

MOE SERVICE PLAN CONSULTATION FEEDBACK



SUBMITTED TO MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

JANUARY 11, 2013

MOE Service Plan Consultation Feedback

The British Columbia Principals' and Vice Principals' Association takes pride in its' leadership role with respect to developing, supporting, facilitating and implementing educational initiatives that contribute to an outstanding public education system. We are always pleased to engage with educational partners in an effort to collaboratively refine and improve our education system and have previously demonstrated a willingness to provide critique, suggestions and ideas related to enhancing the Ministry of Education Service Plan. The BCPVPA is thus pleased to provide a response to the questions being posed by the Ministry around the consultation process related to the 2012/13-2014/15 Service Plan.

A reflection and assessment of the consultation process gave consideration to numerous factors. To ensure meaningful feedback, we are providing articulation of the key components that comprised the analysis undertaken along with the overall assessment:

The 2012/13-2014/15 Service Plan Consultation Process **DID NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS.**

Timelines - given the complexity inherent in the task at hand and the number of documents and information sources that were referenced, a eight to ten week period of response time would be much more realistic. The allocated timelines created inordinate pressures which will typically impact the quality of the response. A key component of the specific question around timelines must also include the time that the Ministry would require to digest the submissions and to appropriately seek to understand, respond and ultimately incorporate those ideas leading to a stronger educational system or implementation program. In times when the Ministry of Education has portrayed the need for a sense of urgency around directions in education, such urgency is not represented by indications that the forthcoming Service Plan will retain the same structure and approach as in the previous year, a format that did not reflect any of the significant recommendations submitted by the BCPVPA. **DNME**

Communication - while communication has served to indicate what is happening, it has not served to build confidence of, or valuing in, the process. The communication process comes across as a component of a checklist that seeks to demonstrate that "interaction" has taken place. We did receive communication on February 21, 2012 thanking us for our submission and providing a brief generic synopsis of the feedback that was received by the Ministry. There has been no response given to our expressed interest in understanding how the submission was perceived, understood or rationalized. Although feedback was also provided at the time on the consultation process, that information is being sought once more along with an indication that the actual forthcoming Service Plan would again represent the previous format. Given some significant developments with the BCedPlan and little or no responsiveness to the recommendations put forth last year or the questions that were raised, it becomes increasingly challenging to see the communication process as representing more than lip service of sorts.

The letter received from the Ministry on February 21, 2012 indicates that you are looking forward to "enhancing collaboration on our service planning process in the future". The suggestion made in the original submission for specific feedback on the Association submission and an

opportunity to have dialogue around the contents did not receive a response. This suggestion was also made verbally along with an indication that there would be value in understanding the perspectives that were being shared with the Ministry by other “partners” in education. The Ministry indicated that feedback “can be summarized in three overarching themes: collaboration, research and alignment”. At this time, no specific details have been shared to facilitate a depth of understanding around these themes. Given the emphasis being placed on ‘open government’ such directions could only enhance opportunities for meaningful collaboration. Such bigger picture understandings are necessary to represent a meaningful set of goals and objectives with a true understanding of the potential for attaining such targets. This recommendation still applies fully and should be expanded to include the beneficial value of understanding the submissions of other educational partner groups. **DNME**

Vision - the information provided and the context that was shared, in our opinion, did not readily facilitate the required bigger picture analysis given the challenges currently facing our society. The feedback requested by the Ministry advocates for the importance of alignment and integration in support of our education system and the challenges being faced. Numerous documents such as B.C.’s Education Plan and the B.C. Jobs Plan are referenced as having compatible goals or objectives. Unfortunately, the references and /or links do not extend to other integral documents such as the Service Plans for Advanced Education, Children and Family Development, *Skills for Growth: British Columbia’s Labour Market Strategy to 2020* and *A Transformation and Technology Strategy for the BC Public Service*. Key themes inherent within the Ministry of Education Service Plan are also not represented within other documents where one might expect strong levels of mutual interest and a desire to benefit from integrated approaches thereby potentially raising fiscal accountability. Integration amongst key support documents, including the B.C. Jobs Plan, is at times very difficult to recognize.

While the consultation process did afford a broad-based opportunity for feedback on the Service Plan framework, there may be value in role-modeling guided analysis of key components of the framework and still retaining an opportunity for bigger picture responses. One would presume there may be particular components of the Service Plan or even specific implementation strategies whereby the Ministry would benefit from specific feedback (especially during a time period that included introduction of the B.C. Ed Plan). Few of the right questions are being asked or suggested. We have learned much in education on how to generate meaningful reflection and need to apply and role-model such pedagogy at every opportunity. Links to decision-making based on research and solid empirical data are not evident.

Previously referenced under the communication heading, but worth noting once more, is the notion that the process **does not** facilitate sharing or engagement on this “reflection” with other educational partners. This merely maintains existing “silos”, seemingly contradicts the “open government” vision and does little to facilitate the development of distributed leadership.

DNME

We believe that an opportunity to receive feedback or to have dialogue on this response would ensure a clarity of understanding and establish a solid basis for the continued evolution of meaningful partnership and that such engagement will enhance future consultations.