought it was a really really great program.. I came in after it was started. I don't know if we had any problems getting it off the ground or not.
- The students need a college place to do the work. Especially for access to the computers and the like. Having the classes at the campus dispels some of the fears of the College.

How could it be improved?

- The Bridging the Gap model is a great model and this program certainly proved that it works. It is difficult to improve on something when there is a 100% employment success rate. However, there are some recommendations I would make:
 - The academic instructor should have some back ground in that particular field. The job description should stress this. Our instructor did a great job but I know she was not used to coming into a program that required such flexibility and continuous curriculum
 - research for the industry which required her to integrate math and communications for that particular industry. Her background was ABE and she was use to teaching in a much more structured way. I suspect this was the case for all the BTG academic instructors. Another alternative would have been to seek an instructor with program development skills. This would have made this aspect proceed more smoothly. There also needs to be as much lead time as possible to give the academic instructor time to prepare for the program. The instructor should be hired several weeks before the program starts.
 - I also believe that there should be more communication between the academic instructors at all BTG sites. There was only one teleconference for them this year. I think that should have been done at least on a monthly basis to share ideas.

- We should examine whether the BTG warrants a full-time co-ordinator. While the co-ordinator was excellent and did a great job, I think our CRO would certainly be able to coordinate it as part of his duties in the contract.
- The last recommendation would be to have the campuses involved in the proposal development. Last year there was a set price to deliver but it was very difficult for our campus to deliver the program within the price we were given. The College committed several in-kind contributions such as travel, curriculum design, and assessments by councillors without consulting the CRO at each campus. All of these costs came directly out of the contract.
- I think the one thing that was glaring was the budget - everybody was given the same budget and we were forced to contribute in kind - that didn't cover any travel from the Campus to the site. There was no recognition in terms of the isolation and the travel required. There weren't sufficient funds in the budget to cover that.
- We went way over on the budget. In future, we would like more money to reflect the actual costs.
- Curriculum development should be done up front. It is difficult to identify the resources and get them done remotely. The up front development needs a lot of industry liaison. If we were to do it again, we would want to do that differently (up front).
- Broad ranges of education in the classroom – that was a challenge. Perhaps that should be more refined. More of a criteria to avoid that type of thing.
- Perhaps we should have them coming out of the field first and then the teaching skills second. Or else deal with the curriculum development up front. Or a more formal linkage with industry experts.
- There was way too much co-ordination. This was a straight forward contract training contract with an instructional co-ordinator. That is the tradition here. There was not enough work for one co-ordinator.
- Perhaps the co-ordinator is not as essential here.
- We were effectively presented (as a campus) with a budget that was pre-determined. This was a big deal when the site was 2 hours away from the campus - increased costs. Needs to take into consideration that budgets reflect the actual costs and operating environment.
- Way too much assessment up front. It was unfair and too much. And it wasn't used. Trim out most of the testing. College's role should be peripheral in testing.
- I look for lack of clutter. Need to eliminate a lot of layers.

Would you do it again?

- Yes, we would do it again. It was very rewarding to see the students develop as the program went on. Their self esteem just increased more and more as time went on. Also, it is gratifying to know that the company is getting good qualified people. It was not always easy going but that is what makes this program such a success knowing that the work paid off.
- Indeed we would. I'd be looking for opportunities for it in our current programming. It is an ideal program. We were very pleased to be a part of it. Debbie was great. It was a bit confusing at first.

- Yes. Next time around, I would monitor it a little more closely. You need to know what you are getting into.
- We'd do it again.

Was it burdensome on the College?

- In the beginning it was burdensome on the CRO because there was no coordinator hired and he did a lot of that work. He was the person involved the most because BTG came under contract training which is his responsibility. The only real burden was the time it took for the CRO to travel to all the meetings in Triton and trying to keep the program within budget. Other than that the program was like any other program that the College would offer.
- No I don't think so - not from an ADA point of view. The cost of travel was a burden, but not the time. It was an investment and we were delighted to be able to meet that target community.
- The service that it provided to the community and the good for the students was well worth the effort.
- It was fine. We never lost any money on it. No burden other than dealing with the problems that we had, and they would be avoided in another round. We had to switch instructors and there was some cost for that. The contract itself was fine, regarding budget.
- No more time consuming than any other ordinary contract.

From the Community Learning Networks (CLNs)

Goals for the BTG programs? What do you hope to be the legacies of the BTG process?

- Ultimately, all of us would like to see at the end of the day is employed individuals who can compete for jobs and obtain jobs in the forestry sector. BTG is a mix of theory and practical. Big strength is that it comes to where the people are instead of shipping them out.
- Two sides: Educational side... we have a baseline program in place that can be applied as a structure to other industries. Big piece is that it is in the community. For the participants - that they change their whole mindset of industry and education will change that they are no longer independent fishermen but are to be employed. Big difference. And a big transition to working for someone else.
- Similar to what they have said. At the end of the day, the employer will be satisfied with the trained workers we are providing here. Participants want success on an individual level. Whether they work with these employers or others, their confidence is increased. A way to do training in the future in other industries.
- Ditto - definitely want to see the participants employed at the end of the day, increase their education level, increase their self-esteem and confidence. Seeing a difference on that already. Would love to be able to see something like this again. Participants just wouldn't be able to go elsewhere to get the training.
- Target low level learners to enter into informal skills/academic training:
 - < provide local economy with skilled workforce, targeting industries/business with labour market challenges.

- < create an environment of learning, which provides opportunity for everyone at various learning development stages.

What do they see as the Legacy of the CLN and BTG

- providing a user-friendly program that meets rural educational and economical development needs. (A one stop shop approach - program that considers individual needs, business/industries needs & making it work) Flexibility and partnerships are key.
- Students who are enrolled to achieve academic success for the skills training being delivered - at the end of the program that the practical training will be enough to get them the job and take them off government dependency.
- From the College perspective - relationship built with two employers (Newfoundland Hardwood and Co-op)
- Strengthening of the employment partner. The first one that we did the employees brought a lot more to the employer and it motivated the workers so there was a strengthening of the company. Hoping the same thing will happen for the two current employers. This is intended to lead to better products, better relationships, and a stronger company.
- Becoming familiar with the partners that we work with. Developing and strengthening the relationships with the other partners.
- This is a much broader scale result. There have been individual relationships developed at the CLN and other initiatives that their experiences and learning here has spawned and been the catalyst for other things - probably some that they don't even know about.
- Hoping to get the participants to reach their employment goals and the social goals. The latter are more important but less tangible to the overall success for the individuals. Enables them to contribute to the community.
- It works specifically to the goals of holistic integrated approach of the SSP. These are some of the hoped for legacies. It enables them to leverage the BTG experience into building and strengthening their communities.
- Strengthening the communities as a whole – take the participant and they gain the self-esteem and they can operate better in their communities and their workplace. Less people on assistance.
- Important that we have the Strategic Social Plan and Zonal people at the CLN - while they aren't directive of the operations of the CLN. It is not an accident that the CLN supports the zonal plan and the SSP.
- We will get 12 participants which are well-versed in the whole industry sector - excellent training program. The 40 week duration is long enough to really get to the meat of it all.
- There has been a lot of training going on that was not linked to employment. This was very practical, job specific, training and we saw this as building and going beyond the Linkages program. We were very excited about the concept overall. We hope things work well. We are hearing about needs from other sectors that want to do the program as well.
- We are training people to stay and not to leave, for a change.
- There is a positive boost in the community to see people who are “down on their luck” working and getting up and going.
- We are producing productive residents who are able to sustain themselves in their community for the long term.

- If this stabilizes or supports the new business, this is a great goal.
- Explore new ways of attaching people more securely to the labour force. Create opportunities for this target group. Employment partner getting some very well trained people and people getting education.
- Giving the participants employment and academics also affecting their social well-being
- Participants that are more employment focussed. Strengthen the employment partners. Helping the employment partner achieve and explore how it could be applicable to other clients.
- Making sure the academic instruction relates to the workplace and grow their personal development.
- Targeted group is important. Getting someone of his long term caseload. Even if it is only 50% of the people get employment he is happy - even if they get some education. It is a win-win-win for everyone.
- Building self-esteem is critical.

What do they perceive are the strengths and weaknesses of BTG?

Strengths:

- Education is in the community
- Employer will have a trained workforce - to their specified
- Increasing education levels
- Local approach
- Leave behind structure which can be applied to other industries
- Better understanding of the economy
- Ability to communicate among the group - there is a high level of trust and communication among them.
- They are able to go around and rally the troops to address any of the weaknesses. They are very flexible
- All the stakeholders coming together as a CLN - we are all learning from one another - two heads are better than one.
- Many more strengths than weaknesses.
- Ability to overcome the barriers of distance to work together as a CLN
- The ability to design the curriculum to meet the needs of industry
- Creativity is a great strength (especially Betty).
- All partners (financial, education, development, industry,) at the same table to find solutions.
- Coordinator to pull everything together is key.
- Plenty of public awareness & clear vision of where the program is leading
- Great resource guides and supervision provided through Random North
- Bringing the academic instructors to the table with the students

- Takes into account the individuals attainment as of to where they are - it is very individualized. Not just a number. While the practical will be the same, the academic component / plan for each will be individualized
- A flexible approach to working with participants and the employment partners. Not a cookie cutter approach.
- Partnership - everybody brings a little bit of difference to the table.
- Better understanding from the employment partners point of view that individuals with challenges -it solidifies the relationship between the employer and the community.
- Participants have a deep trust of the CLN people. They really value their opinion and their input.
- Creates a CLN
- Employment and training to stay in the community
- Strengthens the employment partner
- Good from a community perspective - people in the community likes the investment made in their community
- Enables participants to be more productive
- Tailors the training specifically to the workplace - this is critical to the program.
- Brings new money to the community in the terms of \$\$\$ Estimate this will create \$1 million worth of salaries per year
- This is the real stuff of economic development
- Gives participants a real sense of self-esteem and ownership in the company. Keeps morale up
- There is employment at the end of the day.
- There is a strong linkage to the community
- Capacity Building for the community
- It is flexible. It focuses on the personal development. This is a big part of it for people who haven't had an attachment to the work force. It improves their self-esteem.
- The fact that there isn't a specific group of people that aren't left out - EI eligible and non EI eligible could both participate.
- This is a bit of a showcase - there is a success story. Should there be more good news type of stuff. The Burgeo Broadcasting System (local cable program) did a little piece on it.
- Having a CLN is a strength . Gives the advisory support to the BTG Co-ordinator.
- Having the employment partner on side.
- This conflict has not affected the participants.

Weaknesses:

- Smaller pool of applicants. If you can't have High School completion, this decreased their applicant pool by 50%.
- Communication of what the employers expect of the program (particularly in Health and safety)
- Confidence level that they are doing so many new things. We are continuously having to change and adapt. This is a challenge.

- Because we are all very busy, and BTG is only one item, sometimes scheduling is a challenge
- Should do the Grade 12. In smaller communities they do finish their Grade 12 but the big barrier is to go out of the community to go to school. This is a big barrier.
- The CLN should have been put together right away when the project was first put together. First time they met was in Clarendville.
- The budgeting should be done on an individual basis, versus the same as all of them.
- Education level was a barrier. Although some applicants did complete highschool they did not complete any post-secondary education and felt they were at much disadvantage in getting employment in their home town as were those with less than grade 12 education.
- Difficult to draw the line between counselling and dependency. You have to stand back and not fall into their lives. You have to find a space on their level. Some times they just need a good pep talk to get through the day. The challenge is to keep them from dependency and on the side of advisory capacity;
- Sometimes the selection of participants. Difference in who gets paid what - whether they are on HRDC or HRE. Sometimes there is a perception of favouritism and "making deals".
- Technology is helping to overcome the geography issues, but there is still coming there.
- Unions are a challenge to work with. They can be a strength.
- The complexity of the model - or the difficulty of explaining such a simple concept.
- It would be difficult to explain to the public and to the media. Hard to "Good" or "Excellent" the message out.
- Finding employment partners in real rural areas that need employees and that are sustaining. And are open and flexible to the learning environment and have room to accommodate them.
- They are limited to private sector employers
- If there is no work for them at the end of the program - they are screwed.
- Dependent upon funding - to be announced & found and implemented.
- Dealing with the unions from the College point of view - must take the recalls. Personality plays a large role in this. There is dramatically different requirements of the Academic Instructors. Need the time to do the individualized training and prep work for training and assessment.
- The varying starting points (in terms of literacy) of the students. Makes it more of a challenge.
- Requires more time that is not necessarily there.
- Also requires the time for the Academic Instructors to correlate and build the new content and tailored programs for each work site.
- Lack of Flexibility to meet requirements around employment partners
- Challenge to find employment partners in rural isolated communities.
- Had to have not have a Grade 11. There are still cracks. But this is a targetted program
- Everybody is getting paid differently. This is an issue.
- Selection Process: some up front assessment, but there was too much. One was physically sick because of the testing.
- Communication is key.

- Orientation to the CLN and what is a CLN. There is a tradition of this kind of approach.
- The fact that it is a model from "outside". Role of RNDA. Need more flexible and accommodation between RNDA and the CLN and the sponsor.

What do they hope the CLNs contribute to BTG? What are the expectations of the CLN members?

- From the College's perspective - we bring an experience in training. This is different from our normal route of training. A lot of it is to give the experience we are also learning as we go. This is totally different. We have done distance and on site before but this is different again. The sharing of ideas around the table and also bringing this back and also bringing the approach back to the College as well and sharing the approach.
- A couple of ways to look at it - because it is a Pilot - we are learning the best practices as we go. What we can do better and as we go along. As employment services counsellor, I am keenly interested in learning how this can be applied to other communities. A big contribution is that the CLN members bring a local flair and touch and ability to relate to the people.
- CLN is great for advice to determine what to do and where to go next. Everybody brings a wealth of individual experiences as well. It takes away the isolation of being in a remote community. Helps with the co-operation of other communities helping local industries. More local co-operation. More understanding of what other groups and organizations do and what is there mandate. A team approach to individual problems. Take a more active role in helping communities to increase their educational levels and employment rates.
- The name BTG also bridges the gap over distance.
- Provide ongoing support and advise during the planning and operation stages of the program.
- The program is all about community and the CLN reflects that.
- The individuals around the table make such a difference - they are flexible, accommodating and committed. They are a resource pool.
- BTG wouldn't work with the CLN. It brings a strength and a resource pool to the co-ordinator that wouldn't be able to happen. What is the difference between a resource pool and a CLN.
- There is a sharing of ideas and creative thinking about when we come up against an obstacle. It is a "community" approach.
- There is a better understanding of the others organizations and their roles and operations and programs. It adds to the success of the implementation of the program. It helps to solve problems.
- Respectful, professional approach. Where did this come from? Mostly from Michelle. She made you feel you were really part of it. You feel you are really contributing and a valued member of the group. They have never regretted being involved in the group. It is unbelievable.
- The biggest growing pain was around understanding the complex model of what is BTG. The didn't always understand what it was but they trusted Michelle's leadership. It was uncharted waters in a lot of ways.
- For the places that don't have Michelle - it is more than a challenge.
- They all came to the table with a clean slate.

- Brings together with like minded people who are working together in the goals of getting employment
- Removes the sole responsibility from the sponsor. We are just the lead sponsor - takes away the heavy responsibility of the load. I really love this approach.
- The CLN went through two employment partners before the Project Co-ordinator came on and they helped her a lot. They got a third one up in 3.5 weeks.
- The CLN is my sounding board. If there is anything I have a question about I can use them as a resource. They provide the final say. 5-6 minds is better than one.
- Everyone here represents a vested interest. We all want to see those people do well.
- How often do such different groups come together so quickly and work so quickly? Unheard of.
- It is all about the connecting - community capacity building in our own way.
- Wealth of information is phenomenal.
- The whole group comes from a diverse groups which made the program better organized and easier to solve problems creatively. Especially considering the geography.
- Hard to find any suggestions to improve the CLN. How about including a Student rep? Might be intimidating - in the skill set design subset committee.
- Brainstorming around ideas is important.
- Brings a legitimacy to the project that is not just one persons bee in their bonent.
- Chance to give something back to the community. In terms of employment it is a return to the process.
- Curriculum development issues and dealing with the students
- This brings other opportunities to bring down to Burgeo - a better way to get our tentacles into the community.
- Come to meetings every couple of months and work through the process - support the work of the committees. As long as people live up to their individual commitments. Informational role.
- This is our success story. Willing to do what it takes to make it a successful.
- The ability to be responsive and flexible.
- Fulfills our mandate in the rural development side. A look of the provincial department. Let others know what it is all about.
- To learn know about the BTG programming and implement it as far as possible learn what about it can be adapted to other situations.
- Keenness to learn about what makes this program different.

How do they define success? Failure?

Success

- Providing participants with self-confidence and new skills to gain meaningful employment and or pave the way to receive higher levels of education.
- From the participants point of view - if they are more sure of themselves that they can pursue different employment and training opportunities. If there are other projects that can be delivered in another way - to another industry.

- Participants to increase their self-esteem and an increased awareness of what is out there - what are the options. Who does what and hopefully they will learn some of this through this. The work experience should be a real asset. Break the "no job no experience" cycle. It will be successful if they find a job or they decide to go forward with more post-secondary training. Apply the model to other sectors.
- Employment factor, continuation of this type of project throughout the area but also the development proceeding from this - having the communities grow because they area trained and people don't have to come from outside to do the work. Silviculture is an example. Local employment will happen.
- Any student who makes it through the program is a success - employment is a bonus. That is one form of success. Employment is dependent upon the labour
- Hopefully the social aspects will have been improved.
- Employment is the bottom line.
- Strengthening the employer.
- From the companies point of view is to have well-trained workers - they are trained to appoint where they feel as comfortable together as a family rather than a group of workers.

Failure

- Industry/business partners do not provide work for participants beyond the program period.
- Everyone is dropping out because the program is not meeting their needs or it is too difficult
- If the chains keep breaking down.
- If the CLN can't get along and starts becoming dysfunctional
- It is so difficult to train them out of their mind set. They have been so tied with the fishery where everything is so seasonal. Now that there is no fishery they feel those benefits should be transferred and they aren't.
- There may be challenges from the selection process.

How can BTG be improved for the future?

- Cannot think of anything
- Open it up to more people who have their high school and are still unemployed
- Better understanding by all players (in particular the employment partner) of what is required of them and what will be their contributions. Dept of Forestry in particular
- Knowledge of what is required of the Health and safety stuff up front.
- Have the CLN in place at the very beginning
- Program development and design needs to be done really early on as well. Silviculture was not necessarily a good fit with the saw millers. Clustering is important.
- Someone co-ordinating the training aspect as well - need a clear leadership here.
- Start the BTG co-ordinator right at the beginning. Have her technology and access set up.
- Have the contracts signed up front before they get into it.
- Have the CLN Meet as a team together right from the start.

- More time at the beginning for preparation. We didn't have all of our participants in place when we started. Participants needed a bit more leeway at the beginning.
- The participants would like to know what it was they would actually be learning - they didn't know what the curriculum would be. They took a leap of faith. They needed that info to make a decision. They have low self-esteem and they need more information. Design curriculum, then do your budget. Sometimes there are specialized courses to be taught by specialized people (which have budget implications).
- Maybe we should have a data base of their Curriculums
- Better selection process that is more individualized to the employment partner. How do you screen for medical and physically fit?
- More consistent approach to the funding people receive when they are going through the program. There should be equity there. Some debate about this as it is income support not employment. Should it be based on their family circumstance or otherwise.
- Processes of selecting the instructor needs to be improved
- If there could be more collaboration among the Academic Instructors - looking at each others manuals, or if there were a generic model. Just as a guide - to see how others did it. Challenge is that the manuals are confidential to that client.
- More prep time for Academic Instructor
- Include some student participation in the CLN.
- Should we have more media coverage? It is a good news story that people will enjoy reading and learning about.
- Acknowledge that the process of CLN is what already works in many communities and regions;
- Change the selection process
- Improve the communication of the roles and responsible of the CLN, particularly with people in the private sector. More than just communication but to a formal understanding.
- Quicker to get things communicated.
- Spend more time "to process forming" of the CLN in the first place. They gave Greg too much autonomy and they abdicated their responsibility. This will change.
- Better orientation
- Need a full commitment from all members. HRDC asked Betty to not send her emails about BTG unless there were direct dealings with one of her clients.
- There should be an accountability from the people that decide to not be involved. There should be a recognition of the CLN Members to their supervisors from RNDA or the sponsor, for example.
- A subject matter expert? - Yes it is a good idea. Provides a bit of a challenge. We don't know the sector until the employment partner was selected. Maybe a different role with a different engagement process as they would only be involved in that one for that sector. It has to be someone with a developmental role versus a regulatory role in the sector. It might be more work than it is worth. Maybe just at the Skill set Development Committee. But it could also be an eye opening experience for that individual. Important to keep the personality separate from the function. When they are just from one sector, that makes it difficult.
- Sector specialists tend to have an industrial development mandate and are not focussed on the social side of it - they focus on the businesses and not on the individual side of it. Maybe as an

advisory role. Or on the skills set design side of it all. Especially if the employment partner has a relationship with the sector specialist.

Where there other benefits/costs to working together as a CLN?

- The benefit of working around the table and the inter-agency cooperation. All the cooks brought an ingredient to the table so it worked well. A good synergy—the most important ingredient was money thought
- This is a weird operation, in that we weren't approved to start (form the Food inspection agency) but now we are so its worked out well.
- The local HRDC office was really good; they went above and beyond
- The participants should have a voice in the CLN—one or two participants at the meetings
- The confidentiality issue was respected—which was important for me as a business partner. A lot of people don't understand the cost issues for the partner, but here people understood. And now I got 11-12 well trained and dedicated employees—which was worth the cost.
- There is always time after the meetings to talk about other (non btg) issues and other relationships were developed around other initiatives.
- It is a model that we should use to work on other project as well.
- It is a good example of successful partnerships so you can do several things at once.
- Enhanced networking and appreciation of each other
- Copious emails!!
- It is good for my personal growth and development. It is an investment.
- Others in our organization still don't see the "why" of why we are involved in this. It is not given the weight of a business intervention.
- There are still challenges about educating the senior bureaucrats. They still refer to the Crocker report. They typify it and then it is very difficult to change it.
- No other costs.

From the Site Sponsors

How did you find the project?

- I felt there were so many layers. I felt we were caretakers and that we felt we had little direct input. We inherited a system that had already been established. We didn't feel much ownership. Even though I probably initiated the program and I still believe in it. I've been involved in it for a very long time.
- A lot of issues resulted in the transfer of sponsorship and those issues didn't go away.
- Is there an issue around the selection of the sponsor? Should we add a criteria to ensure there is a collaborative approach at the sponsor management? The whole thing is cumbersome.
- The complexity was too much. HR is often the enabling or disabling character in all of this And we had to deal with the immaturity and drama of the co-ordinator.
- All that being said, we would do it again. We would better define the roles and responsibilities up front.

- Accounting needs to be more streamlined.
- One of the most worthwhile projects we have taken on in the zone, ever. Everybody is really excited overall. They would definitely do it again.
- RNDA were just excellent. They were always available. The college was very helpful and went beyond what was required.
- No - I really don't agree that there is no need for a co-ordinator. There was some discussion among the academic, practical instructors and co-ordinator. I really think we need a co-ordinator. We would not be able to sponsor it without a full-time co-ordinator. And it is important that the CLN not run it - or the employer or the College. The third party sponsorship (the development association) is an important part to ensure the best interests of the participants. (Not the employment partners or the college) We don't get any admin funding or anything out of it.
- Was it much of a burden? No - the co-ordinator was key to that. It didn't contribute any admin funding to us, but the benefits were there - not even for their community, but for the zone. We are hoping that now that we could do two projects with Fannie as a co-ordinator. Zone board was interested in having them do it again.
- The CLN contributed to the overall success of the project. It made it more convenient for the co-ordinator where if one partner or the other couldn't make it, the meeting still went ahead so she still got her work done. There was a real team environment.
- There were other spinoffs of the CLN - it builds overall respect and awareness of each other by working together successfully.
- We need to be more sure and certain about the employment partner before we go to participants.
- The qualifications of participants - you cannot be a high school graduate. He thinks High School graduates should be able to be included in the program.
- It is a wonderful program. Loves the academic training and workplace training and then the job - that is all, isn't it!
- The field trip was excellent. From the point of view of the participants, I was really surprised and impressed how well they conducted themselves. It was nothing but a pleasure. That kind of thing should be built into the program and make sure it was built into the program.
- Thinks the project and the model is great overall. This is the real stuff of economic development.
- He gets lots of support - the Program Co-ordinator and the provincial co-ordinator are very helpful and assistive.
- As the president of the sponsoring body, there are some negatives. It is more difficult to operate with so many partners but it is a better way to do things. Normally our executive committee would run the show.
- As the sponsoring organization - there is no administrative fee to their association. They are used to taking on 10-15% administration fee. There are costs associated with being in business as a sponsorship. Maybe written in the contract the travel is covered out of the 10-15%, or have it separately and for other than the co-ordinator.
- They shine in the reflected glory of the project. Their association looks good if the project looks good, particularly among the members of the CLN.
- The employment partner has to be partnership oriented. They can't demand to have control over everything.

Appendix F - Research Instruments

CLN Focus Group Questions - Initial

- Goals for the BTG programs? What do you hope to be the legacies of the BTG process?
- What do they hope the CLNs contribute to BTG?
- What do they perceive are the strengths and weaknesses of BTG?
- How do they define success? Failure?
- How can BTG be improved for the future?
- Do you think BTG will become a "standing program"? Why or Why not?

CLN Focus Group Questions - Concluding

- How would you characterize your experience with this program?
- How would you improve it if you could do it over again?
- What do you think the CLN added to the process and the program, if anything?
- What did RNDA add/detract from the process?
- How could the CLN process be improved?
- Where there other benefits/costs to working together as a CLN?
- Do you feel the program has been successful? How?

Employment Partner Questions - Initial

- How is the project going overall?
- What do you think of the Participant Selection Process?
- What do you think of the role of the Program Co-ordinator?
- What do you think of the role of the Provincial Co-ordinator and Finance?
- Anything you would do differently?

Employment Partner Questions - Concluding

- Overall perception of the program?

- Interaction with the participants?
- Academic Instructor?
- Project Co-ordinator?
- How can it be improved? If you were going to do it all over again, anything you would do different, or and advice you'd pass along?
- Meetings and everything not too onerous?
- Did you get what you expected?

Sponsor Questions - Initial

- How do you find the program overall?
- How do you find the Participants?
- How do you find the Program Co-ordinator?
- How do you find the the College - Community Relations Officer & Student Counsellor?
- Do you have any recommendations for change at this point in the program?

Sponsor Questions - Concluding

- If you had it to do all over again, what would you do differently?
- Do you think BTG was successful? Why or why not?
- Did the partners (College, Employment Partner(s), CLN, Provincial co-ordination team) fulfill their respective roles? Were they a help or a hindrance to the project? Any changes recommended on their roles/responsibilities?
- Any comments on the selection, training, development and support of the participants?
- Any final comments you wish the evaluation to take into account?

Academic Instructor Questions - Initial

- How do you find the program overall?
- How do you find the Participants?
- How do you find the Program Co-or. ?
- How do you find the the College - CRO & Student Counsellor?
- Do you have any Recommendations for change at this point in the program?

Academic Instructor Questions - Concluding

- If you had it to do all over again, what would you do differently?
- Do you think BTG was successful? Why or why not?
- Did the partners (College, Employment Partner(s), CLN, Provincial co-ordination team) fulfill their respective roles? Were they a help or a hindrance to the project? Any changes recommended on their roles/responsibilities?
- Any comments on the selection, training, development and support of the participants?
- Any final comments you wish the evaluation to take into account?

Project Co-ordinator Questions - Initial

- How does she find the program overall? What are its strengths and weaknesses?
- Participants?
- How does she find the funding partners, College, Employment partners, Provincial co-ordination from RNDA, CLN
- If she had it to do all over again, would she do anything different? How can it be improved for the next time?

Project Co-ordinator Questions - Concluding

- If you had it to do all over again, what would you do differently?
- Would you recommend BTG to others? Why or Why not?
- Do you think BTG was successful? Why or why not?
- Did the partners (College – including the Academic Instructor, Employment Partner(s), CLN, Provincial co-ordination team fulfill their roles? Were they a help or a hindrance to the project? Any changes recommended on their roles/responsibilities?
- Any comments on the selection, training, development and support of the participants?
- Any final comments you wish the evaluation to take into account?

Interviews with the College Associate District Administrators - Concluding Only

- How did you find the program overall?
- How could it be improved?
- Would you do it again?
- Was it burdensome on the College?

Client Attitude Assessment - Initial & Concluding

The following is the attitudinal assessment used with the participants at the beginning and the end of the program. They were administered one-on-one in person (two site had to have their concluding assessment done over the phone due to travel and other restrictions).

Part I Themselves

Introduction (Icebreaker)	Ask participants to introduce themselves in their own words - where are they from, what have they worked at before, talk about their family and the like.
Motivation	What were their primary motivators for becoming involved in the BTG program?
Goals	What are their goals for themselves when they finish BTG? What do they hope to accomplish?
Self-descriptors	How would you describe your personality?
	What are your strong points and your weak points?
	How are you different from other people?
	On a 1-5 scale (with 1 being the Highest and 5 being the Lowest), how would you measure your Intelligence?
Your Self- confidence
Your ability to learn
Your ability to get along with others
Your Independence
Your abilities as a family member
Your abilities as a community member
Mentors	What qualities do you admire in a person?
	Do you have any of those qualities?
Community	Do you currently participate in community activities and community group activities?
	If yes, what are they? Why do you participate?
	If no, why not? Would you like to?

Part II Their work

History	What type of work have you participated in the past?
	What type of work do you enjoy?
Preferences	Do you prefer to work with others or more on your own?
	What is the ideal work situation for you?
Attitudes	On a 1-5 scale with 1 being the highest and 5 being the lowest, how would you measure your desire to work?
 your ability to work?
 your performance at work?
 your ability to take on new tasks at work?

Part III Their future

Vision	How do you see yourself differently in 12 months time?
	In 5 years time?
Work	What changes would you like to see in themselves regarding your work life in the future?
Personally	... regarding your personal / family life?
Community	... regarding your community?

Appendix G - Social and Economic Landscapes

- Burgeo
- Clarenville
- Lethbridge
- Port Hope Simpson
- Triton