

The following document outlines the refined criteria and process for reviewing Aboriginal Service Plans and presents a finalized timeline.

REVIEWING ABORIGINAL SERVICE PLANS:

Process:

The submission deadline for ASPs is September 28, 2007 with implementation beginning in January 2008. As indicated through email correspondence, institutions were given the option to submit by the original date (June 7) and begin implementation in September. The approach to adjudication has been refined to account for the staggered adjudication of proposals.

Review of the Aboriginal Service Plans will consider *two primary aspects*:

1. **Quality of the Plan (determined through Criteria on Page 4)** - The excellence and relevance of services, programs, and policies outlined in the Aboriginal Service Plan (i.e. scope of goals and action, evidence based policies and practice; demonstration of engagement of community in the joint planning and implementation process, etc.)
2. **Institutional and Demographic Data** (number and percent of learners currently served, Aboriginal regional demographic data)

An Aboriginal Service Plan Advisory Committee (ASPAC) comprised of government and non-government representatives will review the plans and provide their perspectives and advice regarding implementation.

Decisions regarding implementation funding will be determined by a government adjudication committee who will consider the advice of the ASPAC and the institutional and regional demographic data relevant to each submission.

Criteria for Determining Implementation Funding:

Part of the role of the ASPAC was to “Review Criteria for Implementation Funding for Aboriginal Service Plans”. Key recommendations from the group included:

- The evaluation of plans should consider regional and demographic information. The number of learners being served and the potential learner impact must be a key considerations;
- Engagement of the community and private Aboriginal institutions should be substantively weighted. Plans should demonstrate community endorsement and evidence of joint planning. This process should involve the principles of recognition, respect, and reconciliation;
- Each plan needs to be considered independently and detailed criteria may be difficult to apply system-wide as factors that influence planning vary significantly across the system (i.e. number of stakeholder groups varies; protocol for rural communities vs. protocol in urban centres);

- The ASPAC is a diverse group of stakeholders that can bring various perspectives to the review process. Having this group in place allows for a thorough review of plans;
- Plans should demonstrate evidence-based policy and practice; and,
- Plans should outline **prioritized** actions and budget planning (goals/actions prioritized through ranking)

It was determined that funding will be allocated based on the following adjudication principle: funds will be dispersed based on **the greatest level of service for the greatest number of learners served (recognizing the continuum of post-secondary programming – e.g. Adult Basic Education through graduate programs).**

Based on this overarching principle, evaluation of the plans will consider the two previously mentioned categories:

Quality of the Plan (determined through Criteria on Page 4) *The excellence and relevance of services, programs, and policies outlined in the Aboriginal Service Plan* will be analyzed based on criteria outlined in the guidelines document. This includes review of the following:

- i. Essential Elements (environmental scan, inventory etc.)
- ii. Goals and objectives align with intended outcomes of the initiative
- iii. Scope of the Plan (goals and objectives are supported by environmental scan and needs assessment and lead to measurable outcomes)
- iv. Process of Development (engagement of community)
- v. Prioritized Action Plan and Budget (Actions are prioritized in the action plan; support the goals and objectives of the plan; and, lead to measurable outcomes)

Institutional and Demographic Data

(please note: institutional and demographic information is not a weighted criteria as it is being considered apart from the “Quality of the Plan”)

(SEE CRITERIA NEXT PAGE)

CRITERIA FUNDING	WEIGHT
<i>PART 1: Quality and Level of Service</i>	
<i>PART 1.1: Plan Content (30%)</i>	
1. Inclusion of the Essential Elements (inventory, environmental scan, etc.) outlined in the Guidelines document	5%
2. Goals and objectives align with the intended outcomes of the initiative, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the access, retention, completion and transitions opportunities for Aboriginal learners. • Increase the receptivity and relevance of post-secondary institutions and programs for Aboriginal learners, including providing support for initiatives that address systemic barriers. • Strengthen partnerships and collaboration in Aboriginal post-secondary education. 	5%
3. Scope of Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goals are broad in scope and reflect a comprehensive approach to increasing aboriginal post-secondary education outcomes. • Goals and objectives are supported by environmental scan and needs assessment and lead to measurable outcomes (input, output, and outcome measures) • Indication that actions address program and service ‘gaps’ and actions are addressed through a thorough implementation plan designed to achieve performance targets. 	10%
<i>PART 1.2: Process of Development (30%)</i>	
4. Engagement of Aboriginal communities, organizations, and private Aboriginal institutions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans should demonstrate community engagement, endorsement, and evidence of joint planning. This process should involve the principles of recognition, respect, and reconciliation with First Nations, Métis, and Inuit populations. • Evidence that demonstrates that Aboriginal partners have a role in the implementation of the plan. • Partnership commitment demonstrated through in-kind contributions, cost-sharing arrangements, and mutual accountability 	30%
<i>PART 1.3: Prioritized Action Plan and Budget (40%)</i>	
5. ASP outlines action for year 1 and associated budgets for these actions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actions support the goals and objectives of the plan and lead to measurable outcomes (input, output, and outcome measures) • Actions are prioritized in the action plan and are accompanied with performance measures; • Actions outlined in budget are an efficient and effective response to identified issues; • Budget will identify in-kind contributions and will demonstrate how ASP implementation funding will be used to leverage funding from other sources (i.e. within institutional budget, Federal funding, Band funding, etc.) 	50%
TOTAL	100%
<i>PART 2: Demographic and Institutional Data</i>	
Demographics and institutional data: The adjudication committee will consider location, regional demographics and institutional demographics including enrolment and percent of aboriginal learners at the institution as a key component in the allocation of funding.	

Finalized Timeline:

DATE	ACTION
September 2007	Institutions submit Aboriginal Service Plans <i>(please note: for institutions working in consortium, one ASP is submitted. Prioritized action plans and budgets can be appended as institution-specific documents)</i>
October 2007	Aboriginal Service Plan Advisory Committee (ASPAC) reviews plans and provides advice and recommendations to AVED regarding the ASP implementation process. Government adjudicates proposals to determine implementation funding (considering advice and recommendations provided by ASPAC as well as institution and demographic data)
November 2007	The Ministry of Advanced Education allocates funding to the 11 institutions.
January 2008	Institutions begin implementation of Aboriginal Service Plan
September 2008	Institutions submit Progress Report (reporting activities initiated through ASP) including Year 2 Action Plan and budget . The role, content, and structure of the Progress Report will be mailed with the funding letters in January 2008.
November 2008	AVED and ASPAC review Progress Reports. AVED allocates year 2 implementation funding
January 2009	Year 2 Implementation Begins
September 2009	Institutions submit Progress Report , including the Year 3 Action Plan and budget
November 2009	AVED and ASPAC review Progress Reports and AVED allocates year 3 implementation funding
January 2009	Year 3 implementation begins
September 2010	Submission of 3-year service plan review that evaluates the overall success of the ASP – reports including input, output, and outcome performance measurement. Pending government funding approval, a decision regarding continuation of the ASP will be required. If funding permits, AVED may consider requiring Phase 1 institutions to draft a new 3-year ASP.