Board Development Program

Evaluation Report

Prepared for

The Muttart Foundation

by

The Edmonton Social Planning Council

February 1994

Executive Summary

An evaluation of the Board Development Program (BDP) was conducted between October 1993 and February 1994. The evaluation report contains descriptive information about the program, as well as discussion of administrative procedures and financial considerations, but the major focus was on input from individuals who have attended BDP workshops, workshop instructors and key stakeholders. Altogether, 188 questionnaires were completed, 71 people participated in focus group discussions and 15 people were interviewed individually. While this evaluation was initiated as a result of the Muttart Foundation funding for BDP II, BDP I received equal attention during the process.

On the whole, the Board Development Program is considered to be one of the best services available for organizations (boards) that are fairly new, those that are functioning poorly, and for board members who are unsure of their roles and responsibilities. A variety of other board programs were identified throughout the evaluation, but no others are as structured or as comprehensive as BDP, or as well suited to addressing these concerns. A need was identified, however, for a comprehensive list of additional services available to boards and how to access them.

One of the keys to the success of the program, mentioned by stakeholders and those who participate in the program, is the collaborative approach it utilizes. The partnerships with the Muttart Foundation, Grant MacEwan Community College and the Alberta Library Trustees Association are beneficial to all concerned. A second key is the extensive use of volunteer resources to deliver the program. Both aspects are managed in a way that supplements the quality control of the program.

All of the people who took part in the evaluation identified aspects of BDP they found particularly helpful: board members mentioned becoming more accountable, having improved communications and developing more purposeful structures; instructors have developed their own skills while providing a useful resource to the community; and stakeholders have been able to offer a quality program to the agencies they serve. At the same time, many people commented on things about the program they would like to see handled a little differently, or suggested additional material they would like to see covered. All the suggestions are contained either in the body of the report or within the appendices.

The evaluation resulted in twelve major recommendations as follows:

1. The Board Development Program should be continued.

2. Funding sources should be explored for the maintenance of BDP II beyond the pilot stage and for expansion into Calgary and Edmonton.

3. Maintain the collaborative approach of the program, including multiple funding sources and involvement of other agencies in training of instructors and workshop coordination.

4. Establish a formal follow-up program to assist boards through the action plan developed in the workshop. This should be available to boards through both BDP I and BDP II.

5. Develop a plan for promoting the program province wide.

6. Invite instructors to participate in curriculum review and to make suggestions for changes to the structure of the program binders.

7. Remove distinctions in administration between BDP I and BDP II where possible.

8. Continue to use the volunteer model to deliver the program.

9. Develop alternate or additional recruitment approaches to attract a broader range of volunteer instructors, for example multicultural groups and people who have volunteered on library boards.

10. Maintain the current high standards for volunteer training and support.

11. In conjunction with other agencies offering board development services, compile a comprehensive list of board development resources, programs and consultants.

12. Investigate the possibility of developing a "board development clearinghouse" through which all boards can access appropriate services or resources.

Glossary

Board Development Program

The Board Development Program helps non-profit boards become more effective in the governance of their organizations. The program has two units, Board Development Program I (BDP I) and Board Development Program II (BDP II).

BDP I is designed to assist arts, library, cultural, and recreation boards throughout Alberta.

BDP II is designed to assist Alberta's non-profit human service organizations (outside of Edmonton and Calgary).

Closed Workshops

Closed workshops are offered to members of a single board to help them become more effective in the governance of their organization. The workshop is tailored to the needs of that board, and only the board members and senior staff of the organization which has arranged the workshop would attend.

Open Workshops

Open workshops provide more general information, and are offered to representatives from various boards. The participants take information back to the other board members of their board. Often organizations attend the open workshop to see what it is all about before committing their board to a customized closed workshop.

Table of Contents

I.   Introduction

Between October 1993 and January 1994, the Edmonton Social Planning Council conducted an evaluation of the Board Development Program, offered through Alberta Community Development. This evaluation included:

- a review of administrative procedures,

- a survey of board members who have attended both open and closed board workshops,

- focus groups with board members, volunteer instructors, and senior staff of organizations in which board members have had a workshop,

- a survey of BDP instructors,

- interviews with key stakeholders, co-sponsors and funders, and

- interviews with BDP staff.

Without exception, all the people involved in the review are impressed by the Board Development Program and feel that it has a lot to offer the community. While a few criticisms were offered and numerous additions or minor changes were suggested, the overall impression is one of a program that has had a major positive impact on the organizations it serves.

The following report includes summaries of the feedback from the above mentioned groups, the findings of the administrative review, and the recommendations coming out of the evaluation. Although detailed program information is readily available from staff, the Council is recommending changes in record keeping and procedures to ensure a smooth transition should additional staff be hired. Appendices provide more detailed compilations of the feedback from the focus groups and questionnaires.

II. Background

The Board Development Program was established in 1982 in response to a need for a program that would train arts boards to more effectively govern their organizations. A study was conducted to identify available board training services, but was unable to turn up materials specific to the training of arts boards. To meet board training needs Alberta Culture, The Volunteer Centre of Edmonton, and Grant MacEwan Community College co-sponsored the implementation of the Board Development Program.

The Board Development Program offers workshops to provide training to boards. The workshops place emphasis on building teamwork within boards by instructing the board on the methods of:

- defining clear roles, responsibilities, and functions for board members, volunteers, and staff;

- recruiting, orienting, and training board members;

- developing and monitoring policy;

- achieving consistent decision making policies;

- establishing suitable organizational structures and communication systems;

- instituting a mission statement and direction;

- developing teamwork between the board and senior staff.

A unique aspect of the program is that it tailors each workshop to the needs of the board. Each board is asked to supply background information on the organization prior to the workshop. In addition, individuals planning to attend the workshop are expected to complete a needs assessment questionnaire four weeks before the workshop. The results of the survey assist the Board Development Program staff and volunteers as they tailor the workshop to the needs of the board.

The workshops last from 8 - 12 hours and are scheduled for Friday evening and all day Saturday. It is expected that boards with six or fewer members will have 100% attendance and larger boards will have participation of at least 75% of their members. The only cost to the organization is to book a space for the workshop and provide lunch to the instructors.

Volunteers with board and adult education experience are recruited and trained to deliver workshops to not-for-profit boards across Alberta. Initially the program focused its attention on arts boards, co-sponsored by Alberta Culture & Multiculturalism, and Grant MacEwan Community College. The Volunteer Centres of Edmonton and Calgary originally were

co-sponsors of BDP. In 1986, they became Associate Sponsors, and the Alberta Library Trustees Association became an Associate Sponsor, enabling library boards to participate in the program. Together, these parts of the program are now known as BDP I. In 1992, the Muttart Foundation joined in the partnership with Alberta Culture & Multiculturalism and Grant MacEwan when a need was identified for workshops to be provided to boards of not-for-profit human service organizations outside of Edmonton and Calgary. (It was believed at the time that organizations in Edmonton and Calgary had adequate access to board development services, while those outside the major centres had few services available.) This addition to the program is referred to as BDP II. In 1993, Alberta Community Development was formed and recreation and sport organizations were added to the list of boards served by the BDP I.

In addition to workshops, the Board Development Program is reaching boards through resource materials. In 1987 *"A Handbook for Cultural Trustees"*, a book based on the Board Development Program was written by Marion Pacquette, Rory Ralston, and Donna Cardinal, and published by the Samuel and Saidye Bronfman Foundation as a national resource for cultural boards. In 1988, *"Board Development: Voluntary Sector Leadership"*, a four part video production, learner manual, and leader guide were produced by the Access Network. The series is based on the *"Board Development Program Foundations Workshop."*

Funded by the Muttart Foundation, *"Board Development"*, the newsletter, was introduced by the Board Development Program in 1992. Published quarterly, the publication reaches more than 1000 non-profit boards and individuals who work with them. In early 1994 two workbooks, also funded by the Muttart Foundation, *"Drafting and Revising Bylaws"* and *"Job Descriptions for Boards of Non-profit Organizations"* were published by BDP as self-directed learning resources. *"Recruiting and Orienting Board Members"* and *"Developing Policies"* are planned for the near future.

III. Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation

As part of the three year funding arrangement between the Muttart Foundation and the Board Development Program, an external evaluation was conducted. The terms of reference for the evaluation were as follows:

- To evaluate the original and expanded Board Development Program and to prepare a report for the Muttart Foundation and Alberta Community Development.

- Upon completion, the Foundation will give the report to other funders to help them determine if this is a program to fund or replicate.

The objectives of the evaluation as laid down by the Muttart Foundation were:

- To evaluate the impact of the Board Development Program with workshop recipients.

- To evaluate the management, administration, and delivery systems of the program.

- To identify the strengths of the program.

- To suggest other ways of running the program.

- To recommend methods for enhancing the program.

IV. Methodology

To evaluate the impact of the Board Development Program on workshop recipients we distributed 325 surveys to board members who had participated in closed workshops, 75 surveys to open workshop participants, and 58 surveys to instructors. The survey participants were selected on a randomized, weighted basis to assure representation from different sectors and geographic locales. Fifty percent of surveys were sent to those taking workshops in the past year, while the other half was distributed to those who participated earlier. Current instructors were interviewed in focus groups, or received questionnaires.

Responses were received from 101 closed workshop participants (31% return rate), 21 open workshop participants (28%) and 35 instructors (60%). Personal, telephone interviews were conducted with 31 additional closed board participants, providing a combined response rate of 41%. Interviewees were selected randomly with representation from different regions and sectors.

Focus groups were conducted with 71 individuals, including two groups of instructors, four groups of senior staff, and eight groups of board members. Groups were arranged in Medicine Hat, Grande Prairie, Red Deer, St. Paul, Calgary, and Edmonton, and participants were randomly selected giving weight to ensure representation from different regions and sectors. We met with 23 individuals from Board Development Program I, and 31 individuals from Board Development Program II.

Interviews were conducted with program staff and program stakeholders such as the Muttart Foundation, the Volunteer Centres of Edmonton and Calgary, Grant MacEwan Community College, and the Alberta Library Trustees Association. Open workshop co-sponsors at Further Education Councils and Family and Community Support Services were interviewed, and an employee of the Edmonton Association for Continuing Education and Recreation was contacted to obtain her impression of the program.

The program evaluators attended two open Board Development workshops as participant observers, and participated in an orientation session for prospective instructors.

V. Evaluation Advisory Committee

An evaluation advisory committee was established to ensure that information flow would take place between the key players: funders, senior program staff, program volunteers, and the evaluators. The committee met on three occasions: at the beginning to define evaluation parameters, midway to examine early results, and at the end to discuss recommendations for change. It was composed of three Board Development Program staff, the Executive Director of the Muttart Foundation - the funding representative, two program volunteers, and the evaluation project team.

VI. Administrative Review

An associate of the Edmonton Social Planning Council was contracted to review record keeping and other administrative systems.

The Board Development Program was at 907, 10405 Jasper Avenue when the administrative review was completed on October 25, 26, and 28, 1993. The program has moved several times, and this lack of permanent space for the program inevitably creates administrative difficulties.

Two staff provide administrative support to the program. One supports BDP I. The other supports BPD II and provides desk top publishing support for the newsletter, manuals, etc.

The program uses a Macintosh computer and three LAN system terminals. There were two typewriters which were used for forms. All supplies, where possible, are purchased through Public Works.

With respect to record keeping at the program, a file is opened for an organization once a consultant has received a request for a workshop. Each file has an information sheet on the inside cover which provides key information about the organization at a glance. BDP I files by date order and BDP II alphabetically by organization name.

There is a good system in place to request background information from the organization, ensure it is received, and to forward the information to the instructors. (Samples of background information forms are contained in Appendix 3.) The instructor confirmation, travel requirements, and accommodation arrangements are sent at the same time as the instructor receives background information. Following the workshop, once again the system works well and after three month follow-up evaluations are completed and sent to instructors, the files are retired.

The present administrative system seems to work well for the participants, instructors and staff. Program information is readily available from the current staff but there are a few recommendations for changes that could be implemented to improve the system. There are also some advantages for present and future staff to have certain functions identical for both programs. In looking ahead, if the programs are amalgamated, it would make sense to have these small things in order. Some changes would also be very helpful if there was another review of the program. In particular, the reviewer found that some names on the workshop sign-in sheets were not board members and there was no indication of who they were. Also, while the addresses and phone numbers of individual board members were in the files it was sometimes necessary to search through a lot of paper to find them.

Recommendations:

- File all the files the same way, alphabetically appears to be easier, and show the year of the workshop clearly on the file.

- Report both programs in the same way, incorporating requirements of Muttart and Provincial Government, perhaps including volunteer hours for instructors and tying expenses to the individual workshops.

- Have both administrative assistants familiar with both computer systems currently being used.

- Ensure staff job descriptions are up to date.

- On the sign in sheet at a workshop, have a few extra columns added for "phone number" and "staff or board". This would facilitate follow-up by enabling staff to track people who are not listed in the file, and would help BDP staff determine how many of the workshop participants are board members and how many are staff representatives.

- Enter the names/addresses/phone numbers of board members in a database and move inactive names to archives after one year. Only the names of board presidents are currently being entered into the database. A larger database would facilitate follow-up, and would make wider distribution of the newsletter possible.

- Show a record of number of canceled workshops.

- Indicate repeat workshops on the file and in written reports.

VII. Questionnaires and Focus Group Questions

Following a review of evaluation documents, previous studies, and other relevant literature, and in consultation with the evaluation advisory committee, questionnaire and focus group questions were selected. The questionnaires were structured to contain a mix of forced choice and open ended questions. Questionnaires and focus group questions are attached as Appendix 4.

> ** Throughout this section, some comments by respondents required clarification or explanation from BDP staff. The commentary provided is indented and italicized.*

Focus Group Summary:

Focus groups were conducted with 71 individuals. In addition to groups in Edmonton we traveled to Grande Prairie, St. Paul, Medicine Hat, Calgary, and Red Deer. We met with two groups of instructors, four groups of senior staff and eight groups of board members. The focus groups had a good mix of participants from BDP I (23) and BDP II (31) and 17 instructors. Three board members who had not participated in the workshop came out to describe how they were integrated into the board process after the workshop. Two people telephoned to give their input.

There were common themes within all three groups. Participants were very positive about the program. They say it is making a contribution to organizations by helping boards develop structures, goals, a direction, and at the very least facilitating teamwork. As a result of the workshop most boards have written job descriptions, bylaws, policy manuals, and mandates. Participants say they have a better understanding of their roles, and report board meetings are much shorter. Many send out a detailed agenda and information package for review before the board meetings, committees are working on tasks and reporting to the board, and the boards are recruiting members to suit the tasks. Several groups have reported a dramatic change in the length of their meetings. One group reports it has decreased its meetings from five hours to two.

Participants having contact with the Board Development Program staff found them very supportive and accessible, although there were a number of board and senior staff participants who were unaware of the newsletter or other Board Development Program services such as follow-up, referral, and resource materials.

> ** Boards who took the workshop before 1992 would not be on the mailing list for newsletters and would therefore not be expected to receive them. This would account for some boards' lack of knowledge of the newsletter. Also, formal follow-up was enabled through Muttart funding for BDP II boards. Follow-up to BDP I workshops is limited due to funding and time constraints.*

Several participants said the instructors, being volunteers themselves, had impacted them in a way a paid trainer could not. The instructors had not-

for-profit experience, they were professional, well prepared, and were committed to their volunteer work. Participants said they were "models" or "examples", and several boards said they would like to recruit them. Many individuals report as a result of the workshop they recognize the important role they play on the board, and have learned to thank their board members with "thank you" notes and volunteer recognition evenings.

The curriculum was suitable for boards in early stages of development, but will have to be adjusted for more advanced boards, and will have to change to meet with future trends. The instructors made suggestions for curriculum development which were in sync with comments from board members and senior staff. They said the components on conflict resolution, strategic planning, advocacy, and public trust could be clearer, and there is a need for more exercises on vision. Topics such as mergers, regionalization, amalgamation, and funding may have to be explored in the near future. There is also a need for materials which go beyond the foundation workshop when the instructors are working with more well developed boards.

The instructors suggested the Board Development Program bring instructors together to work on the structure of the binders, and review curriculum periodically. They would also like to have access to background information on the curriculum, i.e. where it came from, who developed it, where it had been tested.

> *The program has been monitored and field tested for 10 years. Changes have been made in line with participant and instructor suggestions, and instructors have been brought together to review curriculum in the past. However, the current instructors may not all have been involved in the process. Also, source information on the curriculum material is provided in the binders.*

All groups felt the program needed to do more follow-up in the form of workshops. Most board members are asking for a six month follow-up period, and all want to do another workshop within the next four years. Participants who have experienced the benefit of follow-up workshops stress they are necessary to sustain the benefits over the long-term, and take the board beyond the foundation stage. Groups suggested it might be useful to bring together similar boards in "peer groups" or through a "board exchange" to help sustain the benefits of the workshop by building networks to reinforce the workshop.

One idea was the Board Development Program could offer a series of open workshops on general topics with new members attending orientation/ foundation sessions, while other members attend advanced sessions on special topics. Several open workshops could be offered concurrently, and the board members could come together later in the day, or on a separate occasion to work on individual board issues. The special topics board members would like to see covered include: fund raising, program promotion, use of volunteers, funding cutbacks, marketing, vision, strategic planning, and budgeting.

Instructors, senior staff and board members said they were using the skills they had developed at the Board Development workshop outside of their

organizations in community groups, work, other boards, and church groups.

In a number of the focus group discussions, the issue of paying for the program was raised. Among the board members and senior staff who had taken the workshop, the general consensus was that the program was very worthwhile and some groups would be willing to pay a fee for service. However, the majority of people involved in these discussions said their boards would be unwilling or unable to pay. One person said, "If our board had any money for training, it would be used for staff." Others said it would be impossible to get board members to consider spending money on board development because their budget was stretched too far already. A couple of larger organizations said they could pay up to $500 for a workshop while a few said they could afford to pay $50. Another suggestion was that the basic BDP workshop should be free but people wanting follow-up workshops should pay for them.

All groups strongly support continuing the Board Development Program. They said there was a need for well trained, responsible boards in this time of fiscal restraint, and suggested boards other than the ones currently being served may need the Board Development Program in the near future, e.g. hospital boards funded by Alberta Health. Many agencies reported the training they have done with the Board Development Program is the only training they will receive. They say it has raised the efficiency of their organizations, and for some groups it has meant the difference between success, mediocrity, and failure.

Workshop Participant Questionnaires:

Closed Workshops:

A total of 132 people completed questionnaires (including those interviewed over the telephone) about their participation in closed board workshops. The summary provided here is based on the combined responses of all the questionnaires. Quotes in italics provide a <u>sample</u> of the individual responses. These are direct quotes. Where there is a distinct difference between board types it is noted. The breakdown of returned questionnaires is as follows:

Arts	51
Ethno-cultural	7
Library	31
BDP II	43

Respondents were asked to note whether the organization they represent serves a particular population. Two agencies work specifically with Aboriginal people and the ethno-cultural boards all work with multicultural organizations. In the "other" category, children, youth and people with physical disabilities were mentioned.

Demographically, the arts and ethno-cultural boards represented by the respondents were located mostly in Calgary and Edmonton. Over 70% of the sample were aged 35 and over and the responses were evenly split between males and females. The library and BDP II boards were noticeably different in that only three per cent of the responses were from Calgary and Edmonton and 75% of the respondents were women. (As BDP II was designed for boards outside the two major centres and there is only one library board each in Edmonton and Calgary, the location of the responses is logical.) The age breakdowns were similar for all types of boards.

Twenty-eight per cent of the people who completed questionnaires were the chairman of the board at the time they took the Board Development Program. There was an average of ten people on the boards (range 6 - 18) and eight who attended the workshop (range 2 - 13).

> *As these numbers raised some question, BDP staff reviewed their attendance records for BDP I courses over the past three years and all BDP II workshops in 1993. These records indicate that while a small number of workshops have poor attendance (less than 75% of board members present), the average attendance in BDP I is 79% and in BDP II 82%. Sixty-five per cent of the workshops meet the attendance requirements and another 20% are only one person short. Another 9% of the workshops have been two people short while six per cent have been short by three or more participants. Over half the boards in the latter category have 14 to 18 members, eight or more of whom were at the workshop. In BDP I, since 1991, of a potential 1038 board members 819 have participated in the workshops. In BDP II, 404 out of 495 board members have attended the 1993 workshops.*

Seventy-one per cent of the respondents are still serving on the boards they represented at the time of the workshop. Most of those who have left the

boards did so at the end of their term of office. Fifty-eight per cent of the respondents have been with these particular boards for one to three years and 57% have over five years of service on boards in general.

Forty-one per cent of the respondents have taken other board development workshops or seminars. A small number (5/132) have attended more than one BDP workshop. While library board members made up only 23% of the evaluation respondents, they accounted for 34% of those who had additional board training, primarily through their annual Jasper conference.

When asked how they found out about the program, 42% said they were referred by their board, eight to nine per cent said a former participant, a friend or colleague, the Alberta Library Trustees Association, contact from BDP and government or municipal organizations. Smaller numbers mentioned their provincial association, the volunteer centre, Parks and Recreation, the Muttart Foundation and the United Way.

Eighty-six per cent of the respondents said they completed the needs assessment prior to the workshop and that it was reflected in the training they received. Samples of their comments follow:

"The presenters were aware of our problems and addressed them directly."

"The facilitators were familiar with our policy manual and referred to it throughout the workshop."

"Two trainers had obviously by comments and structure/emphasis of workshop, read and incorporated the material."

"The instructors had obviously assessed our needs and highlighted same."

There were a few less positive comments as well. Due to the small number of negative comments, all are listed here:

"Found little on policy development."

"Did not deal with our problems specifically."

"Not completely, was more general than specific."

"Somewhat - it was more helpful to those who had never been on a board. I found material too basic but I've taken and practiced much of this before."

"The workshop looked at the general. We needed (still need) specific information on restructuring."

When asked what they remember most about the workshop, most respondents mentioned a specific topic, such as roles and responsibilities, board accountability, and mission statements. Others commented on the amount of information covered in a short period of time, the instructors, having fun, getting to know the other board members better, working as a

team, and realizing how much more they still had to learn/accomplish. A few people commented about the facilitators telling them how well-off they were as a board in comparison to others even though they still have issues to work through.

Respondents were asked to identify, from a list provided, the top three things they hoped to gain from the Board Development workshop. They were then asked to identify, from the same list, what they actually achieved. The table below identifies, for each board category, the number of people who selected a goal and the number of people who said its goal was met. The final column indicates the total per cent of respondents who selected each item. The most popular goal, selected by 58%, was to *outline roles and responsibilities*. Other goals which ranked highly were *make meetings more effective* (39%), *orient board members* (34%) and *plan and develop policies* (30%). The goals most often achieved were *outline roles and responsibilities* (52%), *orient board members* (39%), *develop mission statement* (36%) and *make meetings more effective* (36%).

Under "other", people had hoped to work on getting to know each other, future planning and improving relationships with others. On what they actually gained, a small number said nothing has changed as a result of the workshop, two said the overall functioning of the board and committees has improved and others said they are working on all the areas listed.

Table 1
Participant's Goals

Topic	Arts		Ethno-Cultural		Library		BDP II		Total %	
	Goal	*Got*	*Goal*	*Got*	*Goal*	*Got*	*Goal*	*Got*	*Goal*	*Got*
Develop a mission statement	13	20	2	2	9	12	5	13	22	36
Plan and develop policies	16	18	3	3	8	9	13	14	30	33
Recruit and maintain board members	5	2	2	1	5	2	7	5	14	8
Orient board members	21	22	1	1	13	15	10	13	34	39
Develop a board manual	10	9	0	0	2	6	4	5	12	15
Make meetings more effective	24	21	2	1	15	13	11	12	39	36
Manage finances	3	3	0	0	3	1	1	3	5	5
Deal with controversy and dissent	9	4	0	0	5	8	2	2	12	11
Develop positive board/staff relations	6	11	0	0	9	8	8	9	17	21
Outline roles and responsibilities	31	25	5	3	18	19	22	21	58	52

On the question of board functioning, the majority of respondents say their board has improved since taking the workshop:

Table 2
Changes in Boards Since Taking BDP

Area	Better*	Worse	Same
Clarified roles and responsibilities of board members	73	0	17
Efficiency and productivity of the board	57	2	30
Relations with other board members, staff and consumers	49	2	38
Establishing policies in all areas	46	2	40
Planning and goal setting	49	1	39
Formalizing the organization's reason for existence	44	1	44

Numbers on this table are the per cent who gave this response.

Thirty-five respondents (27%) noted other changes in the functioning of their boards. Following is a sample of the comments:

"Better organized meetings."

"Have developed to a policy governing board instead of a hands on managing board."

"More use of volunteers."

"Sense of common purpose was established."

"We're more together."

"More interested in organization's business."

"More confident in dealing with government funding agencies and with other organizations."

"Our board has clearly become more professional."

"Even though we had an almost complete turn over in board members, we are a stronger board because of preparation done with the help of the workshop."

With regard to their personal functioning as a board member, people noted improvements in a number of areas. Most commented on having a better understanding of their roles and responsibilities. Additionally, people mentioned having more confidence, more respect for other board members, willingness to take on new tasks and having a stronger commitment.

Respondents noted an improvement in the organizations their boards represent as well:

Table 3
Changes in Organizations Since Taking BDP

Area	Better*	Worse	Same
Board and staff relations	46	3	29
Staff understanding of their roles	46	2	28
Division between board and staff responsibilities	45	4	26
Relations with consumers	23	2	39
Planning and goal setting	56	1	28

*Numbers on this table are the per cent who gave this response.

Twenty people (15%) commented on other changes including:

"Changed from trying to create a "PERFECT" organization to centre that addresses peoples' needs at their level - less threatening approach."

"Information exchange with the membership as a whole has improved."

"With the board more firmly in place and functioning efficiently, the organization itself has been able to do more plays, new projects, in-services."

"More responsive to change, to consumers' needs and input."

"Cooperation is increased."

The majority of the respondents said the workshop materials were tailored to the needs of their board (78%), that the materials were current (85%), and that the workshop addressed their concerns (83%). Sixty per cent said the information in the workshops was new to them. Comments included the following:

"All boards should attend at least one."

"The materials were very helpful. A review should be a part of the board development process i.e. make the date for a review at the first seminar."

"Well done workshop. The failure was us in not following through."

"The workshop materials were standard. It was the presentation and agenda that was tailored to the group."

"Not all the information presented was new to me but it was presented to us in the context of our organization which made it easier to use."

"I feel having this type of development workshop is very important for boards and should be available to communities on an ongoing basis as board members change over the years and occasionally lose sight of their purpose, etc. Their effectiveness pays off in $ to the community."

The feedback on the instructors was extremely positive. Most respondents said the instructors were experienced in board development issues (94%) and were well trained (94%), that the training style was appropriate to the group (95%) and that the instructors worked well as a team (97%). The comments indicated that the instructors are generally pleasant, enthusiastic, willing to change direction to meet the needs of the group and very professional in their approach.

With regard to the scheduling of the workshops on Friday night and Saturday, the majority of respondents (88%) stated that it was probably the best alternative given people's varying schedules. A few people (5) said it caused them some difficulty in making arrangements for other responsibilities. Two said that Friday night was tiring after a full day at work. A few (4) suggested that it is necessary to have this type of intensity to maintain the momentum.

Most of the boards said they had discussions at the board meeting following the workshop to pass on information to those who could not attend. Some also provided written material, either prepared by themselves or handouts from the workshop. In one case, members planned a small workshop of their own. Some said that the best way to share the learning was through example and it is an ongoing process.

The majority of the respondents said they have had no further contact with the Board Development Program since completing the workshop other than completing the follow-up surveys. Twenty-three per cent have received some information, three per cent had a refresher workshop, 11% had follow-up contact with the instructors and three per cent said they had contact with program staff. Only 32% said they receive the BDP newsletter and of these, 48% copy and distribute it to other board members. Of those who have read it, 94% said it is helpful. They find it informative and a good way to keep up-to-date. However, one individual made the following comment: "It appeared to us that the newsletter was going to <u>replace</u> the workshop (i.e. the workshops would no longer be available) so they have confused us as to their purpose. Too general - would be better if the newsletter provided actual details of other boards problems/solutions etc."

*The figures on follow-up contact are not expected to be high as the newsletter and follow-up phone calls are most often directed to the chairperson of the board. The only time contact would be with an individual board member is if that person requested specific information on the evaluation form.

Seventy-three per cent of the respondents said they would see their board taking another workshop. Those who said "no" felt they needed to take action on what they have already learned before they start thinking of moving on. A few said they are working well now and did not see a need

for more development. Those who are interested in follow-up workshops would like to focus on one or two specific issues, for example policy development, planning and goal setting, fundraising and board staff relations. Some would like to have a follow-up after six months to review action taken on the initial workshop. Others said a workshop every three to four years would be beneficial. Sixty-one per cent of the respondents said it would be helpful to have a workshop whenever there is a major turnover in membership to train the new members.

Fifty-eight per cent said the workshop was helpful in other aspects of their life. They find it helpful at their jobs (29%) on other boards (26%), in clubs/associations (17%) and at church (9%).

When asked what new topics they would like to see the program explore, the most frequent responses were for fundraising and long term planning. Others would like more information on organizational structure and board models, ensuring success of initiatives and problem solving. While 79% said that workshops on specific topics would be useful, only 25% were interested in computer based training and 37% in video instruction. Fifty-eight per cent said self administered workbooks would be useful. The only other suggestion put forward was for program staff or volunteers to work in depth with one or two board members who could then work with their boards.

Under general comments, many people summarized their positive impressions. Following are examples of the comments made:

"I only wish we'd done this type of workshop sooner."

"I have highly recommended the Board Development Program to several others."

"The Board Development Program is an invaluable public resource - one of the badly needed services the government funds."

"I think the Board Development training program is good and volunteers should be commended for their work and dedication."

Open Workshops:

Twenty-one questionnaires out of 75 distributed (28%) were returned by people who had participated in open workshops. Two-thirds of the respondents were female and aged 35 to 50. A total of 17 workshops over four years were represented by the questionnaires. There was an average of 17 participants in each workshop. Most participating boards sent two board members and one staff. Among our respondents, three were board chair and three were staff at the workshop.

The most common reason for attending an open workshop was to see what the Board Development Program was about (18) followed by personal development (13). Only two respondents were doing a preview with the

intent of later arranging a closed board workshop. None of the others have taken a closed board workshop. Two people indicated that they were unable to get a commitment from their board for full participation. Others said they were sharing what they learned with the rest of their board.

Fifteen of the respondents are still on the boards they represented at the time of the workshop. Most of them have been with these particular boards for one to three years and have five or more years of total board service. Only six have any other type of board training.

When asked what they remember most about the workshop, the respondents identified a number of specific topics such as bylaws and policy development, board roles and responsibilities and mission statements. A few (3/21) said the workshop was not appropriate to their needs: "Most of the information supplied by the instructors did not apply to our small organization;" "Not much was aimed at library boards;" and "It wasn't what I wanted or needed."

The three things most people hoped to gain from the workshop were information on board recruitment, holding effective meetings and roles and responsibilities of board members and staff. When asked what they actually learned, all the choices except "how to manage finances" were checked by at least eight respondents.

> * While "how to manage finances" was on the list of choices offered to the respondents, it is not intended to be part of the BDP curriculum.

The comments about the workshops were generally very positive. One person said the material was too general while another felt that too much detail was built into the program. With regard to the instructors, all the comments but two spoke highly. In one case the instructors were new and appeared "unsure of themselves in some areas". Another person said the instructors criticized the group for their role in organizing the workshop. (No further explanation was given of this comment.)

As with the closed board workshops, most participants (16/21) felt that the Friday-Saturday format was the best alternative. One person felt the workshop was too long and another would have preferred it during the week.

Participants have used what they learned at the Board Development Workshop in a variety of ways. Four have been involved in the development of policy manuals, seven said the material has helped to improve the efficiency of their boards and two used what they learned to provide orientation to new board members. Five said the workshop enabled them to understand their own roles better. One individual felt the main benefit of the workshop was that it helped the board to realize how much work they needed to do before they would be ready for a closed session.

Nine people, including the people who arranged the closed workshops, have had further contact with the Board Development Program. Fourteen said they have found the information useful in other aspects of their lives. Respondents expressed interest in specific topics including working with volunteers, fundraising, conflict resolution, board responsibilities and

parliamentary rules and procedures. Six said they would use self administered workbooks, seven said they would use video instruction and four were interested in computer based training.

Of the six people who provided additional comments, five spoke of how beneficial the program was in their activities. The sixth person was disappointed with the workshop overall. It is worthwhile noting that this was the same person who commented on the instructors being unsure of the material.

Agency Senior Staff

We conducted focus groups with 14 senior staff, each representing a different agency that took the workshop. We traveled to Grande Prairie, Edmonton, Calgary, and Medicine Hat.

Overall the workshops have met the expectations of senior staff, and their organizations have benefited from the workshop. Many senior staff report the roles and responsibilities of board members are clearer, their board meetings are more effective and productive, and their organizations have a more professional approach.

Some senior staff saw a short term change in the board, but when the enthusiasm inspired by the workshop "fizzled out" the boards' progress was halted. These staff suggested boards should be held accountable to the action plan developed in the workshop by implementing a strong follow-up program through the Board Development Program. Despite their frustration they did not feel the Board Development Program was responsible for the lack of progress made by their boards.

On one thing all senior staff agreed, the program should be continued. Senior staff said the boards are responsible for large amounts of money, and they have to be accountable to the public. For many agencies the training they receive from the Board Development Program is the only training they will receive, and it is going to determine whether they survive or not. For a more detailed description of the comments made by senior staff see Appendix I.

Instructors Input

Volunteer instructors in the Board Development Program were invited to participate in focus groups in Calgary and Edmonton to discuss the program and provide their input to the evaluation. Following the focus groups questionnaires were sent to the 58 instructors who had not been able to attend either session. Through these two sources we received feedback from 52 instructors; 17 in focus groups and 35 returned questionnaires. The summary which follows is based on the combined input.

Among those who completed questionnaires, the majority (20) have been with the program one to two years and have facilitated at least three workshops. Twenty-four of the respondents were recruited to the program through newspaper advertisements while five got involved because they knew people in the program. The comments in the focus groups suggested a similar breakdown.

The instructors overall were very impressed with the training they received. Comments include very thorough, well organized, role-modeled and excellent use of adult training techniques. In the focus group discussions particular mention was made of the value of peer teaching and evaluation in training. People also stated that the training was an excellent way to build a team, giving all the instructors a level of comfort in working together afterwards. Four criticisms were given about the amount of material packed into small periods of time and one about a trainer who "is knowledgeable but not a good adult instructor." Many suggestions were offered by the instructors. These are provided in Appendix 2.

All the instructors spoke very highly of the program staff. No problems were identified. The attitudes are summed up well by this comment: "They are always incredibly professional, courteous, prompt, thorough. They do it all in spades! Every last one of them. They are efficient, diplomatic, listen, suggest, deliver in every department." A strong positive for many of the instructors is that it doesn't matter which of the staff members they speak with: all of them know what is going on at any given time and they provide the same answers to questions when asked. The only issue raised by a few of the instructors was the difficulty created for some by the move to the downtown office: parking and downtown traffic can be a problem.

Only one individual was unclear of the program's expectations. This person has been with the program over a year and has only been asked to deliver two workshops which has raised the question of "why"? However, there was no indication whether program staff had been asked.

For the most part, the volunteers are pleased with the curriculum and the program materials. Five people specifically mentioned fundraising as an issue frequently raised by boards and not covered in depth in the curriculum. Many people, particularly in the focus groups, raised questions about the binders and the organization of the material. A number of other suggestions were offered and these are listed in Appendix 2.

All the instructors like the team teaching approach of the Board Development Program, although a small number reported having the

occasional personality conflict. The instructors enjoy the opportunities to learn from each other and like having someone to share the workload. Some mentioned the need to constantly adjust to new styles, but said this helps them to develop their skills. The quality of training received was identified as the key to enabling the instructors to work well with people they had never met.

Many other suggestions on a variety of issues were provided by the instructors. A number said they would like opportunities to sit with the others to share their experiences. Two said they need space to be on their own (i.e. without the other instructor) on out-of-town trips. Most of the comments, however, deal with the need for follow-up workshops and workshops on specific topics. Again, a complete list of the suggestions is contained in Appendix 2.

A number of instructors expressed general concern over the possibility of cut backs or privatization of the Board Development Program. They see the need increasing in the current political-economic climate and believe that BDP offers a cost-effective approach to helping boards manage. On a related note, many would like to see a more aggressive promotion campaign to raise awareness of the program among boards.

VIII. Legal Curriculum

The Executive Director of the Legal Resource Centre reviewed the legal component of the Board Development Foundations Workshop Handouts. Some concerns raised were:

The handouts did not reflect the workshop presented more than one board model. Without the opportunity to compare and contrast different board models the participants would not have opportunity to develop judgment. This becomes particularly important when board members encounter situations which do not fit the prescribed model.

The handouts do not acknowledge there are different types of non-profit organizations. Not all non-profits are included under the Societies Act, some are included under the Companies Act and a distinction needs to be made.

> *The initial analysis was done only with the handouts. The curriculum received by the instructors is much more in-depth than the handouts. The handouts were not intended to stand alone and may need revisions if they are to be viewed in this manner.*

The handouts state the board has one employee while all employees are actually part of the board's legal responsibility.

The discussion of board liability in the handouts does not explain where liability comes from and why, and the answers tend to be weak e.g. there is no discussion of liability with respect to employee wages.

The importance of board orientation and the legal implications need to be emphasized more emphatically. Boards need to know they are *obliged* to let new members know their responsibilities at orientation.

> *The Board Development Program staff have contracted a legal expert to do an in-depth review of the entire legal curriculum.*

IX. Stakeholder Input

Interviews were held with representatives of the Volunteer Centres of Calgary and Edmonton, Grant MacEwan Community College, the Alberta Library Trustees Association, Family and Community Support Services, rural Further Education Councils, the Muttart Foundation and Alberta Community Development.

Muttart Foundation:

Early in the 1990's the Muttart Foundation became concerned that boards were not working as effectively as they possibly could. The Foundation did extensive research on technical assistance to boards in the United States, and subsequently called for board development proposals in Alberta.

The Foundation received about a dozen proposals to carry out programs, but none fit the true demands of the Muttart Foundation. The Foundation initiated contact with the Board Development Program and agreed on a contractual arrangement to run Board Development Program II. This was to be the Foundation's first move in their reorientation to supporting and restructuring the non-profit sector.

The Muttart Foundation agreed to only fund board development to non-profit organizations outside of Edmonton and Calgary. They decided to limit the Program to rural areas because resources were already available to boards in Edmonton and Calgary, and because volunteer burnout appeared to be more prominent in the rural areas due to the same volunteers serving on many boards.

Since the Program's commencement, the relationship between the Muttart Foundation and the Board Development Program has been terrific. The communication between BDP staff and Muttart is good, BDP's financial reporting is excellent, the Foundation is advised in advance of any potential problems, and is given opportunity to respond to specific concerns. The Foundation describes the relationship as a "real partnership."

The Foundation says they have limited contact with senior staff at Alberta Community Development. The excellent working relationship with BDP staff has eliminated the need for discussions with the Deputy Minister or Assistant Deputy Minister, however, a semi-annual meeting with the Assistant Deputy Minister might be beneficial in the future to assure government support for the Program. This becomes especially important in rapidly changing times.

Future funding of the Board Development will be reviewed by the Board of Directors at the Muttart Foundation once the evaluation is completed. The extent to which government is committed to a real partnership with a private foundation is still unclear to Muttart. Particularly, the Muttart Foundation is concerned about the Government's commitment to BDP I. Under the agreement between Alberta Community Development and the Muttart Foundation any reduction of financial support to BDP I gives the right to

Muttart to pull out of BDP II. Because Muttart is a non-profit foundation they traditionally do not support projects beyond the first term. In the case of the Board Development Program they are questioning whether they want to see such a valuable program disappear. "It will be a very important board policy decision."

Looking to the future, Muttart is concerned about the need for an integration of services. "It would have been desirable to attempt integrating other government and non-government services at program commencement, but that would have made the Program slower to get off the ground because it would have involved players across the province." The Muttart Foundation says it may be prepared to take a lead in the integration of services in the future.

Muttart has also considered expansion of the Program to Saskatchewan. This innovation will be discussed by the Board of Directors of Muttart after the evaluation.

The Muttart Foundation's overall impression of the Board Development Program is very positive. They feel the staff at BDP have been supportive of the evaluation process by co-operating with the selection of evaluators, and by giving guidance, and commitment to the Evaluation Advisory Committee. "The staff have been open to hearing negative as well as positive comments."

Alberta Community Development:

Initially, Murray Finnerty, Assistant Deputy Minister of Alberta Community Development, was asked to provide a departmental perspective to the evaluation. Mr. Finnerty declined the invitation to participate in the process. He believed that he was too far removed from the program to give any useful input, and suggested that Ken Wilson, Director of the Community Field Services Branch, would be a better contact. Mr. Wilson agreed to meet with us and the following comments are based on that meeting.

The feedback given to Mr. Wilson regarding the Board Development Program is very positive. Central office staff as well as regional staff have commented on the high quality of the program and its overall benefits to the community. This feedback is based partly on comparison with other board services which are or have been provided by the department, including the Skills program. The structured, formal approach of BDP is very useful in working with many groups in the community, although other less formal services are offered as well. It was also noted that the volunteer approach utilized by the program is a good one and it may in future become a model for delivery of other government services.

There was some discussion of the consultants working with community boards through other government departments. The issue of jurisdiction is not clear at present as so much change is taking place. This is not a good time to try to develop protocols for partnerships with other departments.

Due to the evolution of the department (from Alberta Culture to Culture & Multiculturalism to Community Development) over the past ten years, the number of organizations that can be served by the Board Development Program has expanded. Under the current mandate, they could potentially offer BDP workshops to any organization in Alberta. This potential is not likely to be advertised, however, as the capacity to meet the resulting increased demand does not currently exist. A question was also raised regarding the ability to maintain quality control if the program is further expanded.

The relationship with the Muttart Foundation has worked well, but questions were raised over the need for such a partnership now that Alberta Community Development is able to work with the full range of organizations. Both the Board Development Program and Toni Lashbrook personally have a lot of credibility, and if the government is going to continue its commitment to the program it could be expanded without the foundation grant. Once the evaluation is completed, discussion with the Muttart Foundation will address future alternatives for offering the program. It may be possible to continue a form of partnership that would not require a financial commitment from Muttart.

The question that remains unanswered at present is, "What is the government's long term plan for BDP?" Department priorities are currently being identified in a three year plan which makes no specific reference to BDP. It is considered to be a very small part of the overall focus of the Community Field Services Branch, which is looking at community needs in the broadest sense. At the same time, it is recognized that services such as this are becoming more essential as greater responsibility is placed on communities.

On the other hand, the Board Development Program could be likened to other direct service programs that the government has chosen to privatize. It is one of the very few government services that has its own letterhead as well as other features that separate it from the department as a whole. This results in some tension and a need for the Director to intervene with other staff.

Once the three year plan is finalized (it is anticipated that the plan will be presented within two weeks of the interview) the Branch Director will have a better ability to address long term plans.

Program Co-Sponsors:

Interviews with staff from the Volunteer Centres, Grant MacEwan and the Library Trustees Association included discussion of the relationship with the Board Development Program, how the organization benefits from the association, any problems they have had with the program, things they would like to see handled differently and general discussion of the program. In all cases, the explanation of the relationship was consistent with that described by staff at the Board Development Program. The Volunteer Centres, until last year, had an agreement to assist with the selection of volunteer trainers. They are also members of the coalition which has

provided joint annual conferences for board trainers. The Community College provides administrative support for the program, primarily in relation to training the volunteers. They arrange space for workshops at the college. Hazel Sutherland (Program Chair, Voluntary Sector Management program, GMCC) is also involved in the training and curriculum development, although she is less involved now than in the early years of the program. The original BDP curriculum material is jointly owned by the Province and Grant MacEwan, which provides protection to both partners. The workbooks which are now being developed are under copyright to the Muttart Foundation. The Library Trustees Association promotes the program among its membership and pays the volunteer expenses for their workshops.

People involved in the delivery of the Board Development Program training commented on the very appropriate use of the available funds and other resources. Training retreats are held at locations like Camp He Ho Ha rather than using hotels, free space is used for other workshops, and the expertise of the partners is utilized rather than bringing in expensive consultants for training.

Each of these organizations notes a number of benefits they receive from their association with the Board Development Program. At least part of this is due to the high regard others have for the program. It reflects well upon the agencies working in partnership. Additionally, the program helps to promote other services they have to offer.

For the Volunteer Centres, the opportunity to review the curriculum material was an asset. They hope this type of collaboration will continue through the trainers coalition. It was noted that this level of collaboration does not exist in other provinces. By keeping in touch with each other and sharing resources, the agencies are able to avoid the duplication of service that happens elsewhere.

When asked if they had any problems with the Board Development Program, the only consistent issue was that people felt they did not have the time to give the program that they did in the past. This in fact led to the end of the agreement between the Volunteer Centres and the Board Development Program.

There also appears to be some disagreement over the initial development of the program. While it is attributed to Grant MacEwan and Alberta Culture, the Volunteer Centre of Edmonton believes it should be identified as a founder.

A question was raised over the fact that while BDP II is not available in Calgary and Edmonton, most of the trainers are from those two cities. Does this result in a drain of the best people from their local community? Given that the total number of trainers is quite small (21 from Edmonton and 28 from Calgary) this should not be a major concern.

On the positive side, all the stakeholders spoke of how valuable the program is to the community and the increasing demand for support for non-profit boards. The Board Development Program is considered to be an excellent resource, particularly for the boards of small organizations that are not well

established. It is the only program of its kind in Alberta, offering the full curriculum over two days. Other programs that exist tend to focus on specific issues and are usually offered in a one to three hour format. While these are appropriate for boards that are functioning well in most areas, they cannot meet the needs of boards that are unclear on the basics of board roles and responsibilities.

A key strength of BDP identified by the stakeholders is its focus on policies. Many boards have no written policies and do not know where to begin to develop them. It was suggested that through the program a number of groups have been able to increase their effectiveness and become more accountable for the funding they receive.

Another benefit of the program identified by the stakeholders is that it has provided agencies in the province with a core group of very well trained volunteers who continue to offer their services to the community after they complete their volunteer agreement. In the words of one person, "What this does for the community is phenomenal. It can't be replicated by any other process."

The stakeholders spoke of the other types of board training they are involved with. In each case, they develop workshops to address specific needs for their clients. There is usually some fee involved, although programs through the Volunteer Centres are not expensive ($50 in Edmonton and $25 to $100/hour in Calgary) and subsidies are sometimes available. At Grant MacEwan, board training is aimed at a different market and can be quite costly. The Library Trustees Association offers an annual conference to its members but it addresses a broad range of topics, only some of which focus on board concerns.

Given this situation and the growing demand for programs, only one of the stakeholders feels it is important to keep BDP II outside of Edmonton and Calgary. The others stated that the division is not very logical and results in a disservice to agencies which could benefit from the program.

There was a lot of discussion in each of the interviews about the need for the different groups to support and promote each other. It is recognized that each of the services being offered meets different types of needs and when another program would be more appropriate, people should be referred to the better option.

People also discussed ways to promote board development in general, to educate boards on the need to learn. It was suggested that testimonials at conferences by board members who have taken BDP would be more convincing than material from the program itself. People noted that it is often difficult to reach boards without personal knowledge of the organization and the board membership. It was also suggested that a list of all board resources should be prepared so people can make appropriate referrals. This should include all the courses available and the print materials as well as consultants who work in the field.

A number of people noted changes in the current and expected trends. The issues for boards now include more focus on needs assessment, insurance and liability and organizational structure and restructuring. It was suggested

that the resource materials generally available to people involved in board development are out of date and there is a need to develop Canadian material to address these issues. People noted that board development is a specialized field, not often included in the broad spectrum of professional development, so it is hard to find good material. The Volunteer Centre of Edmonton is very interested in the development of workbooks through BDP and would like to be able to distribute them through their office.

No one is interested in seeing the Board Development Program privatized, particularly if it is contracted to a consultant. The benefit to the program now of having the expertise from each of the partners would be lost in private hands. Also, the current accessibility of the program, particularly in relation to cost, would be threatened. The only alternative suggested was that the Muttart Foundation take over the program as it exists and offer it themselves.

There was some discussion of the recruitment procedures for BDP instructors. The current method often attracts people with similar human service backgrounds who are generally the type of people inclined to take on this type of volunteer involvement. It may be worthwhile to try recruiting directly from boards that have taken the workshop, particularly in the arts and library boards. Other sectors could also be targeted in recruitment to get a broader range of instructor background.

Finally, it was noted in most of the discussions that the tailored approach is very necessary given today's conditions. Generic programs are considered to be a waste of time for both the presenters and those who are receiving the information. This side of BDP is appreciated by everyone involved.

Supplementary Information:

An additional interview was conducted with Carol Humphries of the Edmonton Association for Continuing Education and Recreation (EACER). While they are not involved with the Board Development Program, EACER is one of the main resources for professional development for human service agencies in Edmonton. Staff there are involved with board training in conjunction with the Volunteer Centre, providing workshops for the general public to inform people of the need for board development. They are also in partnership with GMCC to provide workshops on organizational governance, based on the Carver Model.

EACER believes that the community will benefit by having better informed boards and that currently the needs are not being met. They suggested that part of the problem with smaller boards is that when someone suggests they should take a board development program they are implying that something is wrong with the way the board is operating. In order to address this, it is important to educate people about the purpose and benefits of board development. EACER would be interested in working with the Board Development Program and others to compile a resource list for board development which would identify the options available to all types of boards.

Workshop Co-Sponsors:

We interviewed coordinators of two rural Further Education Councils and two employees of rural Family and Community Support Services. These agencies co-sponsored workshops with the Board Development Program.

Two co-sponsors said they found out about the program through the Board Development Program's regular mail-out of promotional materials, while the others said they had a previous association with the program.

Overall the Board Development Program was well received in rural communities. Co-sponsors said the Board Development staff told them what to expect, they were accommodating, and they worked hard to meet community needs.

The co-sponsors were responsible for coordinating workshops in the community. They promoted the workshop, booked a location, arranged lunch, and registered participants. They said their responsibilities were reasonable. They see supporting volunteers in the community as a role of F.C.S.S. and the Further Education Councils. The Board Development workshop was an opportunity to further support and train their volunteers.

Participants said the workshops were excellent. "It was a teaser that gave organizations insights into the benefit of doing a closed board development workshop." Most who participated could not arrange a closed workshop, either because their boards were not large enough, they could not convince the rest of the board to attend, or they were not eligible for a closed workshop.

Co-sponsors saw minor problems with the "open vs. closed" workshops. Open workshops are not as valuable to boards as closed. Where two or less board members attended the workshop it was difficult to perceive a change in the entire board unless they followed up with a closed workshop. Only a small proportion of boards followed up with the closed workshop, and the two day weekend commitment seemed to be a disincentive for board members.

When asked what they would like to see the program doing in the future a representative of the Further Education Council suggested the Board Development Program promote the program by sending out information yearly. Every community in Alberta is served by a Further Education Council. If materials were sent out each spring, the Council would have lead time to include board development into their Fall program, and the Board Development Program would be promoted in every community in Alberta.

X. BDP Senior Staff

The BDP senior staff were interviewed to assess their perceptions of the program. Board Development Program II started in response to a need for comprehensive board development training for not-for-profit human services boards outside Edmonton and Calgary. Although there are other board development programs in the province, most others modularize board development training, some target different organizations or disciplines than BDP, and many have a cost attached. The Board Development Program offers a comprehensive workshop to give boards a foundation before they work on specific board issues. Staff, instructors, and participants comment that boards would have difficulty focusing on what is important if they did not first take time to learn what it is they should be doing. "Until they do a foundation workshop some groups don't know what they don't know."

Board Development Program II, funded by Muttart, does not offer workshops in Edmonton and Calgary except under special circumstances. The staff see benefits and downsides to this split. Based on current funding, keeping the focus narrow enables them to provide quality programs to the population they are serving. On the downside, people in the cities are asking for Board Development Program services and are being turned down even though they do not have the funds to access other services, or despite their inability to find a comprehensive approach elsewhere. This creates a communication and marketing problem for staff because they spend a great deal of their time explaining why they do not offer services in Calgary and Edmonton, rather than focusing on what they do offer.

There was some discussion of whether programs offering board development training were able to work together to network ideas and cut down on duplication of services.

There is a provincial coalition of groups who meet twice per year to share information. Initially the group arranged instructor training as part of their focus, but this in-service aspect has been phased out. The coalition includes Skills, Edmonton and Calgary Parks and Recreation, the Board Development Program, Grant MacEwan Community College, The Volunteer Centre of Calgary Board Training and Consulting, Volunteer Centre of Edmonton Board Training, and the Rural Education Development Association. Board Development Program staff say the coalition fulfills its purpose by facilitating information sharing, and training, but groups, including the Board Development Program, have never shared their full curriculums. Copyright plays a major factor in this decision.

Consultants in numerous local and provincial government departments offer board development consultation to non-profit groups who are their clients. Some of these include: Municipal Affairs, Alberta Community Development, AADAC, Alberta Agriculture and Rural Development, Alberta Family and Social Services. In fact, a few years back there may have been a perceived excess of board development training, but since the fiscal situation has worsened many services have disappeared. Consultants within departments have become overloaded and do not have the same

amount of time to devote to board development. The time they do have for board development is devoted to training groups in specific areas of concern (e.g. meeting skills and strategic planning). In addition, the consultants are linked with agency funding sources, a factor which often complicates board training since boards do not want to discuss their problems with the funders.

There is a perception at the Board Development Program that some government consultants, although unable to offer the same services as BDP, are hesitant to work with them, or even to refer clients to them. In most cases BDP staff have promoted the program directly to service providers. Because BDP offers services to client groups of so many departments, there is a need for the consultants to come together with BDP staff in a team approach. "Instead of groups re-inventing the board development wheel, we need a more unified way to support all the groups receiving government funding."

Follow-up is one area where this partnership would work. Presently BDP I is not mandated to do follow-up, and BDP II is providing follow-up support and follow-up workshops as requested. The Board Development Program staff see their role as quite different from the consultants. While BDP provides foundation workshops, many groups are requesting follow-up in special areas such as meeting skills, agendas, minutes, chair skills, conflict management, board recruitment, strategic planning, and fund raising. The consultants, and groups such as the Volunteer Centres of Edmonton and Calgary, offer modules on these special topics. If the consultants, Board Development staff, and Volunteer Centres were working in cooperation, all would still have a great deal of work, and boards would have access to a more coordinated, thorough service.

The staff feel positive about the funding partnership between Alberta Community Development, and the Muttart Foundation. The combination of government and foundation funding gives strength to the program by providing support and input from different sectors.

Finally, the Board Development Program staff stress it takes resources and time to recruit, train, support, and coordinate 80 volunteers. Initially the Volunteer Centres of Edmonton and Calgary helped interview volunteers, but due to constraints on their time the Volunteer Centres are no longer involved in this process. Volunteer management is a major component of BDP, and critical to attracting and retaining instructors with the level of skill, experience and commitment required by the program.

XI. Financial Considerations

The question posed to the evaluation team was, "What would it cost a non-government organization to provide the board development services currently provided by BDP II?" There are a number of factors that need to be considered in answering this question.

Based on figures from the start up year *(1992-1993)*, and the second year of operation of BDP II, it cost $107, 560 to operate the program for one year. The financial breakdown is as follows:

Table 4
Financial Breakdowns, BDP II

Activity	Direct Costs	Contract	Admin. Assistant	Program Consultants	Total
Volunteer recruitment & training. *(1 recruitment of 20 instructors/6 days over 2.5 weekends & inservice)*	$16,000	$500	$1,250	$4,075	$21,825
Workshop coordination & follow-up. *(60 workshops & 3 cancellations)*	$13,500		$8,750	$17,320	$39,570
Volunteer recognition.	$400				$400
Resource development. 1. Newsletter			$3,750	$3,055	$6,805
a) Copying	$560				$560
b) Mailing	$2,400				$2,400
2. Workbook *(2000 copies)*	$2,800	$1,150	$3,750	$3,055	$10,755
3. Curriculum updates			$1,250	$1,020	$2,270
Workshop supplies. *(Stationary, certificates, copying & postage)*	$4,500				$4,500
Program consultation, referral, marketing & administration.				$12,225	$12,225
General administration. *(Expenditure tracking, quarterly reports, ordering supplies, departmental support)*			$6,250		$6,250
Total	$40,160	$1,650	$25,000*	$40,750*	$107,560

Includes vacation pay and employer contributions.

These figures do not include the initial start-up costs for the program. Specifically, 6000 promotional brochures ($2,250), 10 portable flip charts with cases ($3,300), and computer equipment ($10,000). The financial breakdown does include:

- **Instructor recruitment, training and support costs.** Includes: Recruiting, selecting and training *(basic and inservice)* volunteer instructors, including the planning and delivery of the "Train the Trainer" events. *(Support includes ongoing volunteer management activities.)*

- **Workshop coordination and follow-up costs.** Program Consultants plan and coordinate workshops. Their duties include: workshop inquiries and confirmations, instructor scheduling and record keeping, needs assessments and background research, aspects of instructor travel and accommodation, instructor supplies/resource materials, immediate workshop follow-up, instructor thank-you notes, 3 to 6 month follow-up evaluation phone calls and questionnaires, instructor feedback and support, and any follow-up consultation requested by the boards.

  The administrative assistant works closely with the program consultants. His duties include: preparing and mailing all workshop correspondence, compiling evaluations, booking instructor accommodation and car rentals, producing, photocopying and filing etc. of workshop related materials, retiring files, updating workshop tracking systems, couriering materials, and doing print and purchase orders for workshop supplies.

  The bulk of the workshop coordination cost includes the expense of booking travel and accommodations for the instructors.

- **Resource Development costs.** Includes: Researching, writing, editing, and coordinating production of curriculum updates, handouts, newsletters, workbooks, and supplementary materials.

- **Program consultation, referral, marketing, and administration costs.** Includes: Consultation and referral *(phone, mail, and in person)* with the individuals and groups who are workshop clients. These include boards and staff of non-profit organizations, as well as numerous public sector employees who work with non-profit organizations. Program marketing includes long and short term market planning, the design and production of promotional materials, and ongoing involvement in promotional activities. Administration includes support to the BDP Unit coordinator in general program administration.

- **General Administration Costs.** For the administrative assistant, there is a variety of other duties that fall under this category. These include:

  Expenditure Tracking: Updating and balancing BDP II budget on the departmental computer tracking system. This must be done by

the eighth of every month. Duties also include assisting balancing the BDP I expenditure tracking system.

Quarterly Report Production: Includes the layout and printing of the quarterly report for the Muttart Foundation. This includes last minute updating of the workshop tracking systems.

Quarterly Newsletter Production: Includes the layout and printing of the quarterly newsletter, "Board Development."

Newsletter Mail Out: Includes updating the newsletter mailing list, envelope addressing, stuffing, and sending.

Other Departmental Projects: Assisting other members in the department with desktop projects.

Other: Caring for and maintaining the computer system. Assisting in the production of departmental reports *(internal documents for management decisions).* Ordering publications and office supplies. Providing client service.

Based on the above figures, and factoring out costs not directly linked to workshop delivery *(e.g. newsletter & workbook production, program consultation, referral, marketing, and administration)* the average workshop costs $1088 ($68,565/63). Without calculating in the canceled workshops, the average cost is $1142.

Each issue of the newsletter costs $2440. While the average workbook costs approximately $5.25.

On the other hand, there are a number of costs not included in the BDP II budget due to the fact that it is offered by a government department. Each of these would need to be considered by any other agency offering a similar program:

- Volunteer training and program administration is provided by the BDP Unit Coordinator. This position is fully funded by Alberta Community Development, but approximately 25% of the time expended is for BDP II.

- Office space, furniture and an additional computer are provided by Alberta Community Development.

- Incidental photocopying, mailings of under 20 pieces and government courier services are provided.

- The WATTS and Rite lines are used for long distance telephone calls. It is estimated by program staff that approximately 1.5 hours per day are spent on long distance calls with instructors, voluntary organizations, and booking accommodation.

- Hotel rooms and car rentals are obtained at government rates.

- There is no GST charged for the program.

- Through the partnership between the Board Development Program and Grant MacEwan Community College, space and expertise are provided at no charge.

Volunteer Involvement

One of the advantages of the Board Development Program is its extensive use of volunteers. All the workshops are delivered by volunteer instructors and some volunteer assistance is provided in the training. The program staff spend a large portion of their time on volunteer support/management activities.

During recruitment the staff screen approximately 350 inquiries, and 150 applications. Approximately 50 candidates are interviewed and 20 selected for training. Each side of the program (BDP I and BDP II) operates with 35 to 40 active volunteers at any given time. Each volunteer agrees to provide a minimum of 8 and maximum of 12 workshops in a two to three year period. In order to meet the demand for service and follow the agreement, it is necessary to recruit new instructors every 18 months. (In the initial year of BDP II, candidates were recruited on two separate occasions to get a total of 40.)

It costs approximately $700 to train each volunteer. This includes recruitment, two full weekend sessions, an evening seminar, a day of peer leading, and all the expenses associated with training (i.e. meals, travel, accommodation). Additionally, in-service training is provided every 12 to 18 months at a cost of about $4000 per workshop for BDP I and II. Approximately 50 out of the 80 instructors attend in-service sessions.

It is estimated that each volunteer gives between 308 and 412 hours of service to the Board Development Program, depending on the number of workshops they conduct. (These figures include the time involved in selection and training.) Delivering each workshop averages to 26 hours per instructor (i.e. times 2), including preparation, travel, delivery and follow-up. In a one year period including one training series, BDP II utilized 4,132 hours of volunteer time.

Summary

The cost of putting on a single workshop averages to about $500 in travel, accommodations and materials plus 52 volunteer hours. The administration of the program (including staff, training and material development, production and distribution) costs over $97,000 per year. Given the advantages of access to government services and the value of having volunteers deliver the program, it is unlikely the same service could be offered privately at a similar or reduced rate.

Appendix 1

Focus Groups

Focus groups were conducted with 71 individuals. In addition to groups in Edmonton we traveled to Grande Prairie, St. Paul, Medicine Hat, Calgary, and Red Deer. We met with two groups of instructors, four groups of senior staff and eight groups of board members. Three board members who had not participated in the workshop came out to describe how they were integrated into the board process after the workshop. Two people telephoned to give their input.

Instructors:

We met with 17 instructors in Edmonton and Calgary. A majority of the instructors indicated they had found out about the Board Development Program through newspaper advertisements. Others had heard about the program through friends, colleagues, or had been contacted directly by the Board Development Program.

The instructors said they were well informed of the program's expectations before they signed up. Most instructors had attended an orientation session and were given an orientation package which outlined the time commitments for training, workshop preparation, and workshop delivery. A current Board Development Program instructor told about her experiences with the program, and answered questions. After the orientation candidates were invited to apply.

Candidates who passed the screening process were interviewed by program staff. The personal interview was helpful in clarifying program expectations, they were long and detailed, and one instructor said he felt as though he was being hired for a paying position because the program had such high standards for their volunteers. Accepted candidates were required to sign a letter of agreement to conditions/expectations.

The screening process at the Board Development Program is quite stringent. When advertising for volunteer positions the program staff will receive 200 or more calls. (*Each recruitment for BDP II so far has resulted in 350 information packages being mailed to prospective candidates.*) Out of this group they will have 110 to 150 applications, and will interview 40 to 45 candidates. Generally 20 people are accepted for training. Normally the staff advertise for volunteers every 18 months, although since Board Development Program II started the program has advertised every six months. Because the process of screening is so stringent the volunteers say they feel like they are chosen. One volunteer said, "It feels like you are special, privileged to be volunteering with them."

Training:

The instructors were satisfied with the training they received. They commented that the training combined a good mixture of content and process. It was well presented by the facilitators, professional, well organized, and drew on the experience of staff, consultants, and former instructors. Participants particularly valued having former instructors share experiences with them because it prepared them to expect the unexpected once they went into the field.

The training was enjoyable and was a great team builder. Because everyone had gone through standard training they found it easier to work together in teams afterward. Even when instructors had not met each other except through telephone conversations, they could coordinate effective, professional workshops.

Some instructors felt overloaded with information at the beginning of the training session. The binders are large and contain a lot of material, and many of the instructors wondered what they had gotten themselves into. As the weekend progressed they realized the information being presented was not as important as how it was being presented, and they started to relax. The instructors suggested they would not feel as panicked at the training session if the facilitators gave them some kind of action plan outlining what will be expected of them for the weekend, and reassure them they are not required to remember everything by the end of the training. "That's what the binders are for."

The instructors liked completing the training over several weeks. Often the sessions seemed overwhelming, so it was good to concentrate on a portion of the work, leave, think about what they had learned, and return for further training. To deal with "information overload" during the training session some instructors prefer to be given information a little at a time, and would also like each component evaluated to help them monitor how they are doing.

The group was supportive of peer teaching as part of the training. They said it gave an opportunity for practice and feedback, and said it was a good confidence builder.

Instructors who had facilitated their first workshop within 3 months of training found it easier than those who had waited longer. Where possible the program tries to match new instructors with experienced instructors. Instructors who had been paired with experienced people said it was helpful, while those who had not said the workshops went well regardless because they were prepared for it in the training.

The instructors commented that the Board Development Program has a professional approach to volunteer development and in-service training. Workshops, seminars, and conferences are offered twice per year. The sessions include board issues, or general training techniques. The sessions focus on areas of concern identified by the instructors.

Curriculum:

Some instructors complained the binders are awkward and could be organized differently to reflect how material should be presented at the workshop, while others like being able to organize the binder the way that best suits them. Although there was some disagreement on how the curriculum should be arranged the focus group suggested the Board Development Program could bring together instructors to work on the structure of the binders.

One instructor said the materials are like a reading list. "You have to pick and choose, and sometimes you really have to dig to find what you need." It was suggested that an index would go a long way in solving this problem.

Also, the instructors said they would like to have background information on the materials. Details such as where the materials came from, who had developed them, and whether they had been tested would be useful. The instructors have been asked these questions during the workshops and have difficulty responding. (*BDP staff note this is in the curriculum.*)

Some instructors identified that they are not comfortable with the legal component of the workshop. The instructors said "public trust" is an area which needs more clarification, because while other curriculum areas describe what your board should be doing, the component of "public trust" prescribes what should be done. Instructors who do not have legal expertise find this topic "scary" and have indicated they would like to have more resource materials on the topic. One participant said he would like access to a handout outlining the nine points of public trust.

Instructors made suggestions for curriculum development. They said the components on conflict resolution, strategic planning, advocacy, and public trust could be clearer, and more vision exercises are needed. Topics such as mergers, regionalization, amalgamation, and funding may have to be explored in the near future. There is also a need for materials that go beyond the foundation workshop when the instructors are working with more well developed boards.

The instructors would like to have a reading list to help them prepare for difficult topics such as public trust or fund raising. They also suggested the Board Development Program bring together groups of instructors to review the curriculum or send out a detailed curriculum evaluation questionnaire. Some of the instructors have expertise in the area of curriculum development and they would be a good resource.

Although the instructors have made suggestions for improving the curriculum, they are fairly satisfied with it. Most say it gives them flexibility with content and scheduling, although some say the terminology is not as precise as it could be and because theory is always open to question they wonder how far you could depart from it without doing damage.

With experienced, well developed boards the instructors have been able to adapt workshops, although, ability to do this partially depends on the

instructor's skills. Because the curriculum does not enable them to take boards beyond the foundation stage, the instructors suggested the program may have to look at developing materials to take boards to a "second step", especially when working with boards who are further along or with those who are attending a second workshop.

Support:

When asked whether the instructors felt supported by the Board Development Program staff the response was unanimous.

The instructors said the staff are incredibly supportive, positive, accessible and efficient. They are amazed at how well informed each staff at the Board Development Program was of the other's position. In both focus groups the instructors said they could ask any of the staff a question and would receive the same answer. Messages are answered promptly, and their communication skills are outstanding.

The instructors said the workshops are well coordinated and it is evident the staff make contact with the board or senior staff before the workshop because the information given to them is "bang on". Several instructors said they are sent information well in advance, and are notified of the workshop in time to prepare for it, and to coordinate their personal lives.

The staff are eager to accommodate to the volunteers. One group said it is more difficult to pick up resource materials now since the program has moved downtown, but the staff make it as easy as possible, even meeting them on the street to give them "the box" of resource materials. They are sensitive to the needs of the instructors matching, where possible, experience with inexperience, and coordinating instructing teams with complimentary personalities. The staff are understanding when an instructor is unable to do a workshop, and they don't pressure or "make them feel bad". They follow-up after each workshop to see how it went and if anything needs to be done.

Team Teaching:

When asked how they felt about team teaching the instructors were very positive. Many had thought they would prefer to work with the same person all the time when they joined up, but have since changed their mind. The instructors said board members comment they appreciate the difference in style and approach. It is easier to facilitate groups in teams, because one can play off the other, and it gives you a break to collect your thoughts for the next section.

One group said working with different people all the time is one of the benefits of volunteering with the Board Development Program. They said it helps them develop skills because they learn from each other, and gain from working with people with different backgrounds. The instructors say they have built strong networks within the program, and have skills that are being used outside of the program.

Future Outlook:

When asked what they would like to see the Board Development Program doing in the future the instructors had several suggestions. They said follow-up should be a stronger component of the program. Although the Board Development Program staff already do telephone follow-up, boards are asking instructors for a more formal, structured follow-up. The foundation workshop covers a lot of material and some boards have difficulty digesting it and then putting it into practice. The instructors would like to go back to the boards within six months and do a short follow-up workshop. This second workshop would help boards put theory into practice. Other boards may need a second workshop to decide where to go next once they have completed the action plan.

With respect to follow-up workshops the instructors said it would be best if the same instructors could return to the group, but it was not necessary. Boards usually leave the workshop with an action plan, and new instructors coming into the group would be able to pick up where the last session had left off.

On the topic of follow-up the instructors also thought it would be helpful to bring together boards of like organizations who are at a similar developmental stage. They suggested the groups could provide "peer support" and could learn from each other. Some groups already do this in the open workshop, but not formally.

The instructors feel there is a need for Board Development II to expand to non-profit groups in Edmonton and Calgary because it tends to be more flexible than other board development training. Also in this time of fiscal restraint they suggest other groups may need the services of the program. One example would be hospital boards funded by Alberta Health.

In the future some instructors would like to see multi-media computer assisted learning used for board training. These materials could be used in lieu of workshops for areas difficult to reach and might even be sold outside of the province. The instructors suggested most public libraries would have the technology to make use of this form of training.

Where possible the instructors would like to be given follow-up feedback on how much of the action plan had been accomplished by the group. Most instructors reported they had not heard from the groups after the workshop. One instructor mentioned she did get feedback once, and it was rewarding to hear how the group had progressed.

> ** The follow-up questionnaires and telephone calls are summarized for the instructors by BDP staff.*

The instructors say they have developed audio-visual materials such as charts and overheads on computer discs and would be willing to share them with the program. They suggest the staff should continue to encourage the instructors to share materials and ideas.

The needs assessments completed before the workshop should ask whether there will be individuals with "special needs" at the workshop to give the

instructors time to adjust the activities to suit their needs. One instructor gave an example of working around overhead materials and changing activities at the last minute because a participant with a visual impairment showed up unexpectedly.

Although the instructors discussed expanding the program in the future they said it is important for the Board Development Program to maintain its parameters. The instructors said the program is a great model for other government programs because it is so cost effective, and it helps equip boards to manage the funding they are given. One participant said, "the Muttart Foundation would find it difficult to make better use of their money because the Foundation supports and touches so many organizations through the program."

Senior Staff:

We met with senior staff of agencies that had completed BDP workshops in Grande Prairie, Edmonton, Calgary, and Medicine Hat. When asked what they hoped to gain from a Board Development workshop some senior staff replied they hoped their board would function better as a whole, the board would be empowered to make decisions, and they would not be just a "rubber stamp" board. Other staff hoped as a result of the workshop their boards would focus on policy and leave "hands on" work to the staff. Senior staff hoped to improve staff/board relations and define their roles and responsibilities, recruit board members committed to stay and contribute to the board, develop a mission statement, define goals and objectives, and make more efficient use of board meetings. They wanted to work on committee structures, policy development, strategic planning, and team building.

On the whole, the workshop seemed to have met the expectations of senior staff. As a result of the workshop, most boards have developed job descriptions, bylaws, policy manuals, and mandates. Many staff say they have a better understanding of their role and feel their board members are better informed of their roles. Senior staff reported board meetings are much shorter. A detailed agenda and information package is sent out for review before the board meetings, committees are working on tasks and reporting to the board, and the boards are recruiting members to suit the tasks. Several groups have reported a dramatic change in the length of their meetings. One group reports it has decreased meetings from 5 to 2 hours.

As they had hoped, senior staff saw a change in the boards' commitment to work following the workshop. For some the change "fizzled out" while for others it has been lasting. One senior staff reported prior to the workshop 20% of the membership was doing all the work but after the workshop tasks were distributed more evenly.

Some groups report they did not have success after the workshop. Committees were not set up and the basics such as policy development, job descriptions, and bylaws have not been developed. Several groups report their board members' initial motivation and enthusiasm only lasted for the first few months. One group suggested the action plan should be worked

on immediately after the workshop, because this is the time boards have the most momentum and enthusiasm. She said their board members would not have accomplished their goals if they had not made all the suggested changes within six months.

Organizations:

The organizations seem to have benefited from the workshop as well. Some senior staff report their organizations are more professional and businesslike. Staff are given more responsibility, and yet the organizations have changed from being staff driven to being board driven. Groups have started holding yearly retreats for board and staff, and have re-examined the purpose of their organizations.

Some senior staff report their boards are more effective decision makers. Where the Executive Director would previously make decisions their roles have changed so they now give information to the board, and the board makes the decisions. Because policy and bylaws are written down the senior staff feel a staff change would not be as harmful to the organization.

Some staff feel their organization will be impacted in the next year. Their boards will play a greater role in program development, will commit policy and mission to paper, and because process will be out of the way the boards will be able to take time to look at the needs of the consumers.

Several organizations report the workshop has helped them re-evaluate their purpose. One senior staff member commented, "The workshop facilitators stressed that we are here to provide a service not to perpetuate a bureaucracy." As a result, organizations are looking at new ways to provide services. Several senior staff feel they are legally better off since the workshop, because they have policies to back up their decision making, and their boards are more aware they are accountable to the public. Many senior staff said the certificate awarded to the board after the workshop gives the organization more credibility when they are seeking funding. This has a direct impact on the organization. A couple of groups reported they received the certificate as much as a year after the workshop, and requested that the certificates be sent sooner.

Other senior staff saw a short term change in the boards' functioning but because there was no way to make the board accountable there was no push to make the changes outlined in the action plan. They did not see this lack of results as a problem with the Board Development Program but did say it would help if the program held boards accountable to the action plan developed in the workshop by implementing a follow-up program to sustain the momentum for change.

They said follow-up could be done in a number of ways. Boards would like to have follow-up workshops anywhere from six months to a year after the first workshop. Most staff would like the follow-up workshop to be shorter than the first. Some staff would like to see volunteers or consultants experienced in board development attending the first few board meetings to provide continuity and to evaluate the boards' progress. Other staff would like to have a consultant attend board meetings 3 to 4 months after the

workshop. The volunteers could be recruited through the Board Development Program, or referred by them from another board in the area. The Board Development Program would likely have contact with experienced board members through the workshops. One group suggested the Board Development Program could facilitate a "board exchange" having experienced members from like boards attending board meetings and exchanging ideas.

Senior staff say the newsletters could help keep the board on track but they have not because the board members change frequently, and newsletters sent to past members are not being distributed. To make full use of newsletters the staff suggest the Board Development Program send them to a senior staff member and encourage the staff to photocopy and distribute them to the board.

Future Outlook:

In addition to increased follow-up the staff would like the Board Development Program to offer generic open workshops more often. They see value in bringing together large groups to discuss a topic. They say the program could facilitate individual board development by putting board members together in smaller groups to focus on agency needs within the larger workshop setting. Activities could be completed in "closed board groups". The focus group participants would like to see a minimum of one board member and one senior staff attending these training sessions. They suggest sending two individuals will increase the likelihood information will be passed to the other board members.

They would like the more generic workshops/lecture series to be used to give new members the basics, and to touch on special topics such as funding, fundraising, liability, insurance, and the use of volunteers. The staff suggest topics could be determined by sending a questionnaire to the mailing list periodically.

While some senior staff said it would be valuable to have more frequent workshops focusing on special topics, all agreed the tailored workshop was needed and was something they would want again in the future. Most senior staff said they would need another workshop every three or four years.

The senior staff outside of Edmonton and Calgary said they would like to have board development resource people in their communities, because a pool of trainers in the community would benefit the local area. It is expensive to become a trainer, but if the program had trainers who only worked within the region they would save money, and could still fly someone in from Edmonton or Calgary to work with local trainers. The local experience would filter into the community, follow-up workshops would be easier to arrange, yearly open orientation workshops could be offered, and they would be able to facilitate tailoring workshops to the communities' needs.

Some senior staff said it was difficult to get 90% to 100% of board members to commit to attend the workshop when it was spread out over one

among the membership. People would leave the meeting and have "parking lot" meetings. It was not unusual for them to call each other outside of the meeting to lobby against issues. They would even write damaging letters and send them to a board member. On the needs assessment board members described their concerns, and the instructors dealt with them in the workshop. The board reports the improvements have been remarkable. They are now working as a team, and the old problems with gossip are a thing of the past.

Another board was concerned about the legal position the board was in. They said they were on the verge of a legal, financial crisis. They described their concerns on the needs assessment and the instructors worked it into the board development session. Since the workshop the board has written a policy manual, they do detailed financial record keeping, and they publish financial statements.

Generally when someone had not filled out the needs assessment they said it was because it was too difficult to fill out. Some participants suggested the needs assessment should be shorter and easier to fill out, while others said it was necessary for the assessments to be detailed.

Organizations:

The workshops have had a direct impact on the organizations. Several groups said they felt their organizations had changed from being amateur to being more professional. Some have established permanent mailing addresses and telephone numbers, and one board is in the process of finding a building for the organization. Many boards have increased their staff. One board member said before the workshop the organization did not have any staff, but as a result of planning at the workshop they decided to hire. Over time they have increased to 30 staff. A couple of board members from a teen board said the workshop has impacted their services dramatically. They have hired staff and no longer have to find parent volunteers to supervise the evening programs. The centre is open now during more appropriate hours, weekends and evenings, and therefore is more accessible to young people.

In some cases the staff's confidence in a board's decision making has been boosted. One board member said their staff recently took a 5% cut in wages. She said the staff could agree to the cut because they trusted the board. Since the workshop the board has been working effectively and the staff know that what they are doing is in the best interest of the organization.

Another board member said they had staff representatives at the workshop. The workshop created an atmosphere of understanding between the board and staff. After the workshop the coordinator was happier and more content in her job, and other staff appear to be happier because they know what exactly they are supposed to be doing. They have policies, their roles are defined, and they are clear on the organization's mission.

In some instances board members, or even senior staff have resigned since the workshop. Most of these resignations have been reported as a positive

change by the board members. In a couple of cases new procedures, or a shift in responsibilities, created such a change the individuals could no longer work within the structure. One board reported their executive director had complete control over the organization before the workshop, even to the point of signing her own cheque, and she could not cope with the loss of control after the workshop, so she resigned. For other boards the loss of an executive director or board member has been unfortunate but the board has adapted by recruiting individuals who can work within the new structure.

Board Training:

To ascertain whether the results of the workshop would be lasting we asked board members how they planned to sustain the changes, how they integrated board members who had not attended the workshop, and how they planned to orient new members.

The board members said some of the results of the workshop will be lasting. The paper work alone sets a structure for incoming board members. Policies, more well defined roles, job descriptions, a clear mandate, and long-term goals and objectives will all help to sustain the changes. Many boards have developed orientation manuals since the workshop and they have incorporated the Board Development Program's training handouts into their board education materials. Several groups had written reports after the workshops, sent out newsletters, and briefed absent members on the progress.

Some participants said they would have difficulty passing on the information. Many are doing succession planning but most are finding it difficult to have retiring board members commit to training new board members. They stated they did not feel qualified to train new members, and feel the information will become watered down as it is passed from person to person, year to year. The board members also said they would not be able to properly deal with new issues. One board member commented he would have to study and accumulate experience to become as knowledgeable as an instructor.

Board members are saying they need an independent, objective trainer so the exercise does not become a personal struggle. Many of the boards we met with had philosophies about what a board should be doing. In cases where members have conflicting ideas or a power struggle between members they needed an outside objective source to come in and say, "Here are the basics. How do they fit into the structure of your board?" This is especially true in the area of liability. Many board representatives said they had members who were resistant to change, and often their resistance was around critical issues. One board president said she told the members often that they were legally responsible for the money the board was working with, and by missing meetings they would not be relieved of this responsibility. It was not until the Board Development Program instructors, the "respected experts", talked to the board members about their responsibilities that they started to take them seriously. The board members are now attending meetings regularly and a board crisis has been averted.

Anecdotes similar to this were not uncommon. Once they had experienced their first Board Development workshop the members say they would be committed to further training either with the Board Development Program, or with independent consultants. A few boards felt they could pay for board training, and have already contracted the services of other sources in the community. Those who are able to pay would also be willing to pay for Board Development Program services. Most boards did not have any board training funds. A couple of boards said they are working with yearly budgets of less than $500. These boards are completely volunteer driven, and serving on the board as a volunteer has cost some of the members a great deal of money, from board expenses to travel, parking, and child care. Many of the members would not be able to afford board training.

Future Outlook:

We asked the boards whether they would be seeking other services from the Board Development Program, and if so, what other services they would like to see offered. All the boards we met with said they would like to do another workshop with the Board Development Program, although how they would use the service varies. Some said they would need a workshop every 3-4 years while others thought they would need one every year. Generally the more well established boards were needing less frequent workshops while newer boards were looking for more support.

Some groups would like to have follow-up workshops to motivate them and help them re-evaluate their mission. One board member said, "The direction for today will change tomorrow and it is hard to make that change internally. We will need someone outside of the organization to do this. We have used people locally in the past but the end result was not as good as the work we did with the Board Development Program. We will need another workshop."

Others would like the follow-up program to evaluate the success of the board in a form of board audit. They would like to be held accountable to make the changes outlined in the action plan. They are requesting more long term contact with the program, so the boards' progress since the workshop would be monitored for up to 5 years.

Some boards are using the telephone follow-up and referral services offered by the Board Development Program. They call for information on topics specific to their boards' needs, and have called for referral to other services in the community. They would like to see the referral service at the Board Development Program continued, and expanded to facilitate networking between boards. It was suggested networking could be facilitated by bringing groups together at open workshops on a common theme, or at joint closed workshops. On the whole, the board members would like to see the program expanded and more widely publicized.

Some board members commented concrete examples of failed and successful boards would make the workshop seem less abstract. They also said examples of functioning mission statements and mandates would help boards compose their own.

One innovative idea was the Board Development Program could offer a series of open workshops on general topics with new members attending orientation/foundation sessions, while other members attend advanced sessions on special topics. Several open workshops could be offered concurrently, and board members could come together later in the day, or on a separate occasion to work on individual board issues. The special topics board members would like to see covered include: fund raising, program promotion, use of volunteers, funding cutbacks, marketing, vision, strategic planning, and budgeting.

Cost:

The board members had some ideas about cutting cost within the Board Development Program. They feel two facilitators could handle bigger groups, and similar groups could join for workshops. The Board Development Program could expand the open workshop so larger groups could focus on special topics, and they could train more locally based instructors. The board members suggested the program could do a budget review of organizations interested in the program to see how much they could be reasonably asked to pay, and then charge a fee to help cover the costs.

Many of the volunteers have never had previous board experience and they have never been trained to serve as board members. For most this is the only training they will receive, and they report it has regenerated them as volunteers. They are excited about the work they are doing, and feel they are less likely to fall into the rut of doing things the way they have always been done.

The board members strongly support continuing the Board Development Program. They say it has raised the efficiency of the organizations and the benefits outweigh any costs they incur. Many said the program is invaluable, it helped them sidestep problems, save time, and taught them to help themselves. One board member commented, "There would be a void in the community if our non-profit groups ended. Because the boards are run by volunteers, and in some cases have no paid staff, it would be very easy to lose groups. These groups are giving to the community. Our board worked with a $1,000,000 non-profit budget last summer. That's a lot of money for a board that usually budgets less than $500 dollars per year, and we need support. For that year we brought an incredible amount of tax revenue into the province. If we hadn't done the Board Development Program workshop we would never have taken on such a responsibility. Because of the workshop we knew where we stood legally, and were encouraged to 'reach for the sky'."

Conclusion:

There were common themes within all three groups. Participants were very positive about the program. It is making a contribution to organizations by helping boards develop structures, goals, a direction, and at the very least facilitating teamwork.

Appendix 2

Suggestions from questionnaires, focus groups and interviews
The following comments are compiled from the responses of all those who participated in the evaluation process. As these comments are not generally in response to direct questions, It is difficult to give any weighting. Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of individuals who made the same or similar suggestion.

Instructors: (Total n = 52)

Training:

- should be broken down into more manageable parts, spread out over more than two weekends with homework in between (6)

- presentation of materials could be improved to better illustrate the relationships between the modules, and to provide a "path" (1)

- more emphasis on assessing board needs and planning accordingly (1)

- make the training more plain language (1)

- more ongoing training and opportunities to get together with other instructors to share ideas (9)

- it would help to be able to deliver a workshop right away after the training is completed (2)

- the manuals could be arranged to be more supportive of the material to be presented (6)

- the second weekend could be "residential" as well to encourage trainers to get to know each other better (1)

- provide an opportunity for new instructors to sit in on a workshop with an instructor judged by their peers to be particularly inspiring prior to presenting themselves (1)

- be more specific with examples (1)

- material should be modularized into teaching packages (3)

- more emphasis on facilitation and presentation skills (1)

- have a trial run at putting together a workshop from a needs assessment (1)

Curriculum:

- simplify the language on the needs assessment and make sure boards understand it (2)

- put more focus on the practical components of board meetings and program evaluation (2)

- provide more information or specific modules on fundraising, crisis management, strategic planning, etc. (9)

- material is too dry and rigid (1)

- would be helpful to have a list of other resources to refer people to for specific needs such as fundraising (2)

- add a follow-up module to the core workshop to see where things are going with the action plan (8)

- demonstrate more awareness that at times the curriculum must be simplified or adapted to meet the needs and level of the group (2)

- curriculum should be up-dated (1)

- revise program to a staged/phased model - groups that are just starting out; groups that have something in place; groups that are developed; etc. (1)

Other:

- offer BDP II in Calgary and Edmonton (2)

- it would help if materials were provided on disc instead of so much paper (1)

- let instructors do more workshops (2)

- use us once a month so we don't have to refresh each time (1)

- create an alumni team of those with proven success to do follow-up or advanced workshops (2)

- BDP II should be permanently funded (1)

- hold open forum sessions for the public (1)

- expand the program to include municipal boards, school boards, health boards, etc.

- take a leadership role in producing/coordinating resources for not-for-profit boards (1)

- make board development training mandatory for any program receiving provincial funding (1)

- provide BDP business cards in the workshop box (1)

- provide return labels for the material to be sent back to the office (1)

- include relaxation activities in the structure of the curriculum to break up the day and help participants focus on the material i.e. Brain Gym exercises (1)

Workshop Participants: (Total N = 186)

- have more discussion on different board models (many times)

- have someone come and watch the board in action at a meeting prior to the workshop (2)

- provide handouts in advance so people can be prepared for discussion (1)

- provide a summary of the follow-up evaluation to the board to assist in the action plan (1)

- make sure trainers can recognize when the group has gotten bored or needs to deal with an issue at greater length (1)

- need information on recruitment in today's society where people's time is at a premium (4)

- more information on the problems and solutions other boards have experienced (3)

- there is not enough time to do the theoretical and all the practical as well (1)

- make the program available to more groups, e.g. Parent Advisory Council at school (3)

- more emphasis on board/staff relations (many times)

- information on fundraising (many times)

Parting Comments:

Each questionnaire respondent was given an opportunity to provide additional comments. They are offered verbatim here.

Instructors:

I think this is an invaluable program that will become even more necessary in the next few years as financial resources become harder to find and more service delivery will be done by the not-for-profit sector.

I am 3/4 of the way through my commitment to the program at least in terms of time. I would actually like to have the option of staying on at least one more year before I get retired from the program.

I enjoy my association with BDP 2 immensely. I meet people in places that I might never otherwise have a chance. I enjoy seeing a group gather themselves up and have a plan of action to go forward. I feel I am part of a process that allows people to have more say in their own spheres. I love to see things work more happily and efficiently.

The policy of the BDP to cycle people through and limit your involvement after 2 years is very good. New blood is always coming up. I know of other programs (Skills, Boardwalk) who continue to use the same old tired people – a big mistake.

It's a wonderful program. I am totally committed because I feel appreciated by the staff people. I get the support I need. They aren't chintzy/cheap with their volunteer appreciation – I cannot tell you how much this means to me. I have worked as a volunteer on another program, similar to BDP and received none of these things. Needless to say, I had no commitment, no satisfaction, no energy for the program.

I love the program. I believe in it strongly. I believe that many boards need it desperately. Improve boards and you help so much the non-profit sector. We need it more than ever. Thanks for the chance to "sing praises" to the program. I think _very_ highly of it!

It has got to be the best program devised by the government. It emphasizes role-modeling of volunteers, training, recruitment, rewards, everything.

The feedback from groups after they have had the training has been excellent. The trainings have made a significant difference in their ability to work as an effective board.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback. Toni, Wendy, Janet and Sean are committed to the program. Their dedication and professionalism are demonstrated every time I deal with them.

I think this program is a fabulous vehicle to help out boards in their development and processing of their needs. The gratitude we as volunteer

instructors receive from participants make it all worthwhile. I would be interested if possible of getting an evaluation report upon completion.
I have found this volunteer commitment to be very intense and very time consuming. However, it has been rewarding and challenging. The 2 year, 8 workshop commitment is a good cap – long enough to get into it and not too long. I hope the program is asked to continue.

Living so far from Edmonton we don't always have as much opportunity for contact with the other instructors. Maybe as we have more instructors in the north we could have the odd regional get together to exchange ideas.

BDP has been a very positive learning experience for me. I have met some wonderful people, learned more about Alberta, it's great volunteers and variety of services, learned about some excellent resources, and lots about me. It's been a positive growing and sharing experience.

Sorry I'm doing this very quickly but I think the board development program is an "untapped natural resource". I see it as the way to deliver govt. services in the future – excellent!

I have loved meeting the individuals who are trainers, those who train, and the BDP support staff. I regret that I, due to unexpected activities at work, have not had the time to make myself a better trainer.

I think this is an excellent program and I am proud and grateful to be a part of it. I commend the Muttart Foundation for its leadership and initiative in working with the government to improve our society through NFP community. Thanks for allowing me to be involved.

I would like to know that the Premier Mr. Klein and his Ministers are fully supportive of the BD program now and will continue to be in the future.

We enjoy being a part of this program and believe that Toni, Wendy, Janet, Sean and the other staff we don't always see are doing an exceptionally fine job. We have learned from this involvement and we have met many wonderful people. Kudos galore!

Being involved with the BDP has been one of the most rewarding adventures I have taken. At the end of a workshop it is nice to know that you have actually achieved your mission and made a difference for organizations. The training is beyond reproach. Many other organizations can take direction from BDP re. training.

BDP has provided a valuable support to many people in Alberta in raising the level of knowledge, interest and participation in both cultural/library and support services communities.

Volunteers all want to make a difference in their organization. This program helps them understand their roles and how they can contribute more "effectively". The staff support provided for this program is "crucial". The ongoing support through needs assessment, follow up, and feedback make it a "quality" program.

Closed Workshop Participants:

I only wish we'd done this type of workshop sooner.

I have highly recommended the Board Development Program to several other members of the college who belong to other Boards!

I feel that the BD workshop I took was worthwhile and the instruction was good. However, due to a lack of commitment on the part of the Board I was on, the workshop left few residual effects for our Board.

I'm not terribly interested in policies and procedures. I guess I make a better committee member than a board member. Paperwork is not something I enjoy.

I feel the workshop contained many valuable tools. However, I discovered some people were more interested in disagreeing with new ideas than listening to them.

The workshop was so long ago and so non specific that it has left little lasting impression beyond our mission statement.

The Social Planning Manual on Boards was very useful.

I felt the workshop was very beneficial for myself and the other board members who attended.

I still have reservations about my being a board member. I'm not passionate enough about the library.

In general I support the B.D. we have gone through – initially skeptical – now a convert.

I realize I have not completed this questionnaire as fully as might wish. However, including the surveys completed before, during and after the workshop, this is the 4th or 5th one that has been requested – far too many for a single workshop. Our entire Board found the workshop excellent and we have told you that repeatedly.

I think the Board Development Program is an excellent program but I feel that a fee should be charged. I'm sure our board would have taken it more seriously if we had to pay for it.

This program should be promoted to all volunteer boards.

The Board Development program is an invaluable public resource – one of the badly needed services the government funds.

Although I am very interested in the video and computer training possibilities – they would not be of use unless there was an administered system of training in place, including feed back and specific direction and interaction for the board's purpose.

I was motivated and challenged by the workshop, and believe my involvement with AGEHR will be better because of it.

The workshop was good in formalizing board responsibilities and to keep on specific goals.

Training materials of the generic type are excellent.

We have had a lot of work to do since last December! A 'refresher' course a year from now would prove to be quite useful!

Thanks to Diane and Jayne for two. Very beneficial for all who attended and also brought a lot more interest in what we have managed to put to use. Good as is. Keep the human element – can't be replaced by a video.

In case of our workshop, ability of instructors to adapt to what was happening/needed was what made the whole thing work. Perhaps some topics could be covered without that interaction.

My experience with the program has been very positive. I've attended two with the AMA which were tailored to the current needs of the board/assoc. I had attended one years ago which was more generic and less useful.

A good program – keep it if at all possible.

There are 4 of us who are seniors and will go off board next year. Then all will be new and another workshop could then be held.

Day and a half was a waste – we need help but this was not efficient or useful. We now have job descriptions which we had before.

It would be a detriment to small communities in particular if this type of workshop was not available to help volunteer organizations do the best they can with their resources.

What topics to look at might be to priorize each boards' development needs as we have done in order to deliver board training in a more useful way.

The workshops motivated our board to get with it and do. For a small library I'm quite proud of how much we've achieved over the last 6 years. It all started with the workshop.

Video instruction would help reduce problems of distance – especially on short topics. Computer based training could be useful depending on topics – could be it would be more useful to staff.

Workshops provide up to date contact about Board Management. Need them to keep current and functioning properly.

I'm not sure what you mean by computer based training. Self administered workbooks are better than nothing, but it is easier to have a real person answer or clarify questions.

<u>This evaluation form is far too long!</u>   I think the Board development training program is good and volunteers should be commended for their work and dedication.

Sorry I took so long returning this. I know how important feedback is.
The Family Resource Centre closed in April of 1993. We started working towards this in the fall of 1992. With the board training in June, 1992, the summer and winding down, we were not able to put into effect what we learned. Personally I feel I learned a lot and it may be of help in the future.

I've found that these Board development/Library chairmen development workshops to be every useful. I would hate to see these discontinue because I feel this type of information/instruction is in gov't's best interests to serve communities etc.

I only attended a few classes. With only attending a portion of the program and the passage of time, I'm sorry my comments are not as helpful or concise as they should be.

Open Workshop Participants:

The workshop was useful to me. I learned lots.

In all honesty I was disappointed with the workshop as our expectations were not fulfilled.

It's always unfortunate when programs such as the Board Development Program is offered that more candidates cannot take the opportunity to attend. To me personally it was a Godsend and I really enjoyed it, even if it seemed at the time I was not absorbing the information.

It is very difficult to keep going when the people who benefit from the organization could care less.

I didn't expect to learn a lot of new things from this workshop but to get a few pointers. The information was so relevant to one board I'm on that light bulbs went on throughout the session. Very positive experience.

Overall the program was a useful aid in helping us establish ourselves as a registered non-profit agency. I'm not sure I could have achieved this status without the program.

I believe that the most successful method is a hands on approach.

I think the Board Development Program is a most useful effort. The big problem is to get people convinced enough to "give up" the time to do it.

BOARD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

WORKSHOP INSTRUCTOR TRAINEE APPLICATION

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: STREET _____

          CITY _____ POSTAL CODE _____

PHONE: RES. _____ BUS. _____

1. Current Non-Profit Board Member Experience:

Name of Organization(s)	Position(s)	Date(s) of Term	Comments

2. Previous Non-Profit Board Member Experience:

Name of Organization(s)	Position(s)	Date(s) of Involvement	Comments

3. Group Training/Teaching Experience:

Name of Organization(s)	Position(s)	Date(s)	Comments

4. Other Volunteer Experience:

    _____
    _____
    _____

5. Educational Background (include any relevant courses, workshops, and seminars):

    _____
    _____
    _____

6. Work Experience - Current Occupation:

    _____

    Current Employer: _____

7. Previous Employment:

    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____

8. Additional Information:

    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____

NOTE: PLEASE ATTACH A RESUME IF AVAILABLE

DATE: _____   SIGNED: _____

Please Forward To: Program Consultants
                        Board Development Program
                        16214 - 114 Avenue
                        Edmonton, Alberta
                        T5M 2Z5

                        Phone: 427-2556
                        (Callers outside of Edmonton area
                         can use local RITE Line)

                        Closing Date For Applications is
                        March 20, 1992

WORKSHOP ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES

YOUR ORGANIZATION AGREES TO:	ALBERTA COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGREES TO:
• arrange for a suitable workshop location and facility	• coordinate the workshop
• collect and submit requested background information on your organization for the instructors	• provide trained Instructors
• guarantee the attendance of a minimum of 75% of the board members	• provide support materials for all participants
• provide AV equipment as required	• cover all costs related to Instructors' travel and accommodation (approximately $300.00 per workshop)
• complete and return Needs Assessment Questionnaire (will be forwarded if you book a workshop)	
• cover costs related to facility usage	
• provide refreshments (coffee, juice) during workshop breaks	
• cover costs related to Instructors' lunch	

BOARD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
OPEN WORKSHOP
REGISTRATION

Name of Participant: _____

Address, Phone: _____

Name of Organization: _____

Position in Organization: _____

No. of Board Members: _____ Total Membership of Organization: _____

No. of Paid Staff Positions: _____ Titles of Staff Positions: _____

Provincial Incorporation Date: _____ Year: _____

Under which Act?: _____

Federal Incorporation (Registered Charity) Date: _____

Year: _____

Who does your organization serve? _____

_____

Complete the following sentences to describe your board and organization:

a) The **strengths** of our Board are: _____

_____

b) The areas we **need to improve** on as a board are: _____

_____

c) The **purpose** of our organization is: _____

_____

d) The **issues** facing our organization are: _____

_____

e)   What would make this workshop useful to you? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please add any additional information you feel is relevant in the space below:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

                              THANK YOU.

BOARD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
WORKSHOP BACKGROUNDER

PLEASE COMPLETE (AND RETURN 3 COPIES)

Name of Organization:_____

Staff Contact Person:_____Position:_____

Organization Address:_____

Organization City:_____Organization Postal Code:_____

Organization Phone Number:_____

Board Contact Person:_____Position:_____

Board Address:_____

Board City:_____Board Postal Code:_____

Board Business Phone No.:_____Board Home Phone No.:_____

No. of Board Members:_____Total Membership of Organization:_____

No. of Paid Staff Positions:_____Titles of Staff Positions:_____

_____

Are you Unionized? Yes_____ No_____

Provincial Incorporation Date: ____Day ____Month ____Year

       Under Which Act?_____

Federal Incorporation (Registered Charity) Date: ____Day ____Month ____Year

What were your board's revenues and expenditures for the previous fiscal year?

Revenues:_____Expenditures:_____

What is the purpose of your organization?:_____

_____

Who do you serve?:_____

_____

Is your organization? (Check one)

Local ____   Provincial ____   National ____

Ongoing Program Description:_____

_____

_____

_____

Special Projects Description:_____

_____

_____

_____

Past Programs Description:_____

_____

_____

Future Programs Description:_____

_____

_____

_____

PLEASE ATTACH IF AVAILABLE (AND RETURN 3 COPIES) *	**CIRCLE:**
Constitution: Objectives/Application for Incorporation	Attached/Not Attached
By-laws:	Attached/Not Attached
List of Board Members and Positions:	Attached/Not Attached
Board Biographies/Length of Service:	Attached/Not Attached
List of Committees, Their Terms of Reference, the Committee Chairman and Number of Members on Each Committee:	Attached/Not Attached
Board Job Descriptions:	Attached/Not Attached
Staff Job Descriptions:	Attached/Not Attached
Policy Handbook:	Attached/Not Attached
Personnel Manual:	Attached/Not Attached
Board Orientation Manual:	Attached/Not Attached
Mission, Goals and Objectives for Current Year:	Attached/Not Attached
Current Year's Budget: (Revenue and Expenditures)	Attached/Not Attached
Organizational Structure Chart:	Attached/Not Attached
Minutes of Latest Annual General Meeting:	Attached/Not Attached
Latest Annual Report:	Attached/Not Attached
Latest Audited Financial Statement	Attached/Not Attached
Sample Copy of Monthly Financial Statement	Attached/Not Attached
Sample Copy of Board Meeting Agenda	Attached/Not Attached
Sample Copy of Three Consecutive Board Minutes:	Attached/Not Attached
Sample Copy of Executive Committee Minutes:	Attached/Not Attached

* The effectiveness of the workshop often depends upon the information received by instructors about your group. Please make every effort to supply the items, if they exist.

ORGANIZATION: _____

RETURN BY: _____

BOARD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Assessing Training Needs

For each of the following statements, select the response that best reflects the current situation of your board and/or organization.

Yes = This statement accurately reflects my board and/or organization
No = This statement does not describe my board and/or organization
Partial = This statement describes my board, but only somewhat
? = I'm not certain

	YES	NO	PART	?
1. Written statements for board members exist that outline duties, responsibilities, and expectations.				
2. Board members understand the relationship between the organization and its funders.				
3. Committees plan to identify who will do what and when.				
4. Everyone affected by decisions clearly understands what they are expected to do.				
5. Board members represent the interests of the organization's membership.				
6. Trusting and respectful relationships exist between board members and the organization.				
7. The organization has a policy manual.				

Written policies exist in the following areas:

	YES	NO	PART	?
8. Policy development.				
9. Programs and services.				
10. Finances.				
11. Personnel (paid and unpaid).				

	YES	NO	PART	?
12. Board members understand their own and each other's role.				
13. Board meetings deal primarily with determining policy, reviewing plans, reviewing finances, making board authorizations, and evaluating the organization's work.				
14. Board members understand the role of the senior staff (e.g. Executive Director, General Manager) as it relates to the board.				
15. Conflict is dealt with openly, respectfully, and effectively.				
16. Paid and unpaid staff are recognized for their organizational contributions.				
17. Written statements exist that outline the organization's beliefs, mission and long-range goals.				
18. The organization has an ongoing process to monitor pertinent, local, provincial, and federal policies and legislation.				
19. The board has a means (e.g. an executive committee) to handle matters that arise between meetings and to which certain decision-making responsibility is delegated.				
20. Staff and volunteers follow through on plans and commitments.				
21. Board members follow through on plans and commitments.				
22. Board members are aware of their own legal obligations.				
23. Board members ensure that the organization's legal requirements are met.				

Additional Information

1. Have you and your board participated in any other workshops prior to the Board Development Workshop?

<div style="text-align:center">Yes_____ No_____</div>

If yes, please list these workshops below.

2. Which of the following learning activities would you like to have in a workshop? (Select as many as apply)

a)   Lecture   _____
b)   Participative lecture   _____
c)   Small group discussion   _____
d)   Case studies   _____
e)   Role playing   _____
f)   Question-and-answer sessions   _____
g)   Other (please specify)   _____

_____

3. What would make this workshop useful to you?

4. Complete the following sentence to describe your board and organization.

a) The strengths of our board are:

b) The weaknesses of our board are:

c) The purpose of our organization is:-

d) The issues facing our organization are:

5. Please add any additional information you feel is relevant in the space below.

Thank you for your comments.

BOARD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION

Organization:

Date of Workshop:

Workshop Instructor(s):

Please circle the appropriate rating, and please give us as much detail as possible.

1.   I have been able to use the information presented in the workshop in my organization.

5	4	3	2	1
Totally	Very Much	Some	A Bit	Not At All

HOW? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2.   I think I will be able to use the information in the next year.

5	4	3	2	1
Totally	Very Much	Some	A Bit	Not At All

HOW? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

MORE QUESTIONS ON OTHER SIDE

3. Since the workshop, have you noticed any changes in the way your organization performs in the areas covered by the workshop?

    _____ Yes   _____ No

    If yes, please specify _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

4. What further information or assistance would be helpful to you or your board? What would help your board become more effective? (Please let us know where you want us to send any written materials.)

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

5. Other comments or suggestions: _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    Thank you. We appreciate your feedback.
    Please return this completed evaluation form by   to:

BOARD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
PARTICIPANT EVALUATION

1. **Organization:** _____

    Date and Location: _____

    Workshop Instructors: _____

2. Did you find the material presented to be appropriate to the needs of your organization? Please comment.

3. Was there enough time in the workshop setting to deal with the needs of your organization? Please comment.

4. Was the workshop format most suited to meeting the needs of your organization? Please comment.

5. Should the workshop have emphasized any particular topic? Please comment.

6. What other methods might be as effective in providing the information to your organization? Please comment.

7. Were the instructors efffective in their presentation? Please comment.

8. What did you feel was <u>most</u> valuable about the workshop?

9. What did you feel was <u>least</u> valuable about the workshop?

10. Please rate the overall success of the workshop
    1 Not at all successful
    2
    3
    4
    5 Very Successful

    Please comment.

Thank you for your comments.

BOARD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

<u>INSTRUCTORS' SUMMARY AND EVALUATION</u>

Please attach your agenda and attendance list.

Name of the Organization: _____

Volunteer Instructors: _____

Date(s): _____ Location of Workshop: _____

Total No. of Participants: _____ No. of Board Members: _____

No. of Staff: _____ No. of Others (please list): _____

_____

PLEASE IDENTIFY THE FOLLOWING:

- Pre-workshop contact(s) that took place.

- Based on the background materials, needs assessment and phone contacts:

    a) What was your assessment of the board's needs?

    b) How did you meet these needs?

- Please describe any NEW needs identified during the workshop. How did you meet these needs?

- Type of group dynamics that occurred during the workshop.

- Strengths/weaknesses of the board.

- Additional resource information requested by the board.

- What needs do you think this board might have for followup to the Foundations Workshop?

Board goals, objectives and new directions identified by the board during the workshop on the back of this sheet.

Board Development Workshop
Action Planning Sheet

ORGANIZATION:

DATE:

Goals	Who?	Start Date	Finish Date	Resources needed (board, volunteers, staff, time, budget, facility)!

eSpC

SOCIAL PLANNING

planning for change

BOARD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE

The Edmonton Social Planning Council has been contracted to complete an evaluation on the Board Development Program. Your impression of the program is very important to the evaluation and we encourage your input. All replies are confidential! Your responses will not be disclosed in any way which would identify you.

Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed postage paid envelope by November 19, 1993. If we have not heard from you by that date we will call you to see if we can be of any assistance in filling out the questionnaire. Thank you for your cooperation!

We would like to have some information about who is attending the workshops.

1. Sex:　　☐ Male (1)　　　☐ Female (2)

2. Age:　　☐ Under 20 (1)　　☐ 20 - 35 (2)
　　　　　☐ 35 - 50 (3)　　　☐ 50 - 65 (4)
　　　　　☐ Over 65 (5)

3. Have you taken more than one Board Development workshop? (If yes, please answer the questionnaire with respect to the most recent workshop you have taken).

　　　　　☐ Yes (1)　　　☐ No (2)

4. What town or city do you live in or closest to? _____

5. When did you complete the workshop? Date: _____

6. Which board were you representing? _____

7.　At the time you took the workshop were you the board chairperson?

☐　Yes (1)　　　　☐　No (2)

8.　How many people serve on your board?　_____

9.　How many board members participated in the workshop?　_____

10.　Are you still serving on the board that took the workshop?

☐　Yes (1)　　　　☐　No (2)

(If no) Why did you leave the board? _____

_____

11.　How long have you been (or were you) a member of that board?

☐　Less than a year (1)
☐　1-3 years (2)
☐　4-5 years (3)
☐　More than five years (4)

12.　How many years of board experience do you have? (Total years service on all boards.)

☐　Less than a year (1)
☐　1-3 years (2)
☐　4-5 years (3)
☐　More than five years (4)

13.　Does your organization serve *only* members of the following groups?

☐　Aboriginal (1)
☐　Multicultural (2)
☐　Other (3) (Please specify) _____

2

14. What other board development training have you done?_____

_____

_____

15. How did you find out about the Board Development Program? (Check as many as apply.)

☐ Referred by a former workshop participant.(1)

☐ Referred by a friend/colleague.(2)

☐ Referred by my organization/board.(3)

☐ Volunteer Centres of Edmonton or Calgary.(4)

☐ Alberta Library Trustees Association.(5)

☐ Contacted by the Board Development Program.(6)

☐ Provincial Association.(7)

☐ Government or Municipal Organization (eg. F.C.S.S.).(8)

☐ Other (Give details) _____

16. Each workshop participant was asked to complete a needs assessment questionnaire before the workshop.

(a) Did you complete it and send it back?

☐ Yes (1)   ☐ No (2)

(b) Did the workshop reflect that it had been adapted to your needs?

☐ Yes (1)   ☐ No (2)

Explain: _____

_____

17. What do you remember most about the workshop? _____

_____

_____

18. What did you *hope* that your board would gain from the workshop? (Pick your top three).

☐ Develop a mission statement.(1)

☐ Plan and develop policies.(2)

☐ Recruit and maintain board members.(3)

☐ Orient board members.(4)

☐ Develop a board manual.(5)

☐ Make board meetings more effective.(6)

☐ Manage finances.(7)

☐ Deal effectively with controversy and dissent.(8)

☐ Develop positive working relations between board and senior staff.(9)

☐ Outline roles, responsibilities, and functions for board members, volunteers, and staff.(10)

☐ Other (Please specify) _____

19. What did your board *actually* gain from the workshop? (Check all that apply).

☐ Develop a mission statement.(1)

☐ Plan and develop policies.(2)

☐ Recruit and maintain board members.(3)

☐ Orient board members.(4)

☐ Develop a board manual.(5)

☐ Make board meetings more effective.(6)

☐ Manage finances.(7)

☐ Deal effectively with controversy and dissent.(8)

☐ Develop positive working relations between board and senior staff.(9)

☐ Outline roles, responsibilities, and functions for board members, volunteers, and staff.(10)

☐ Other (Please specify) _____

_____

20. Since taking the workshop, would you say your board is better, worse, or about the same in the following areas:

		(1)	(2)	(3)
(a)	Clarified roles and responsibilities of board members.	Better	Worse	Same
(b)	Efficiency and productivity of the board.	Better	Worse	Same
(c)	Relations with other board members, staff and consumers.	Better	Worse	Same
(d)	Establishing policies in all areas.	Better	Worse	Same
(e)	Planning and goal setting.	Better	Worse	Same
(f)	Formalizing the organization's reason for existence.	Better	Worse	Same

21. Have you noticed any other changes in the functioning of your board?

☐ Yes (1)   ☐ No (2)

Explain: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

22. How did the workshop change the way you function as a board member? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

23. How has the *organization* your board represents been impacted by the Board Development workshop? Would you say that the *organization* is better, worse, or about the same in the following areas:

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(99)
(a)	Board/staff relations.	Better	Worse	Same	N/A
(b)	Staff understanding of their roles.	Better	Worse	Same	N/A
(c)	Division between board & staff responsibilities.	Better	Worse	Same	N/A
(d)	Relations with consumers.	Better	Worse	Same	N/A
(e)	Planning and goal setting.	Better	Worse	Same	N/A

24. Have you noticed any other changes in the functioning of the *organization* your board represents?

☐ Yes (1)   ☐ No (2)   ☐ N/A (99)

Explain: _____

_____

_____

_____

25. Workshop Materials:

		(1)	(2)	(99)
(a)	The workshop materials were tailored to meet the needs of our board.	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know
(b)	The materials used were current.	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know
(c)	The information was new to me.	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know
(d)	The workshop addressed my concerns.	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know

Comments: _____

_____

26. Instructors:

		(1)	(2)	(99)
(a)	The instructors were experienced in board development issues.	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know
(b)	The instructors were well trained in board development issues.	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know
(c)	The training style was appropriate to the group.	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know
(d)	The instructors worked well as a team.	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know

Comments: _____

_____

27. How did you feel about the workshop being scheduled on Friday and Saturday ? __

_____

_____

_____

28. If not all of your board participated in the workshop, how did you let the others know what had happened at the workshop?

_____

_____

_____

29. What contact has your board had with the Board Development Program since the workshop?

☐ Sent Information (1)

☐ Refresher workshop (2)

☐ Further contact with instructor (3)

☐ Further contact with program staff (4)

☐ Other (Please specify): _____

7

30. Do you receive the Board Development Program newsletter?

    ☐ Yes (1)   ☐ No (2)

31. Do you copy and distribute the newsletter?

    ☐ Yes (1)   ☐ No (2)   ☐ N/A (99)

32. Is the Board Development newsletter helpful?

    ☐ Yes (1)   ☐ No (2)   ☐ N/A (99)

Explain: _____

_____

33. Would you see your board taking another workshop?

    ☐ Yes (1)   ☐ No (2)

34. (If no) What is the main reason you are not interested in taking another workshop?

_____

_____

_____

35. (If yes) What would you like to accomplish in another workshop?

    ☐ Refresh previous workshop.(1)

    ☐ Train new members.(2)

    ☐ Explore new areas.(3) (Please specify) _____

_____

_____

    ☐ Other (Please specify) _____

_____

36. How much time do you think should be between workshops to the same board?

☐ Within 6 months (1)

☐ Within 1 year (2)

☐ Within 2 years (3)

☐ Other (Please specify) _____

_____

37. Was the Board Development workshop helpful in other areas of your life?

☐ Yes (1)   ☐ No (2)

38. (If yes) In what ways was it helpful? (Check all that apply)

☐ Another board. (1)

☐ Club/Association. (2)

☐ Work (3)

☐ Church (4)

☐ Other (Please specify) _____

_____

_____

39. What new topics would you like to see explored by the Board Development Program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

40. We would like your opinion on what the Board Development Program should look towards doing in the future. If any of the following options were offered would you use them? (Check as many as apply).

			(1)	(2)
(a)	☐	Self administered workbooks on special topics.	Useful	Not useful
(b)	☐	Workshops on specific topics.	Useful	Not useful
(c)	☐	Video instruction.	Useful	Not useful
(d)	☐	Computer based training.	Useful	Not useful
(e)	☐	Other (Please specify) _____		

_____

Comments:

_____
_____
_____
_____

Name: _____

Telephone : _____

Please return questionnaire by November 19, 1993 to:

EDMONTON SOCIAL PLANNING COUNCIL

c/o 3 Wingate Place
St. Albert, Alberta
T8N 3G2

Thank you for your participation!

edmonton

SOCIAL PLANNING

planning for change

BOARD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE

The Edmonton Social Planning Council has been contracted to complete an evaluation of the Board Development Program. Your impression of the program is very important to the evaluation and we encourage your input. All replies are confidential! Your responses will not be disclosed in any way which would identify you.

The Board Development Program offers two kinds of workshops, *open* workshops and *closed* workshops.

Closed workshops are offered to members of a board to help them become more effective in the governance of their board. The workshop is tailored to the needs of the board, and only the board and senior staff of the organization which has arranged the workshop would attend.

Open workshops provide more general information, and are offered to representatives from various boards. The participants take information back to the other members of their board. Often organizations attend the open workshop to see what it is all about before committing their board to a customized closed workshop.

We are asking you to complete this questionnaire because you have participated in a Board Development Program *open* workshop. If you have completed other Board Development Program workshops we would ask that you answer this questionnaire with respect to the most recent *open* workshop you have completed.

Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed postage paid envelope by November 29, 1993. If we have not heard from you by that date we will call you to see if we can be of any assistance in filling out the questionnaire. Thank you for your cooperation!

We would like to have some information about who is attending the *open* workshops.

1.　Sex:　☐ Male (1)　☐ Female (2)

2.　Age:　☐ Under 20 (1)　☐ 20 - 35 (2)
　　　　　☐ 35 - 50 (3)　☐ 50 - 65 (4)
　　　　　☐ Over 65 (5)

3.　Have you taken more than one Board Development workshop? (If yes, please answer the questionnaire with respect to the most recent *open* workshop you have taken).

　　　　☐ Yes (1)　　　☐ No (2)

4.　What town or city do you live in or closest to?　_____

5.　Where did you complete the *open* workshop?　_____

6.　When did you complete the *open* workshop? Date: _____

7.　How many people were at the *open* workshop you attended?　_____

8.　How many of your *staff* participated in the open workshop?　_____

9.　How many of your *board* members participated in the open workshop?　_____

10.　What was your role when you took the *open* workshop?

　　　　☐ Board Chairperson (1)
　　　　☐ Board Member (2)
　　　　☐ Senior Staff (3)
　　　　☐ Staff (4)
　　　　☐ Other (Please specify) _____

_____

2

11. Why did you come to an *open* workshop? (Check as many as apply).

☐ To see what the Board Development workshop was all about.(1)

☐ To pre-view the workshop before arranging a closed workshop for my board.(2)

☐ The other board members were not committed to training.(3)

☐ Personal development.(4)

☐ Orientation to board.(5)

☐ Re-fresher workshop.(6)

☐ Other (Please specify) _____

_____

12. Have any other of your staff/board attended *open* workshops?

☐ Yes (1)   Approximately how many? _____

☐ No (2)

☐ Don't know (3)

13. Has your board arranged a *closed* workshop?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (2)

14. Was the *closed* workshop arranged as a result of your participation in the *open* workshop?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (2)

☐ N/A (99)

Comments: _____

_____

3

15. Are you still serving on the board you were representing when you took the *open* workshop?

☐ Yes (1)   ☐ No (2)   ☐ N/A (99)

(If no) Why did you leave the board? _____

_____

_____

_____

16. How long have you been (or were you) a member of that board?

☐ Less than a year (1)

☐ 1-3 years (2)

☐ 4-5 years (3)

☐ More than five years (4)

☐ N/A (99)

17. How many years of board experience do you have? (Total years service on all boards.)

☐ No board experience (1)

☐ Less than a year (2)

☐ 1-3 years (3)

☐ 4-5 years (4)

☐ More than five years (5)

18. Does your organization serve *only* members of the following groups?

☐ Aboriginal (1)

☐ Multicultural (2)

☐ Other (3) (Please specify) _____

_____

19. What other board development training have you done?_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

20. How did you find out about the Board Development Program? (Check as many as apply?)

☐ Referred by a former workshop participant.(1)

☐ Referred by a friend/colleague.(2)

☐ Referred by my organization/board.(3)

☐ Volunteer Centres of Edmonton or Calgary.(4)

☐ Alberta Library Trustees Association.(5)

☐ Contacted by the Board Development Program.(6)

☐ Provincial Association.(7)

☐ Government or Municipal Organization (eg. F.C.S.S.).(8)

☐ Other (Give details) _____

_____

_____

21. What do you remember most about the workshop? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

22. What did you *hope* you would learn from the workshop? (Pick your top three).

☐ How to develop a mission statement.(1)

☐ How to plan and develop policies.(2)

☐ How to recruit and maintain board members.(3)

☐ How to orient board members.(4)

☐ How to develop a board manual.(5)

☐ How to make board meetings more effective.(6)

☐ How to manage finances.(7)

☐ How to deal effectively with controversy and dissent.(8)

☐ How to develop positive working relations between board and senior staff.(9)

☐ How to outline roles, responsibilities, and functions for board members, volunteers, and staff.(10)

☐ Other (Please specify) _____

23. What did you *actually* learn from the workshop? (Check all that apply).

☐ How to develop a mission statement.(1)

☐ How to plan and develop policies.(2)

☐ How to recruit and maintain board members.(3)

☐ How to orient board members.(4)

☐ How to develop a board manual.(5)

☐ How to make board meetings more effective.(6)

☐ How to manage finances.(7)

☐ How to deal effectively with controversy and dissent.(8)

☐ How to develop positive working relations between board and senior staff.(9)

☐ How to outline roles, responsibilities, and functions for board members, volunteers, and staff.(10)

☐ Other (Please specify) _____

_____

24. Workshop Materials:

		(1)	(2)	(99)
(a)	The materials used were current.	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know
(b)	The information was new to me.	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know
(c)	The workshop addressed my concerns.	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

25. Instructors:

		(1)	(2)	(99)
(a)	The instructors were experienced in board development issues.	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know
(b)	The instructors were well trained in board development issues.	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know
(c)	The training style was appropriate to the group.	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know
(d)	The instructors worked well as a team.	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

26. How did you feel about the workshop being scheduled on Friday and Saturday ?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

27. How did you use what you had learned with your board/organization?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

28. What contact have you had with the Board Development Program since the workshop?

☐ Sent Information (1)

☐ Arranged a closed workshop for board (2)

☐ Refresher workshop (3)

☐ Further contact with instructor (4)

☐ Further contact with program staff.(5)

☐ Other (Please specify): _____

_____

_____

_____

29. Was the Board Development workshop helpful in other areas of your life?

☐ Yes (1)   ☐ No (2)

30. (If yes) In what ways was it helpful? (Check all that apply)

☐ Another board. (1)

☐ Club/Association. (2)

☐ Work (3)

☐ Church (4)

☐ Other (Please specify) _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

31. What new topics would you like to see explored by the Board Development Program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

32. We would like your opinion on what the Board Development Program should look towards doing in the future. If any of the following options were offered would you use them? (Check as many as apply).

			(1)	(2)
(a)	☐	Self administered workbooks on special topics.	Useful	Not useful
(b)	☐	Workshops on specific topics.	Useful	Not useful
(c)	☐	Video instruction.	Useful	Not useful
(d)	☐	Computer based training.	Useful	Not useful
(e)	☐	Other (Please specify) _____		

_____

_____

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Name: _____

Organization/Board: _____

Please return questionnaire by November 29. 1993 to:

EDMONTON SOCIAL PLANNING COUNCIL

c/o 3 Wingate Place
St. Albert. Alberta
T8N 3G2

Thank you for your participation!

edmonton

SOCIAL PLANNING

council

planning for change

BOARD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM EVALUATION

INSTRUCTORS QUESTIONNAIRE

The Edmonton Social Planning Council has been contracted to complete an evaluation of the Board Development Program. Your impression of the program is very important to the evaluation and we encourage your input. All replies are confidential! Your responses will not be disclosed in any way which would identify you.

Please return the questionnaire by December 5, 1993. Thank you for your cooperation!

1. How were you recruited to the Board Development Program? _____

_____

_____

2. How long have you been with the Board Development Program?   _____

3. How many workshops have you facilitated?   _____

4. Are you satisfied with the training you received?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Explain: _____

_____

5.　How could the training be improved? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

6.　Do you feel supported by the staff of the Board Development Program?

☐　Yes

☐　No

Explain: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

7.　Do you feel that you are well informed of the program's expectations?

☐　Yes

☐　No

What are they? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

8.   Curriculum: Yes   No

(a)   Are you comfortable with the curriculum?   ☐   ☐

(b)   Is the curriculum adequate for your purposes?   ☐   ☐

(c)   Does it match with the needs assessments   ☐   ☐
      completed by the participants prior to the
      workshop?

      Comments: _____

      _____

      _____

      _____

9.   What do you think about team teaching? _____

      _____

      _____

      _____

10.   What is it like to be teaching with different people all the time? _____

      _____

      _____

      _____

      _____

11.   Is there anything you would like to see the Board Development Program doing
      differently?

      _____

      _____

      _____

      _____

12. What would you like to see the Board Development Program doing in the future?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Name: _____

Telephone: _____

Please return questionnaire by December 5, 1993 to:

EDMONTON SOCIAL PLANNING COUNCIL

c/o 3 Wingate Place
St. Albert, Alberta
T8N 3G2

Thank you for your participation!

BOARD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

TELEPHONE QUESTIONNAIRE

We would like to have some information about who is attending the workshops.

1. Sex: ☐ Male (1) ☐ Female (2)

2. Age: ☐ Under 20 (1) ☐ 20 - 35 (2)
          ☐ 35 - 50 (3) ☐ 50 - 65 (4)
          ☐ Over 65 (5)

3. Have you taken more than one Board Development workshop? (If yes, please answer the questionnaire with respect to the most recent workshop you have taken).

    ☐ Yes (1) ☐ No (2)

4. What town or city do you live in or closest to? _____

5. When did you complete the workshop? Date: _____

6. Which board were you representing? _____

7. At the time you took the workshop were you the board chairperson?

    ☐ Yes (1) ☐ No (2)

8. How many people serve on your board? _____

9. How many board members participated in the workshop? _____

10. Are you still serving on the board that took the workshop?

    ☐ Yes (1) ☐ No (2)

(If no) Why did you leave the board? _____

_____

_____

11. Each workshop participant was asked to complete a needs assessment questionnaire before the workshop.

    (a)   Did you complete it and send it back?

        ☐ Yes (1)   ☐ No (2)

    (b)   Did the workshop reflect that it had been adapted to your needs?

        ☐ Yes (1)   ☐ No (2)

    Explain: _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

12. What do you remember most about the workshop? _____

_____

_____

_____

13. Have you noticed any other changes in the functioning of your board?

        ☐ Yes (1)   ☐ No (2)

    Explain: _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

14. How did the workshop change the way you function as a board member?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

15. Have you noticed any other changes in the functioning of the *organization* your board represents?

☐ Yes (1)   ☐ No (2)   ☐ N/A (99)

Explain: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

16. Would you see your board taking another workshop?

☐ Yes (1)   ☐ No (2)

17. (If no) What is the main reason you are not interested in taking another workshop?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

18.   (If yes) What would you like to accomplish in another workshop?

☐   Refresh previous workshop.(1)

☐   Train new members.(2)

☐   Explore new areas.(3) (Please specify) _____

_____

_____

☐   Other (Please specify) _____

_____

_____

_____

19.   What new topics would you like to see explored by the Board Development
       Program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Name: _____

Telephone :   _____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

FOCUS GROUP - INSTRUCTORS

1. How were you recruited to the program?

2. How long have you been with the Board Development Program?

3. How many workshops have you facilitated?

4. Are you satisfied with the training you received? What did you like most/least about the training?

5. How could the training be improved?

6. Do you feel supported by the staff of the Board Development Program? What kind of support do they provide?

7. Are you comfortable with the curriculum? Is the curriculum adequate for your purposes? Does it match with the needs assessments completed by the participants prior to the workshop?

8. Do you feel that you are well informed of the program's expectations? What are they?

9. What do you think about team teaching? What is it like to be teaching with different people all the time?

10. What would you like to see the Board Development Program doing in the future?

FOCUS GROUP - SENIOR STAFF

1. What did you hope that your board would gain from a Board Development workshop?

2. What did you hope to gain personally?

3. Has the workshop met with your expectations? How?

4. How has your board benefited from the workshop? What were the immediate benefits? What were the long-term benefits?

5. Has your organization benefited from the workshop? Were there immediate benefits? Do you see any long-term benefits?

6. What changes has your board made as a result of the workshop? Do you think that the changes will be lasting? Why/why not?

7. Was the Board Development workshop helpful in other areas of your life?

3. How could the Board Development program improve their services?

9. What would you like to see the Board Development Program doing in the future?

BOARD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

STAKEHOLDERS QUESTIONS - CO-SPONSORS

1. What is your relationship with the Board Development Program?

2. What contact have you had with them?

3. What are your impressions of the program?

4. Describe the process of arranging the workshop? What were your responsibilities? Were they reasonable?

5. How is the Board Development Program perceived in your community? How is it promoted?

6. Has the Board Development Program impacted organizations in your community? Explain. Do you see this as a long-term impact?

7. What is it like to be working with a government organization? How does it compare with other groups you work with?

8. What would you like to see the Board Development Program doing in the future?

Appendix 5

Project Staff

Project Coordinator	Alison MacDonald
Project Assistant	Dana Diamond
Administrative Associate	Diane Goodall

Project Advisory Committee

Jonathan Murphy (Chair)	Edmonton Social Planning Council
Robert Wyatt	The Muttart Foundation
Toni Lashbrook	Board Development Program
Wendy MacDonald	Board Development Program
Janet Buckmaster	Board Development Program
Jim Klingle	BDP I Instructor
Percy Cummins	BDP II Instructor
Alison MacDonald	Edmonton Social Planning Council
Dana Diamond	Edmonton Social Planning Council