



***Indigenous Adult and Higher Learning Association***

***IAHLA***

***Data Collection Project 2006/07***

**FINAL REPORT**

**March 30, 2007**



# Table of Contents

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Methodology.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. Who Responded.....</b>	<b>3</b>
3.1 Student Enrolments.....	4
3.2 Instructors .....	6
3.3 Funding .....	7
3.4 External Program Evaluations.....	9
<b>4. Personal Development.....</b>	<b>11</b>
4.1 Life Skills Programs.....	12
4.2 Short Non-Credit Courses or Short Term Workshops.....	13
4.3 Student Support Services.....	14
4.4 Service Assessment Tools.....	15
4.5 Links to Other Service Providers.....	16
4.6 Learner Ratings on Their Personal Development .....	17
<b>5. Leadership Development.....</b>	<b>18</b>
5.1 Groups Directly Involved with Programming/Learning .....	19
5.2 Student Involvement and Communication.....	20
5.3 Learner Ratings of Becoming More Active in Community.....	21
5.4 Formalized Relationships with Others.....	22

<b>6. Cultural Development.....</b>	<b>24</b>
6.1 Cultural Promotion as an Institutional Goal.....	25
6.2 Emphasis on Language and Culture Vis-A-Vis Education and Employment .....	26
6.3 First Nations Language Courses and Revitalization Projects .....	27
6.4 Learner Ratings on Language and Cultural Events .....	28
<b>7. Wisdom Development.....</b>	<b>28</b>
7.1 Student Assessment Tools.....	29
7.2 Assessed Literacy and Numeracy Levels .....	29
7.3 External Psycho-Educational Assessments .....	30
7.4 Learner Ratings Of Learning.....	31
<b>8. Student Satisfaction.....</b>	<b>31</b>
8.1 Student Satisfaction with Courses, Facilities and Relationships.....	32
8.2 Institutes' Use of Surveys to Gather Student Feedback.....	33

## **LIST OF EXHIBITS**

Exhibit 3.1 – Responding Institutes' Student Enrolment.....	4
Exhibit 3.2 – Institutes Offering ABE and Other Programs .....	5
Exhibit 3.3 – Instructors Employed Full-time/Part-time .....	6
Exhibit 3.4 – Instructors' Highest Level of Education.....	6
Exhibit 3.5 – Instructors' Other Qualifications .....	7
Exhibit 3.6 – Funding Sources.....	8
Exhibit 3.7 – Major Funding Sources (Over 50% of Total Budget) .....	8
Exhibit 3.8 – Changes in Funding Since Last Year.....	9
Exhibit 3.9 – Able to Fund Facilities or Other Capital Projects .....	10
Exhibit 3.10 – Years External Program Evaluations Conducted .....	10
Exhibit 3.11 – External Program Evaluation Funders .....	11
Exhibit 4.1 – Institutes Providing Life Skills Programs .....	12
Exhibit 4.2 – Institutes Providing Shorter Term Non-Credit Courses or Workshops.....	13
Exhibit 4.3 – Interventions and Referrals Provided.....	14
Exhibit 4.4 – Helpfulness of Student Support Services.....	15
Exhibit 4.5 – Service Providers Linking with Institutes .....	16
Exhibit 4.6 – Learner Ratings on Their Personal Development .....	17
Exhibit 4.7 – Learner Goals for Next Year .....	18
Exhibit 5.1 – Groups Directly Involved with Programming/Learning .....	19
Exhibit 5.2 – Student Involvement and Communication .....	20
Exhibit 5.3 – Learner Ratings on Becoming More Active in Community .....	21
Exhibit 5.4 – Formalized Relationships with Others.....	22
Exhibit 5.5 – Institute/Community's Involvement in Partnerships with Others .....	23

<i>Exhibit 5.6 – Support Received from Partners.....</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Exhibit 5.7 – Proportion of Students Enrolled in Articulated/Transferable Programs.....</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>Exhibit 6.1 – Importance of First Nation Institute Goals.....</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Exhibit 6.2 – Importance of First Nations Goals (2006/07 and 2005/06) .....</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Exhibit 6.3 – Comparative Emphasis of Goals.....</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Exhibit 6.4 – Institutes Offering First Nations Language Courses and Involved with Revitalization Projects.....</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>Exhibit 6.5 – Language Courses —Hours Offered Per Week.....</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>Exhibit 6.6 – Learner Ratings on Language and Cultural Events .....</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>Exhibit 7.1 – Student Assessment Tools Used to Place Students.....</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>Exhibit 7.2 – External Psycho-Educational Assessments.....</i>	<i>30</i>
<i>Exhibit 7.3 – Learner Ratings of Learning .....</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>Exhibit 8.1 – Student Satisfaction Ratings .....</i>	<i>32</i>
<i>Exhibit 8.2 – Surveys Used to Gather Student Feedback.....</i>	<i>33</i>

**LIST OF APPENDICES**

<i>Appendix A: Data Collection Project—Approved Framework.....</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>Appendix B: Institutes Responding to the IAHLA Data Collection Project.....</i>	<i>37</i>
<i>Appendix C: IAHLA Student Survey Respondents Profile.....</i>	<i>39</i>

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## 1.0 Introduction

The Indigenous Adult and Higher Learning Association (IAHLA) is a non-profit society dedicated to Indigenous adult and higher learning. In 2005/06, IAHLA initiated the Data Collection Project. This report focuses on the results of the second year of research (2006/07). The project assists First Nations institutes to meet accountability and reporting requirements using a framework developed for First Nations adult and post-secondary institutes by First Nations institutes. In this way, institutes are able to report data that reflects First Nations values. The First Nations framework comprises five areas:

- personal development;
- leadership development;
- cultural development;
- wisdom development; and,
- student satisfaction.

## 2.0 Methodology

To undertake this project, IAHLA asked First Nations institutes offering adult and post-secondary education programming to complete a data collection instrument that included two components:

1. A survey questionnaire to be completed by institute staff; and
2. A survey questionnaire for learners.

Surveys were sent out, returned, entered and analysed between October 2006 and January 2007. 76% (19) of 25 eligible institutes returned surveys and 255 learners completed surveys.

## 3.0 Who Responded

17 of the 19 responding institutes<sup>1</sup> enroll a total of 994 learners, with 35% studying part-time and 65% studying full-time. For the 13 responding institutes which report data for both years, the 2006/07 total student enrolment represents a 26% decrease from the previous year. Program offerings are contingent on the availability of grant-based funding which varies annually.

In 2006/07, 47% of the institutes report they offered some combination of Adult Basic Education (ABE) and post-secondary programming the previous academic year (in 2005/06), while 16% report they offered only ABE and 26% report they offered only non-ABE post-secondary programming. 11% of the responding institutes did not respond to this question.

---

<sup>1</sup> These are institutes reporting enrolment data for the current (2006/07) academic year. Please note that this excludes two institutes that reported enrolling between 500 and 1,000 students last year (2005/06). In 2006/07, one of these institutes did not respond to the survey; the other responded to the survey but not to this question.

18 of the 19 responding institutes<sup>2</sup> employ 150 instructors, with 70% of these instructors working part-time and 30% working full-time. Most (79%) of these instructors have a Bachelors degree or higher level of education. A majority (55%) of these instructors also have relevant work experience and one-in-ten (10%) have First Nation language skills.

Institutes most frequently use the following funding sources: the Indian Studies Support Program (ISSP), tuition, First Nations Schools Association (FNSEA) New Paths Grants, and Adult Nominal Roll funding. Adult Nominal Roll funding is most likely to be the major funding source (responsible for 50% or more of an institute's budget).

Just over one-third of the institutes indicate they experienced a decrease in funding this year. A similar proportion experienced no change, and one-fifth experienced an increase in their budget relative to last year.

Approximately four-fifths (79%) of these institutes do not have base or core funding. A similar proportion (74%) are "never" or "not often" able to fund the facilities or other capital projects they need for a healthy learning environment.

Seventy-nine percent of the Institutes have undergone an external program evaluation in the last five years, most often funded by the ISSP or the FNSEA. INAC requires that every nominal roll school have an evaluation conducted every five years. According to FNSEA assessment data, seven IAHLA members have used the FNSEA assessment process since 2003/04.

#### **4.0 Students' Personal Development**

Responding First Nations institutes support students' personal development through:

- Delivering Life Skills programs – 63% of responding institutes provide Life Skills programs to students. Typically, 25% to 50% of their learners enrolled in them last year.
- Offering shorter, non-credit, courses and workshops – almost all institutes offer one or more such workshops, especially those on life skills (68%), career planning (68%) and computer skills (68%).
- Providing interventions and referrals for learners – most often institutes provide academic advising (94%) and peer support (95%) interventions and/or referrals. Referrals only are most common for drug and alcohol prevention (47%) and family violence prevention (42%). The learners surveyed used academic advising (65%) and/or peer support services (66%) most often. Almost all the learners using such services found them to be very or somewhat useful.
- Linking with a wide range of other providers – institutes link with other providers to deliver supports and other services to learners. Most common are links with public colleges/universities, traditional/spiritual advisors and Elders and social development services.

More than four-in-five of the 255 learners surveyed agree they feel better about themselves and/or more confident since beginning at their institutes. Most (more than 75%) have also set future goals in areas like their family life, personal lives and/or education.

---

<sup>2</sup> One institute did not respond to these questions.

## 5.0 Leadership Development

Responding institutes promote learner's leadership within their communities as well as First Nation communities' leadership of their programs through:

- Involving community members in programming and learning, especially Elders (89%) and First Nations governance structures, e.g., Bands and Tribal Councils (84%).
- Involving learners in programming and learning as well as leadership opportunities – 95% of the institutes report involving learners in programming and learning. Forty percent of the learners surveyed report their institute has a student council or other type of student government.
- Encouraging and/or enabling learners to become more active in their communities – 49% of the learners surveyed agree they have become more active in their communities.
- Participating in formal relationships with other institutions or organizations. Almost one-half of the institutes (47%) say they participate in full partnerships in which their institute or community has *complete say in delivery* (sharing in decision-making, managing finances, as well as having a level of ownership of curriculum and programming which is transferable and credentialed). The same proportion (47%) of institutes are in partnerships in which their institute or community has *some say in delivery*.

## 6.0 Cultural Development

Responding institutes advance learners' cultural learning by:

- Placing a high level of importance on promoting aspects of culture, in addition to academic goals. Promoting aspects of culture is centrally or very important to 84% of the institutes in 2006/07. It was centrally or very important to a similar proportion (88%) of responding institutes in 2005/06.
- Placing an equally strong emphasis on culture and education/employment. Two-thirds of the institutes report they place equal emphasis on these two goals, while 2 (11%) institutes place a stronger emphasis on cultural development than on education/employment.
- Offering language courses – 79% of the institutes offer First Nations language courses in 2006/07. Typically, up to 50% of their learners participate in these language courses. In 2005/06, a similar proportion (71%) of responding institutes offered First Nations language courses.
- Being involved in language revitalization projects – two-thirds of the 2006/07 responding institutes (68%) are involved in such projects. In comparison, 41% of responding institutes were involved in such projects in 2005/06.

One-in-two learners surveyed report being more culturally active and one-in-five improved their ability to carry on a conversation in their First Nations language.

## **7.0 Wisdom Development**

Responding institutes provide knowledge and skills to students based on staffs' assessments of students' literacy and numeracy levels. Responding institutes use a variety of assessment tools to place students – most frequently the Canadian Adult Achievement Tests or other institute/college assessments. Most often, students are assessed at the Advanced level (Grade 10/11) in terms of both literacy and numeracy. A few institutes (10%) also engage contractors to conduct external psycho-educational assessments.

Four-in-five learners agree they are better able to learn since beginning at their institute. Seventy percent or more of these learners also agree that they have been helped to prepare for their further education, learn problem solving skills, learn research skills and/or learn to seek help for their needs. More than half the learners surveyed state they have been helped to prepare for getting a job and/or have learned computer skills.

## **8.0 Student Satisfaction**

Learner satisfaction with courses, facilities and relationships ranges between 70% and 85%. Learners rate their relationships with other students and teaching staff most highly, followed by their courses. Just over half of the institutes report they use both general student satisfaction surveys and course/instructor evaluation forms.



## 1.0 Introduction

The Indigenous Adult and Higher Learning Association (IAHLA) is a non-profit society dedicated to Indigenous adult and higher learning. In 2005/06 IAHLA initiated the Data Collection Project. This report focuses on the results of the second year of research (2006/07).

The ultimate goal of Indigenous higher education is empowerment. Therefore, the basic question to be answered by this Data Collection Project is:

*Are we empowering learners through personal, leadership, cultural and wisdom development?*

The intention of the Data Collection Project is to develop a better understanding of what is happening in First Nations adult and post-secondary institutes and to report on the scope of programs and services being offered to support learners. The information can be used in the following ways.

At the institute level, the information:

- Provides data which institute staff and students can use to make decisions about programming and to monitor changes over time;
- Provides supportive data for funding options and operational budget development; and,
- Assists institutes in maintaining accountability to students, communities and to funding agencies using a process designed *for them by them*.

At the collective, Association, level the information:

- Allows IAHLA to identify priorities for services and advocacy;
- Helps identify best practices;
- Assists with planning and tracking of growth; and,
- Creates a sense of unity and networking among IAHLA member institutes.

The project assists First Nations institutes to meet accountability and reporting requirements using a framework developed for First Nations adult and post-secondary institutes by First Nations institutes. In this way, institutes are able to report data that reflects First Nations values. The First Nations framework comprises five areas:

- personal development;
- leadership development;
- cultural development;
- wisdom development; and,
- student satisfaction.

The First Nations framework is presented in more detail in Appendix A.

## 2.0 Methodology

To undertake this project, the IAHLA Data Collection Working Group<sup>3</sup> asked all member First Nations institutes offering adult and post-secondary education programming to complete a data collection instrument that included two components:

1. A survey questionnaire to be completed by institute staff; and
2. A survey questionnaire for students.

The Data Collection Working Group initially sent a letter to institutes requesting their participation. Following this letter, in the week of October 16, 2006, Juniper Consulting<sup>4</sup> began contacting institutes on behalf of IAHLA. Institutes were asked to provide a project contact person and email address or fax number. These contacts were then emailed or faxed an institute survey and student surveys with a response deadline of November 15, 2006. Participating institutes provided students with access to an electronic (online) or paper copy of the IAHLA Data Collection Student questionnaire and encouraged students to complete and return or submit the surveys. All completed data collection surveys (from institutes and students) were gathered by December 22, 2006.

This year, the Data Collection Project invited IAHLA member Adult Learning Centres, which are solely funded through Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) Nominal Roll funding<sup>5</sup>, to participate in the IAHLA survey. This enables the project to capture a complete picture of the adult upgrading education delivered at the community level. Institutes which are also a member of the First Nations Schools Association (FNSA), and offer Ministry of Education (i.e., Adult Dogwood) courses to adult students were asked to complete either the IAHLA Data Collection survey tool OR the FNSA Adult Centre Data Collections survey.

Completed surveys were sent to IAHLA c/o the First Nations Education Steering Committee (FNESC) office which, in turn, forwarded the materials to Juniper Consulting for processing. This aggregate report presents the findings of these analyses at the provincial level, demonstrating overall results. In addition, Juniper Consulting will prepare customized reports which will be shared only with individual responding institutes, including a summary of their student responses.

IAHLA has plans to report on the results of the 2006/07 Data Collection Project and seek direction for any future activities at the April 18-19, 2007 IAHLA Annual General Meeting.

In 2006/07, 76% (19) of 25 eligible institutes responded to the Data Collection Project. A similar proportion responded the previous (first) year of the project. In 2005/06, 81% (17) of 21 eligible institutes responded.

---

<sup>3</sup> The IAHLA Data Working Group is comprised of 5 IAHLA members who represent large and small institutes from all regions of the province.

<sup>4</sup> In August 2006, Juniper Consulting was engaged by IAHLA to: undertake data entry, coding, editing, and cleaning; and, to prepare descriptive statistics of the institute and student responses presented in this report.

<sup>5</sup> Please note that Nominal Roll funding and New Path funding are both provided through Indian and Northern Affairs Canada.

In 2006/07, 255 students completed surveys. In 2005/06, 176 students completed surveys.

The institutes responding each year are presented in Appendix B. The questionnaires and other data collection instruments the project used are presented under separate cover in the 2006/07 IAHLA Data Collection Project's Methodology Report.

### 3.0 Who Responded

17 of the 19 responding institutes<sup>6</sup> enroll a total of 994 learners, with 35% studying part-time and 65% studying full-time. For the 13 responding institutes which report data for both years, the 2006/07 total student enrolment represents a 26% *decrease* from the previous year. Program offerings are contingent on the availability of grant-based funding which varies annually.

In 2006/07, 47% of the institutes report they offered some combination of Adult Basic Education (ABE) and post-secondary programming the previous academic year (in 2005/06), while 16% reported report they offered only ABE and 26% report they offered only non-ABE post-secondary programming. 11% of the responding institutes did not respond to this question.

18 of the 19 responding institutes<sup>7</sup> employ 150 instructors, with 70% of these instructors working part-time and 30% working full-time. Most (79%) of these instructors have a Bachelors degree or higher level of education. A majority (55%) of these instructors also have relevant work experience and one-in-ten (10%) have First Nation language skills.

Institutes most frequently use the following funding sources: the Indian Studies Support Program (ISSP), tuition, First Nations Schools Association (FNSEA) New Paths Grants<sup>8</sup> and INAC Adult Nominal Roll funding. INAC Adult Nominal Roll funding is most likely to be the major funding source (responsible for 50% or more of an institute's budget).

Just over one-third of the institutes indicate they experienced a decrease in funding this year. A similar proportion experienced no change, and one-fifth experienced an increase in their budget relative to last year.

Approximately four-fifths (79%) of responding institutes do not have base or core funding. A similar proportion (74%) are "never" or "not often" able to fund the facilities or other capital projects they need for a healthy learning environment.

Seventy-nine percent of the institutes have undergone an external program evaluation in the last five years, most often funded by the ISSP or the FNSEA. INAC requires that every nominal roll school have an evaluation conducted every five years. According to FNSEA assessment data, seven IAHLA members have used the FNSEA assessment process since 2003/04.

---

<sup>6</sup> These are institutes reporting enrolment data for the current (2006/07) academic year. Please note that this excludes two institutes that reported enrolling between 500 and 1,000 students last year (2005/06). In 2006/07, one of these institutes did not respond to the survey; the other responded to the survey but not to this question.

<sup>7</sup> One institute did not respond to these questions.

<sup>8</sup> The FNSEA New Paths Grants are funded by INAC.

### 3.1 Student Enrolments

17 of the 19 responding institutes report enrolment data for the current (2006/07) academic year. Almost one half (47%) of the responding institutes enroll less than 50 learners.

*Exhibit 3.1 – Responding Institutes’ Student Enrolment*

	2006/07	2005/06
	N <sup>9</sup> = 19	N = 17
<b>Enrolling more than 100 students</b>		
# of Institutes	3	4
% of Institutes	16%	24%
<b>Enrolling 50 to 100 students</b>		
# of Institutes	5	5
% of Institutes	26%	29%
<b>Enrolling 0 to 49 students</b>		
# of Institutes	9	8
% of Institutes	47%	47%
<b>No Enrolment #s Provided<sup>(1)</sup></b>		
# of Institutes	2	0
% of Institutes	11%	0%

(1) Student enrolment numbers may not be available until the end of the academic year.

In total, these 17 institutes enrolled 994 learners this year, with 35% studying part-time and 65% studying full-time. In the 2005/2006 IAHLA Data Collection Project, responding institutes enrolled a total of 2,602 learners, with 36% studying part-time and 64% studying full-time. In particular, two institutes enrolling between 500 and 1,000 learners last year either did not participate in the project this year or did not report current year enrolment data.<sup>10</sup>


For the 13 responding institutes that reported enrolment data for both years, the 2006/07 total student enrolment represents a 26% *decrease* from the previous year. These institutes report enrolling 1,139 learners last year (2005/06) and 847 learners this year (2006/07). Program offerings are contingent on the availability of grant-based funding which varies annually.

<sup>9</sup> Please note that throughout this report “N” refers to the number of institutes or learners who responded to a survey question.

<sup>10</sup> Nicola Valley Institute of Technology is not able to report current academic year student enrolments until the end the year and the Institute of Indigenous Government did not participate in the project this year.

Almost two-thirds (63%) of the institutes offered Adult Basic Education (ABE) programming last year (in 2005/06). More than one-half (58%) offered one-year non-ABE post-secondary programs and 53% offered multi-year non-ABE programs.

*Exhibit 3.2 – Institutes Offering ABE and Other Programs*




In 2006/07, 47% of the institutes report they offered some combination of ABE and post-secondary programming the previous academic year (in 2005/06), while 16% report they offered only ABE and 26% report they offered only non-ABE post-secondary programming. 11% of the responding institutes did not respond to this question.

### 3.2 Instructors


18 of the 19 responding institutes<sup>11</sup> employ 150 instructors, with 70% of these instructors working part-time and 30% working full-time. In 2005/06, somewhat more instructors were working full-time (37%).

Exhibit 3.3 – Instructors Employed Full-time/Part-time



Four-in-five (79%) of the instructors at these responding institutes have a Bachelors degree or higher level of education. Somewhat more instructors have Bachelor's degrees this year than last year, but fewer have Masters degrees.


Exhibit 3.4 – Instructors' Highest Level of Education



<sup>11</sup> One institute did not respond to these questions.

A majority (55%) of the instructors also have relevant work experience and one-in-ten (10%) have First Nation language skills. They also have a variety of “other” qualifications including a Certificate in Adult and Continuing Education, a Provincial Instructors Diploma, and related skills or experience e.g., computer skills, life skills, career planning, distance education, arts and crafts, curriculum development, and Class 4 driving skills.

*Exhibit 3.5 – Instructors’ Other Qualifications*




### **3.3 Funding**

Institutes most frequently use the following funding sources: the INAC Indian Studies Support Program (ISSP), tuition, First Nations Schools Association (FNSEA's) New Paths Grants (whose source is INAC) and INAC Adult Nominal Roll funding. Provincial funding is also accessed by 47% of the institutes. Their “other” funding sources include Aboriginal Human Resources Development Agreements (AHRDA), special education funding, grants from the Ministry of Advanced Education and First People’s Heritage and Language Culture Council (FPHLCC), flow-through funding, K-12 school funding and general fundraising efforts.

Similarly, among 2005/06 responding institutes – ISSP was the most commonly used funding source followed by tuition. Please note that last year the survey did not ask specifically about Adult Nominal Roll funding and FNSA New Paths Grants (though they may have been included in other category responses e.g., other federal funding).

*Exhibit 3.6 – Funding Sources*



1 Other funding sources include AHRDA, special education funding, grants from the Ministry of Advanced Education and First People's Heritage and Language Culture Council, flow through funding, K-12 school funding and general fundraising efforts.

In 2006/07, Adult Nominal Roll funding is the most likely to be the major funding source (responsible for 50% or more of an institute's budget). Forty-two percent of the responding institutes access Adult Nominal Roll funding as a major funding source. ISSP and provincial funding are a major funding source for 16% of the institutes, followed by tuition and FNSA – New Paths Grants (INAC funding).


*Exhibit 3.7 – Major Funding Sources (Over 50% of Total Budget)*

	<b>2006/07</b>
	N = 19
Adult Nominal Roll	42%
Indian Studies Support Program	16%
Provincial funding	16%
Tuition	10%
FNSA – New Paths Grants	10%
Other federal funding	5%
Other	5%
Band funds	5%



The survey asked institutes whether they had experienced a change in their total funding level this year. Just over one-third of the institutes indicated they had experienced a decrease in funding. A similar proportion had experienced no change, and one-fifth had experienced an increase. The decreases experienced were proportionally greater than increases experienced. For example, decreases ranged from 6% to 50% while increases ranged from a cost of living increase of 1.3% to 13%.


*Exhibit 3.8 – Changes in Funding Since Last Year*



Approximately four-fifths (79%) of these institutes do not have base or core funding. Only 21% of these institutes have base or core funding through affiliation agreements, other partnerships or directly from the provincial Ministry of Advanced Education. Their primary sources include Thompson Rivers University, Vancouver Community College and the Provincial Aboriginal Special Project Fund.

Almost one-third (32%) of these institutes are *never* able to fund the facilities or other capital projects they need for a healthy learning environment. A further 42% are “not often” able to do so. The remainder (26%) are “always” or “often” able to obtain such funding.

*Exhibit 3.9 – Able to Fund Facilities or Other Capital Projects*



### **3.4 External Program Evaluations**

79% (15) of the Institutes have undergone an external program evaluation in the last five years. Just over one-third of such evaluations were conducted in the past two years (2005/06), approximately one-third were conducted in 2004 and the remainder in 2002 or 2003.

*Exhibit 3.10 – Years External Program Evaluations Conducted*

	<b>2006/07</b>
	N = 14
2002	14%
2003	14%
2004	36%
2005	21%
2006	14%

Almost one-half of the external program evaluations were funded through the Indian Studies Support Program (47%) with most of the remainder funded by the First Nations Schools Association (40%). “Other” includes INAC and self-funded for Private Career Training Institutes Agency (PCTIA) renewal of accreditation. INAC requires that every Nominal Roll school have an evaluation conducted every five years. According to FNSA assessment data, seven IAHLA members have used the FNSA assessment process since 2003/04.

*Exhibit 3.11 – External Program Evaluation Funders*

	<b>2006/07</b>
	N = 15
Indian Studies Support Program	47%
First Nations Schools Association	40%
Other	13%

## 4.0 Students’ Personal Development

Responding First Nations institutes support students’ personal development through:


- Delivering Life Skills programs – 63% of responding institutes provide Life Skills programs to learners. Typically, 25% to 50% of their learners enrolled in them last year.
- Offering shorter, non-credit, courses and workshops – almost all institutes offer one or more such workshops, especially those on life skills (68%), career planning (68%) and computer skills (68%).
- Providing interventions and referrals for learners – most often institutes provide academic advising (94%) and peer support (95%) interventions and/or referrals. “Referrals only” are most common for drug and alcohol prevention (47%) and family violence prevention (42%). The learners surveyed used academic advising (65%) and/or peer support services (66%) most often. Almost all the learners using such services found them to be very or somewhat useful.
- Linking with a wide range of other providers – institutes link with other providers to deliver supports and other services to learners. Most common are links with public colleges/universities, traditional/spiritual advisors and Elders and social development services.

More than four-in-five of the 255 learners surveyed agree they feel better about themselves and/or more confident since beginning at their institutes. Most (more than 75%) have also set future goals in areas like their family life, personal lives and/or education.

#### 4.1 Life Skills Programs

Almost two-thirds (63%) of the responding institutes provide Life Skills programs (including planning, goal setting, time management, etc.). Just over one-third (37%) do not offer such programming.

*Exhibit 4.1 – Institutes Providing Life Skills Programs*



Base: Total Institutes Responding (N = 19)

In 2006/07, 8 of these 12 responding institutes that offer a Life Skills Program reported the number of learners who participated in their program last year (in 2005/06). In total, 175 learners participated in these programs last year. This was usually between 25% and 50% of the learners reported as enrolled in their programs last year where these data are available.

Among the learners surveyed in 2006/07, 26% are or have been enrolled in a Life Skills program since beginning their studies at the institute. Of these learners, 80% report they have benefited from the skills and information they learned and 15% say they did not benefit. 5% did not respond to this question.


## 4.2 Short Non-Credit Courses or Short-Term Workshops

Life skills are also the subject of shorter term non-credit courses and workshops at two-thirds (68%) of the institutes. A similar proportion (68%) of institutes offer such courses or workshops on career planning or computer skills.

More than one-half of the institutes also offer short courses or workshops on drug or alcohol abuse, Fetal Alcohol Syndrome Disorder (FASD) and emotional health. One-fifth or more of the institutes offer short courses or workshops on other topics addressed in the survey.

“Other” courses or workshops which institutes offer include those on bursaries, cultural awareness/sensitivity, essential skills for work, and residential schools.

*Exhibit 4.2 – Institutes Providing Shorter Term Non-Credit Courses or Workshops*



16 institutes offer at least one or more such workshops. One institute does not offer any of these as separate courses or workshops, but commented that these topics are embedded in its courses. 2 institutes did not respond to this question.


In the 2005/06 IAHLA Data Collection Project survey, life skills and emotional health courses and workshops were most common. However, career planning and computer skill courses were not specifically asked about that year.

### 4.3 Student Support Services

#### 4.3.1 Interventions and Referrals

The institutes provide the following types of interventions and referrals to learners. Most often institutes provide interventions and/or referrals for academic advising and peer support. Personal counseling, healing circle and drug/alcohol prevention interventions or referrals are also provided by four-fifths of the institutes or more.

Exhibit 4.3 – Interventions and Referrals Provided



Interventions are most common for academic advising (73%), peer support (69%) and career counseling (68%) services.

“Referrals only” are most common for drug and alcohol prevention (47%) and family violence prevention (42%) services.

“Other” interventions and referrals include those related to books, supplies, counseling and talking circles, childcare subsidies and community courses at a local college.


### 4.3.2 Helpfulness of Student Support Services

Most often the learners surveyed have used academic advising (65%) and/or peer support (66%) services. One-in-two have used support from Elders (55%), career counseling (49%) and/or personal development support (48%).

About one-third have used family violence prevention (34%), drug & alcohol prevention (34%) or healing circles (31%).

Almost all those who have used these services have found them “very helpful” or “somewhat helpful”.

Exhibit 4.4 – Helpfulness of Student Support Services



Base: Total Learners Responding N = 255

### 4.4 Service Assessment Tools

The institutes were asked to indicate what assessment tools staff use to prepare learners to access daycare, transportation, support systems and housing services. Most often, individual applications/registrations form the basis for these assessments. For example, institutes report using the following:

- for daycare - individual applications/registrations, referrals and subsidies;
- for transportation - individual applications/registrations, bussing and the provision of information on public transit;
- for support systems – applications, referrals and Elders;

- for housing – applications, referrals, help by writing support letters to go with applications and one institute is in the process of building a residence; and,
- for other services – information on funding sources.

#### **4.5 Links to Other Service Providers**

Institutes establish links with other service providers (within and outside the community) in order to support learners. Most frequently, they link with public colleges/universities, traditional/spiritual advisors and Elders and social development services, followed by other First Nations institutes and health services.

“Other” service providers which link with institutes to provide support to learners include – community agencies (friendship centres, hostels, parks and recreation and legal aid agencies), counseling services and First Nations governments.

As well, some learners access support directly. For example, learners who are studying in their own community have ongoing family and community support. Some learners also have direct access to their Village, Band or other First Nation governments.

In the 2005/06 IAHLA Data Collection project survey, traditional spiritual advisors and Elders as well as public colleges/universities were also cited as the most frequent link to learner supports.

*Exhibit 4.5 – Service Providers Linking with Institutes*

	<b>2006/07</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
	N = 19	N = 17
Public colleges/universities	89%	76%
Traditional/spiritual advisors & Elders	84%	88%
Social development	84%	71%
Other First Nations institutes	74%	71%
Health services	74%	65%
Public school district of schools	68%	65%
Off-Reserve agencies	63%	71%
First Nations schools	63%	65%
Child and family services	58%	65%
Employment services	58%	59%
Tribal Council	47%	n/a
AHRDA or On-Reserve Training Society	42%	n/a
Economic Development Corporation	37%	n/a
Other	37%	29%



#### 4.6 Learner Ratings on Their Personal Development


More than four-in-five of the learners surveyed agree they feel better about themselves (83%) and/or more confident (82%) since beginning at their institute.

Similarly, large groups of learners have set goals for their education (85%) and/or for their personal lives (84%).

Many (76%) have also set goals for their family life, for understanding their culture (65%) and/or for their role in their communities (61%).

Forty-three percent have set goals for understanding and speaking their traditional language.


Exhibit 4.6 – Learner Ratings on Their Personal Development



Base: Total Learners Responding N = 255

Most learners intend to continue to study next year – most often at the same institute (52%), but also at universities, First Nation and non-First Nation institutes. In comparison, 17% intend to seek employment next year and 12% are not yet sure of their goals for next year.

*Exhibit 4.7 – Learner Goals for Next Year*



Base: Total Learners Responding N = 255

86% of the learners surveyed feel that their program of study is adequately preparing them to pursue their goal for next year. Only 5% do not feel prepared (9% are unsure or did not respond to this question).

## 5.0 Leadership Development

Responding institutes promote learners' leadership within their communities as well as First Nation communities' leadership of their programs through:


- Involving community members in programming and learning, especially Elders (89%) and First Nations governance structures e.g., Bands and Tribal Councils, (84%).
- Involving students in programming and learning as well as leadership opportunities – 95% of the institutes report involving learners in programming and learning. Forty percent of the learners surveyed report their institute has a student council or other type of student government.

- Encouraging and/or enabling learners to become more active in their communities – 49% of the learners surveyed agree they have become more active in their communities.
- Participating in formal relationships with other institutions or organizations. Almost one-half of the institutes (47%) say they participate in full partnerships in which their institute or community has *complete say in delivery* (sharing in decision-making, managing finances, as well as having a level of ownership of curriculum and programming which is transferable and credentialed). The same proportion (47%) of institutes are in partnerships in which their institute or community has *some say in delivery*.

### 5.1 Groups Directly Involved with Programming/Learning

Programming/learning is a collaborative effort. All (100%) of the institutes involve other groups directly in their programming/learning. The most common group directly involved is learners, followed by Elders and a First Nations Governance structure such as a Band or Tribal Council. Almost three-quarters involve family/community members in their programming and almost one-half involve other agencies.

Exhibit 5.1 – Groups Directly Involved with Programming/Learning




## 5.2 Student Involvement and Communication

Students are also involved in leading their own learning. Forty percent of the learners surveyed report their institute has a student council or other type of student government at their institute. A further 29% say they are not sure if such student governance exists at their institute. A similar proportion (29%) say it does not.

Many institutes communicate with learners by providing information to them through a student handbook. Two-thirds (67%) of the learners surveyed report their institute has a student handbook and a further 19% are not sure (only 13% report they do not).

Also, some institutes have written discipline and/or dispute resolution policies which are accessible to learners. Sixty-one percent of the learners surveyed report their institutes have such policies and a further 34% are not sure.

Exhibit 5.2 – Student Involvement and Communication




Base: Total Learners Responding N = 255

### 5.3 Learner Ratings of Becoming More Active In Community

Almost one-half (49%) of the learners surveyed agree they have become more active in their communities since beginning at their institute. A further one-third are neutral about such activity – possibly because they were active before, or because they feel this question is not applicable to them e.g., their institute is not located in their community.

Exhibit 5.3 – Learner Ratings on Becoming More Active in Community




Base: Total Learners Responding N = 255

## 5.4 Formalized Relationships with Others

Similar to last year, all of the institutes have at least one type of formalized relationship with others<sup>12</sup>. Most common are affiliation agreements, followed by other types of relationships (e.g., partnerships, MOUs, federation agreements, etc.) and service agreements. Least common are brokering arrangements.


Exhibit 5.4 – Formalized Relationships with Others



<sup>12</sup> Please note that this question asked only about relationships with other public institutes and most, but not all, of the responses are limited to this. In the chart on these relationships both the current year and previous year's data include a few relationships with other First Nations institutes, Bands/communities and the K-12 education system. The remainder of the questions in this section have likely also been answered with respect to all these relationships, not just those with other post-secondary public institutes as per the question wording.

Most of these relationships are shared partnerships. Almost one-half of the institutes (47%) say they are either full partnerships in which their institute or community has *complete say in delivery* (sharing in decision-making, managing finances, as well as having a level of ownership of curriculum and programming which is transferable and credentialed) or partnerships in which their institute or community has *some say in delivery*, with public partners who are responsive to community needs. Sixteen percent have partnerships in which their institute or community has *no say in delivery* (operating on a strictly fee-for-service basis).

*Exhibit 5.5 – Institute/Community’s Involvement in Partnerships with Others*



Responding institutes’ community-based programs receive support from public post-secondary partner(s) most frequently in the form of a coordinator, followed by funding support, an advisory committee or full-time equivalents (FTEs). One-quarter of the institutes say they are not delivering a community-based program in partnership with a public institute. Twenty-two percent receive other kinds of support including instructors who teach credit courses and courses brokered through Thompson Rivers University, Open Learning Agency<sup>13</sup>.

*Exhibit 5.6 – Support Received from Partners*

	<b>2006/07</b>
	N = 18
Coordinator	28%
Funding Support	22%
Advisory Committee	17%
FTEs	17%
Other	22%
Not Delivering A Community-based Program In Partnership with A Public Institute	28%

<sup>13</sup> The Open Learning Agency is now operating through Thompson Rivers University.

14 (74%) institutes provided the number of students currently enrolled in articulated/transferable programs related to their public post-secondary partners. Most often, 50% or more of their learners are enrolled in such programs.

*Exhibit 5.7 – Proportion of Students Enrolled in Articulated/Transferable Programs*

	<b>2006/07</b>
	N = 14
100%	36%
50% to 99%	21%
1% to 49%	36%
None	7%

17 (89%) responding institutes provided the number of certificates, diplomas, degrees or other awards made to students in the last academic year (2005/06) through their relationships with public post-secondary partners. Of the 255 such awards, 49% were certificates, 17% were diplomas, 2% were degrees and 32% were other awards (including Adult Dogwoods, GEDs and course-specific awards).

## 6.0 Cultural Development

Responding institutes advance learners' cultural learning by:

- Placing a high level of importance on promoting aspects of culture, in addition to academic goals. Promoting aspects of culture is centrally or very important to 84% of the institutes in 2006/07. It was centrally or very important to a similar proportion (88%) of responding institutes in 2005/06.
- Placing an equally strong emphasis on culture and education/employment. Two-thirds of the institutes report they place equal emphasis on these two goals, while 2 (11%) institutes place a stronger emphasis on cultural development than on education/employment.
- Offering language courses – 79% of the institutes offer First Nations language courses in 2006/07. Typically, up to 50% of their learners participate in these language courses. In 2005/06, a similar proportion (71%) of responding institutes offered First Nations language courses.
- Being involved in language revitalization projects – two-thirds of the 2006/07 responding institutes (68%) are involved in such projects. In comparison, 41% of responding institutes were involved in such projects in 2005/06.

One-in-two learners surveyed report being more culturally active and one-in-five improved their ability to carry on a conversation in their First Nations language.




## 6.1 Cultural Promotion as an Institutional Goal

First Nations' institutes place a high level of importance on promoting aspects of culture, in addition to academic goals. Promoting aspects of culture is centrally or very important to 84% of the institutes.

College or university preparation is centrally or very important to 85% of the institutes. General academic upgrading, First Nation language promotion and certificate/diploma/degree completion are of similar importance to about three-quarters or more of the institutes. High school completion – either Adult Dogwood diplomas or GED completion – are a priority for one-half to two-thirds of these institutes.

Exhibit 6.1 – Importance of First Nation Institute Goals



Similar goals were important last year. In 2005/06, academic preparation and culture ranked most highly, followed by general academic upgrading and certificate/diploma/degree completion. Please note that last year the survey did not ask about Adult Dogwood diplomas separately from high school equivalence (GED).


*Exhibit 6.2 – Importance of First Nations Goals (2006/07 and 2005/06)*

<b>% of central importance or very important</b>	<b>2006/07</b>	<b>2005/06</b>
	N = 19	N = 17
College/university preparation	85%	82%
Promoting other aspects of culture	84%	88%
General academic upgrading	79%	82%
First Nations language promotion	74%	65%
Certificate/diploma/degree completion	74%	71%
Adult Dogwood diplomas	69%	n/a
High school equivalence (GED)	48%	65%

### **6.2 Emphasis on Language and Culture Vis-A-Vis Education and Employment**

When asked specifically about their emphasis on culture and language vis-a-vis education and employment, two-in-three institutes report they place an equally strong emphasis on both goals. In comparison, only one-in-five place a stronger emphasis on preparing learners for further education and employment. One-in-ten place a stronger emphasis on promoting the Nation’s language and culture.


*Exhibit 6.3 – Comparative Emphasis of Goals*



### 6.3 First Nations Language Courses and Revitalization Projects

More than three-quarters (79%) of responding institutes offer First Nations language courses. Similarly, in 2005/06, 71% of responding institutes offered such courses.

*Exhibit 6.4 – Institutes Offering First Nations Language Courses and Involved with Revitalization Projects*



More than one-half (58%) of responding institutes offer language courses for credit, while 27% offer non-credit language courses<sup>14</sup>.

Language courses for credit are optional for most learners. Of the 15 institutes that offer First Nations language courses, 11 provided enrolment numbers totalling 284 learners enrolled in language courses for credit. Of the 9 institutes that had both these enrolment and total enrolment numbers, 2 had 100% of their learners enrolled in language courses for credit, 1 had between 50% and 99% enrolled and 6 (two-thirds) had less than half of their learners enrolled in language courses.

Learners are more likely to study language for more than three hours per week in courses for credit rather than non-credit courses.

*Exhibit 6.5 – Language Courses —Hours Offered Per Week*

	2006/07		2005/06	
	Credit	Non-credit	Credit	Non-credit
More than 3 hours per week	32%	10%	57%	50%
3 hours or less per week	26%	16%	42%	50%
Don't know hours and/or whether language courses offered are for credit or not	21%	53%		
No language courses offered	21%	21%		

<sup>14</sup> These include 11% (2) institutes which offer both credit and non-credit language courses. One institute which reported offering language courses did not provide information on whether these were credit or non-credit courses.


Among the learners surveyed, 31% are studying First Nations language(s) as part of their studies at their institutes. Of these learners, 45% are very satisfied with the progress they are making and a further 38% are satisfied.

Two-thirds (68%) of the institutes are involved with First Nations language revitalization projects (41% last year).

#### 6.4 Learner Ratings on Language and Cultural Events

Almost one-half (45%) of the learners surveyed agree they have become more active in cultural events. One-in-five (22%) agree they are better able to carry on a conversation in their First Nations language. A higher than usual proportion (more than one-third) of the learners are neutral on these statements, possibly because they were quite culturally active or able to speak their First Nations language before beginning at their institute or because they feel this question is not applicable to them.

Exhibit 6.6 – Learner Ratings on Language and Cultural Events



Base: Total Learners Responding N = 255

## 7.0 Wisdom Development

Responding institutes provide knowledge and skills to learners based on staffs' assessments of learners' literacy and numeracy levels. Responding institutes use a variety of assessment tools to place students – most frequently the Canadian Adult Achievement Tests (CAAT) or other institute/college assessments. Most often students are assessed at the Advanced level (Grade 10/11) in terms of both literacy and numeracy. A few institutes (10%) also engage contractors to conduct external psycho-educational assessments.

Four-in-five learners agree they are better able to learn since beginning at their institute. Seventy percent or more of these learners also agree that they have been helped to prepare for their further education, learn problem solving skills, learn research skills and/or learn to seek help for their needs. More than half the learners surveyed state they have been helped to prepare for getting a job and/or have learned computer skills.

### 7.1 Student Assessment Tools

Institutes were asked to indicate what assessment tools they use to place learners. Most frequently institutes use the CAAT for reading/literacy, writing and numeracy. Institute/college assessments are used next most often. “Other” assessments used include English/math diagnosis, placement tests, program applications, literature and a writing exercise. Over one-in-five of the institutes did not report assessment tools they use to place learners.

Exhibit 7.1 – Student Assessment Tools Used to Place Students

	2006/07			2005/06		
	Reading/ Literacy	Writing	Numeracy	Reading/ Literacy	Writing	Numeracy
Canadian Adult Achievement Test or Canadian Achievement Test	37%	26%	32%	47%	35%	41%
Institute/College Assessment	16%	10%	21%	18%	18%	18%
Accuplace	5%	10%	10%	6%	6%	6%
CAST Assessment for Adult Learners	5%	5%	5%	6%	6%	6%
BC Ministry of Education Assessment	5%	5%	5%	6%	6%	6%
Other	16%	10%	16%	12%	18%	12%
No Assessment Tools Reported	21%	37%	26%	0%	0%	6%

In addition, some (26%) of the institutes use tools which assess life skills. These include career planning tools and collaborative learning activities.

### 7.2 Assessed Literacy and Numeracy Levels


Nine (47%) institutes reported on the percentage of new students assessed at each *literacy* level for 90% or more of their students using the assessment tools discussed above. *All* of these institutes reportedly have students assessed at the Advanced level. *Many* have students assessed at the Provincial and Fundamental levels. *Fewer* of these institutes have students assessed at the Basic level.

Eight (42%) institutes reported on the percentage of new students assessed at each *numeracy* level for 80% or more of their students using these assessment tools. *Many* of these institutes have students assessed at the Advanced and Fundamental levels. *Fewer* of these institutes have students assessed at the Provincial and Basic levels.

### 7.3 External Psycho-Educational Assessments

Last year, 10% of the institutes contracted with an external professional to conduct psycho-educational assessments. The remaining 90% did not. One institute commented that such assessments are done on-site by staff using CAAT. Another commented there has never been a need to conduct them.

Exhibit 7.2 – External Psycho-Educational Assessments



In the 2005/06 survey, 18% of the institutes reported they had been able to offer psycho-educational assessments in the previous school year. A further 29% were not able to offer them, but felt they would have been beneficial. The remainder (43%) were not sure if they would have been beneficial.


## 7.4 Learner Ratings of Learning

Almost four-in-five of the learners surveyed agree they have been better able to learn since beginning at their institute – they either strongly agree (39%) or somewhat agree (39%). A similar proportion agree they have been helped to prepare for their further education, and about one-in-two (53%) have been helped to prepare for getting a job.

Most learners agree they have gained problem solving skills (74%) and/or research skills (71%), and a majority (56%) agree they have gained computer skills.

Three-quarters (74%) agree they have learned to seek help for their needs.

Exhibit 7.3 – Learner Ratings of Learning



Base: Total Learners Responding N = 255

## 8.0 Student Satisfaction

Student satisfaction with courses, facilities and relationships ranges between 70% and 85%. Learners rate their relationships with other students and teaching staff most highly, followed by their courses.

Just over half of the institutes use both general student satisfaction surveys and course/instructor evaluation forms.


### 8.1 Student Satisfaction with Courses, Facilities And Relationships

Four-in-five of the learners surveyed agree they have liked the courses they have taken – they either strongly agree (52%) or somewhat agree (30%). Almost three-quarters (74%) like the availability and range of courses available.

Most learners (79%) like the classrooms, facilities and common spaces at their institutes. They also agree (71%) that their institute’s physical environment reflects First Nations’ culture.

Most learners (85%) agree they have made new or better relationships with other learners, and that they feel supported by teaching staff (82%) as well as by administrative staff (70%).

Exhibit 8.1 – Student Satisfaction Ratings




Base: Total Learners Responding N = 255



## 8.2 Institutes' Use of Surveys to Gather Student Feedback

Just over half of the institutes use both general student satisfaction surveys and course/instructor evaluation forms. A further one-third use only course/instructor evaluation forms. Five percent use only student satisfaction surveys and 10% do not use regular surveys.

Exhibit 8.2 – Surveys Used to Gather Student Feedback



## Appendix A: Data Collection Project – Approved Framework

The framework created for this Data Collection Project reflects the following assumptions.

- The data collection effort is not intended to identify “good” and “bad” higher education institutes. This project is meant to promote improved programming through effective information collection and sharing.
- The project considers a range of data and indicators, including student achievement data, satisfaction surveys, descriptions of education processes, and demographic information.
- IAHLA is committed to carefully managing the release of the information collected, with the intention of building support over time by demonstrating that the data can be used without blame.
- IAHLA plans to use the project information to identify appropriate programs and activities that can be implemented at the provincial level.
- This project is meant to reflect the values and expectations of First Nations institutes, and the initiative is founded upon educational standards expressed by representatives of First Nations higher learning institutes. Those education institutes are unique places, and they serve learners who have unique backgrounds and experiences.

For the purposes of this project, First Nations representatives identified the following standards.

First Nations higher learning institutes ...

Provide learner support, including:

- family models and a family environment (an integrated program);
- student self-government models;
- incentives/validation;
- counselling/support;
- crisis intervention;
- an experiential context to reinforce culture; and
- education programs that meet learners’ basic needs.

Promote First Nations languages, cultures, and spirituality, and accommodate cultural responsibilities.

Provide knowledge and skills development through programs that are:

- self-paced; and
- structured.

Are founded upon unique governance structures that are:

- community driven; and
- based upon community leadership and responsibility.

Are based upon whole learning, which includes personal learning, cultural learning, and academic learning.

First Nations higher education must foster self-governance and self-reliance, and the basic question to be answered by the data collection is:

Are we empowering learners through wisdom, cultural and personal development?

The ultimate goal of Indigenous higher education is empowerment.

Using these “standards” as broad categories, the participants in the 2005 Data Collection Consultation workshop were asked to identify a number of indicators that could be used to show how well these expectations are being reflected. The results of that input are described below.

*Personal Development Indicators:*

- percentage of institutions which have programs that provide awareness on healthy/holistic living
- percentage of institutions that offer life skills programs, percentage of learners who participate in life skills programming, and percentage of learners reporting utilization of skills learned through life skills
- number of learners who report setting goals (weekly, monthly, 5 year plan)
- number of institutions regularly providing student recognition, achievements, contributions
- percentage of institutions reporting interagency links, such as counselling referrals
- number of learners participating in extra curricular activities
- number of learners self-reporting an improved sense of self-esteem
- number and types of interventions provided for student support

*Leadership Indicators:*

- percentage of institutes with student empowerment governance models (such as student councils)
- the decision making processes used in the institution’s governance
- whether the leadership is mainstream or culturally based
- what mechanisms are in place for Elders, learners, and community to direct learning/programming
- what Board structure models are in place, and whether traditional values are imbedded in policy
- number of professional certifications of staff (admin/instructional)
- what discipline/dispute resolution models are in place

*Cultural Development Indicators:*

- number of learners who report progressing from rudimentary Aboriginal language usage to basic conversational language usage
- number of learners who have become more active in community or other cultural events
- number of visits by Elders and other family members to the school
- number of institutes that provide allowances or support for cultural responsibilities
- number of institutions which incorporates culture and worldview into program and courses
- number of hours of language instruction (noncredit/credit)
- percentage of budget allocated for personal/cultural development
- number of learners who report feeling more empowered since beginning school

*Wisdom Development Indicators:*

- number of learners who report feeling they set realistic goals for themselves – academic, personal, family, community, cultural
- number of learners who gained critical thinking/problem solving skills
- number of learners who feel they learned more/utilize more resources – support/systems
- what learners identify as their strengths and weaknesses
- what assessment measurement tools are being used
- what levels are learners assessing in literacy and numeracy
- number of learners continuing on in academic/vocational studies
- retention/attrition rates

*Student Satisfaction (Interpersonal Relationships) Indicators:*

- what decision making authority models (how do learners make decisions, decision making process)
- does the program/institution prepare learners for employment and/or further education
- how satisfied are learners with staff/student relationships and the school environment
- number of institutes offering self-care /health/cultural initiatives
- number of institutes offering a formalized peer support systems
- number of learners who report their school/program empowered them
- number of institutes providing regular student surveys (course/instruction)
- number of learners who feel their instructors care about them

## Appendix B: Institutes Responding to the IAHLA Data Collection Project

School Name	2006/07 Institute (Note 4)	2006/07 Completed FNSA Survey	2005/06 Institute (Notes 2 and 3)	2006/07 Student Surveys (Note 1)	As a % of Student Enrolments
Cariboo Chilcotin Weekend University, Cariboo Tribal Council	Yes		Yes	14	13%
Chemainus Native College	Yes		Yes	15	79%
Community Futures Development Corporation of Central Interior First Nations	No		Yes		
Enowkin Centre / (Okanagan Indian Education Resources Society)	Yes		Yes	20	29%
First Nations Training and Development Centre	Yes		Yes	14	82%
Neskonlith Band School (formerly George Manuel Institute)	Yes		No	6	8%
Gitksan Wet'suwet'en Education Society	No	Yes	Yes		
Gitwangak Education Society	Yes		Yes	10	36%
haahuuhpay'ak Adult Education Centre	Yes		Yes	8	53%
Heiltsuk College	Yes		Yes	7	16%
Institute of Indigenous Government	No		Yes		
Kwadacha Dune Ty (Aatse Davie School)	Yes		No	0	
Kyah Wiget Education Society/	Yes		N/A	2	13%
Muskoti Learning Centre	Yes		N/A	2	6%
Nicola Valley Institute of Technology (NVIT)	Yes		Yes	45	6%
N'Kwala School	No		No		
Nus Wadeezulh Adult Education Centre	N/A		N/a		
Nuxalk College (Lip'Alhaye School)	Yes		Yes	12	22%
Penelakut Adult Learning Centre	No		N/A	1	
Saanich Adult Education centre	Yes	Yes	Yes	18	18%
Seabird Island Indian Band	No		N/A		
Sechelt Indian Band Education Centre	N/A (5)		N/A		
Skeetchestn Band Education	N/A (3)		N/A (2)		
Secwepemc Cultural Education Society	Yes		Yes	12	18%
Skil' Mountain Community School Adult Basic and Continuing Education	No		N/A		
Sto:lo Nation	Yes		Yes		
Ted Williams Memorial Learning Centre	Yes		N/A	12	80%
Tl'azt'en Adult Learning Centre	N/A (6)		No		
NEC Native Education College	Yes		Yes	44	20%
Wilp Wilxo'oskwhl Nisga'a	Yes		Yes	12	15%
Yu Thuy Thut Training Program	N/A (3)		N/A (2)		
				254	

Note 1: One online student survey put "other" as their institute

Note 2: N/A = Nominal Roll students only last year - thus not included in the project.

Note 3: N/A (2) = others not included in the project last year

Note 4: N/A (3) = Not included in the project this year

Note 5: N/A (4) = not eligible – no students on site

Note 6: N/A (5) = not eligible – no students currently registered

## Appendix C: IAHLA Student Survey Respondents Profile

- 63% are in their first year at their institute while 36% are not. (1% did not respond to this question.) Of those past their first year, more than half had previously attended the same institute for 1 or 2 years either full-time (47%) or part-time (7%). One-fifth had previously attended it for 3 years or more either full-time (14%) or part-time (7%). The remainder did not provide the number of years they had previously attended the institute.
- 70% are female and 28% are male (2% did not respond to this question.)
- 13% are under 20 years of age, 37% are 20 to 29, 23% are 30 to 39 and 26% are 40 years of age or older. (1% did not respond to this question.)
- The students are attending 18 First Nations institutes as detailed in the exhibit below.

	Frequency	Percent
Cariboo Chilcotin Weekend University	14	5.5
Chemainus Native College	15	5.9
En'owkin Centre	20	7.8
FN Training and Development Centre	14	5.5
Neskonlith FN Institute	6	2.4
Gitwangak Education Society	10	3.9
haahuupay'ak Adult Education Centre	8	3.1
Heiltsuk College	7	2.7
Kyah Wiget Education Society	2	.8
Muskoti Learning Centre	2	.8
NEC Native Education College	44	17.3
Nicola Valley Institute of Technology	45	17.6
Lip'Alhaye School (Nuxalk College)	12	4.7
Penelakut Adult Learning Centre	1	.4
Saanich Adult Education Centre	18	7.1
Secwepemc Cultural Education Society	12	4.7
Ted Williams Memorial Learning Centre	12	4.7
Wilp Wilxo'oshkwhl Nisga'a	12	4.7
Other	1	.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>100.0</b>