

Review of the Director of Studies Position

by Ginette Sheehy

Presented to the Board of Governors of

Champlain Regional College

on March 20th, 2015

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION AND MANDATE	3
THE RESEARCH DEVIS.....	4
INTRODUCTION.....	4
WHY THIS STUDY?.....	5
CHAPTER 1 HISTORY, LEGALITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.....	7
THE LEGAL STRUCTURE OF CHAMPLAIN REGIONAL COLLEGE: DIFFERENT MODELS	7
THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DIRECTOR OF STUDIES	8
<i>According to the College Act</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>According to Champlain College By-law 1.....</i>	<i>10</i>
CHAPTER 2 RESULTS.....	13
THE STRUCTURE: LOOKING DOWNWARD.....	13
THE STRUCTURE: LOOKING UPWARD	14
ACADEMIC MANAGEMENT: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	15
<i>Academics and economies of scale</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>A comparative analysis of responsibilities.....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Dimensions</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Challenges.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Summary.....</i>	<i>29</i>
CHAPTER 3 CHANGE OF STRUCTURE RECOMMENDATIONS.....	23
CHAPTER 4 MODEL ANALYSIS	30
CONCLUSION.....	33

The author wishes to thank everyone who took the time to either respond to a questionnaire or to meet with her for an interview.

Special thanks to:

*Josée Bouchard, Planning & Evaluation Analyst,
for formatting and administering the questionnaires;*

*Bridget Suitor, Administration Technician,
for linguistic revision and report formatting; and*

*Dr. J. Kenneth Robertson, Director General, and
Mr. Donald Shewan, St. Lambert Campus Director &
Interim Director General, for their constant availability.*

Introduction and Mandate

While its campus structure allows Champlain Regional College (CRC) to offer many opportunities for the students and the regions concerned, the remoteness of the Director of Studies Office and the absence of a hierarchical relationship with the Campus Deans seem to generate important issues related to the overall academic management of CRC. This study aims to measure the scope of the difficulties related to the position and recommend changes to meet the challenges.

In accordance with the given mandate (see Appendix A) the consultation process has included different individuals in different roles at the College in order to “review the roles and responsibilities of the Director of Studies and consider any possible structural changes related to academic management” through a consultation process involving:

- The Board of Governors and Commission of Studies;
- The Director General
- The Campus Directors and Academic Deans;
- The Service Directors;
- Campus Academic/Pedagogical Councils;
- Faculty and Staff;
- Unions and Associations;
- Former Directors of Studies of the College as recommended.

Study Mandate:

This study is an analysis founded on the obligations related to the role of the Director of Studies and how the Champlain structure facilitates or hinders this function. It is not about producing statistics or surveys of people’s opinions.

The interviews held have shed some light on issues concerning the way the Director of Studies’ role is handled and the consequences. The questionnaires were constructed keeping in mind the role of the instance interviewed in relation to the Director of Studies.

All questionnaires to solicit information from the Board of Governors (BOG), the Commission of Studies and the local pedagogical committees are found under the Appendices D, E, & F provided at the end of this report.

Furthermore, the questionnaires that were used as interview guides are also provided in Appendices H & I.

Introduction

Chapter 1 will present the legal aspects related to letters patent of colleges in general and the meaning on their structure. We will establish the position of Champlain Regional College (CRC) as we move along in the comparison. The obligations and regulations pertaining to the Director of Studies will also be presented. Again, we will present the legal aspects and see how they are implemented at CRC.

Even at this early stage, it is important to mention that while we are not dealing with the overall College structure, one has to bear in mind that this College structure does have very important impacts on the Director of Studies. It would have been difficult to conduct this study ignoring the independence movement that is presently active on two of the campuses. It systematically came up during most interviews. It will consequently be addressed as long as there is a link to be made with the Director of Studies' roles and responsibilities. As we go along there will be questions brought forward about some further investigation concerning the overall structure.

Chapter 2 will then proceed with the results of the study concerning the problems and challenges related to the structure and the role of the Director of Studies.

The analysis concerning the impact of the structure and role of the Director of Studies will deal with the dimensions important in the mandate of the Director of Studies: vision, leadership, student success, teamwork, and efficiency. We will then proceed to articulate the specific challenges related to the roles, responsibilities, and accountability of the Director of Studies in the context of the Champlain Regional College structure.

Chapters 3 & 4 will then proceed to identify the possible structural changes related to the management of the College's academic affairs and the inventory of

issues found in the study. While developing possible options for the Board of Governors to consider, we will outline the appropriate advantages and challenges of each option, as well as the related legal and structural implications. Finally, recommendations will be given to the Board of Governors based on the report.

Why this study?

The recent changes in the Director of Studies incumbent and a growing “malaise” about the responsibilities of the Director of Studies, has led the Board of Governors to ask for a study of the position, its responsibilities and the structure under which it operates.

The last six years have seen three different incumbents for the position of Director of Studies. Consequently, the Board is concerned there may be difficulties related to the structure and/or the responsibilities that have proven to be a challenging situation for a Director of Studies. In the two last cases, the individuals have left to occupy the same function in another College.

It has to be said that there is growing difficulty in the whole *réseau* to attract and retain Directors of Studies, and more so, in the Anglophone CEGEPs. Directors of Studies are frequently solicited and selection often goes to several rounds.

The geographic reality of Champlain –an administrative centre located in Sherbrooke plus three campuses situated in Lennoxville, Québec and Saint Lambert, is less conducive to timely communications and to holding meetings easily and productively. Not to mention « le bel hiver canadien! »

The question related to the Director of Studies is not a new one. In 2006, Bertrand Daigneault, Director of Studies at Champlain College, had produced a document in which he advised the College to bring changes to the role of the Director of Studies and to redefine the links with other parts of the College. He was recommending that there be a better definition of the responsibilities of the Director of Studies. This document was brought to the Director General’s Advising Committee.

In response, Gerald Cutting, Director General at the time, reiterated the same recommendations and articulated the following:

“No matter what, the responsibilities of the office of the Director of Studies cannot be delegated. Yet, in many instances, the authority of the office has been either formally or informally delegated to Campus Deans and/or Campus Directors.”

Director General Cutting was envisioning two streams of possible action. The first was to consider any given academic dossier such as evaluations, policies, etc. to be treated as projects for which the Director of Studies would be the project manager. The second alternative was to bring a change to the structure so that the Deans would report to the Director of Studies for academic matters. He further insisted on the fact that Campus Deans were not Directors of Studies. The following years, the Directors of Studies have worked within the first option, acting as project manager for dossiers such as evaluations and policies. Deans have not reported to the Director of Studies, but to Campus Directors.

While this document from Mr. Daigneault only came to light as a result of this Board mandate, it is evident that the College continues to have similar problems, creating challenges for the Director of Studies.

Chapter 1 History, legalities and responsibilities

The legal structure of Champlain Regional College: different models

When one looks at the legal structure of colleges and of Champlain Regional College, in particular, the first question that arises concerns the kind of letters patent under which Champlain Regional College operates.

The College Act defines two types of letters patent. The first are those of a regular college, meaning one central college that may be operating from one or more sites or campuses. The second is that of a “regional college” with one regional college that acts as the head office and one or more constituent colleges. Articles 1 to 30 of the College Act define the case of a College, while Articles 31 to 72 define how the second model functions.

While Champlain’s letters patent describe the College as being one under the first model, it appears that the reality is not exactly the one described in the official document. Champlain is actually a little of both having a three-campus structure with a central head office.

The following table presents the differences between the two models and compares the Champlain reality.

Positions/College Act	General model (Comprising campuses or not)	Lanaudière Regional model	Champlain Regional College model
Director General	<i>1 at the Central College</i>	<i>1 at College Administration</i>	<i>1 at College Administration</i>
Director of Studies	<i>1 at the Central College</i>	<i>1 per Constituent College</i>	<i>1 at College Administration</i>
Service Directors	<i>All located at the Central College</i>	<i>All located at College Administration</i>	<i>All located at College Administration</i>
Board of Governors	<i>1 BOG</i>	<i>1 BOG + 1 Constituent Council per Constituent College</i>	<i>1 BOG</i>
Commission of Studies	<i>1 for the College</i>	<i>1 per Constituent College</i>	<i>1 for the College plus 3 Academic/Pedagogical Committee</i>

The key questions are: Is the present role of the Director of Studies the best possible fit for the College? Does it allow the best possible management? Is it financially sound? Is it a historical result that has never really been challenged?

Since Champlain is not recognized as a regional College by the legislation, it would mean that CRC is financed similarly to the general model and does not receive the same funding as the Lanaudière model does (a difference of around 200 000\$). CRC certainly does not receive the budgets that would cover the cost of three Directors of Studies, should the Board of Governors decide to go in this direction. Therefore, such a recommendation would mean a change in the letters of patent and political support for a change in the Colleges Act.

At Champlain, the existence of a College administration is justified by the possibility of generating economies of scale in rendering, including but not limited to services related to: finance, human resources, purchasing, payroll, and material resources. The present political context would gladly greet the opportunity to validate and to promote the existence of these savings.

While the purpose of this study is to look at the role of the Director of Studies, there will undoubtedly be an impact on other management roles, including but not necessarily limited to that of the Deans, Campus Directors, and possibly the Director General. These changes may amount to a rather important change in the structure of Champlain Regional College in general.

It has been mentioned that CRC would gain by better defining a mission and values that encompass the three realities that compose its structure. How can we embrace the whole College?

The roles and responsibilities of the Director of Studies

According to the College Act

In its College Act, the Ministry has defined the basic organization of colleges. It has defined the role and responsibilities of the Board of Governors, of the Executive Committee and also of its two “hors cadres” leaders who are the Director General and the Director of Studies. While the Director General is responsible for the general administration of the College, the Director of Studies

is in charge of all pedagogical matters of the College, including the application of the Student Success Plan, the IPESA (Institutional Policy on the Evaluation of Student Achievement), and IPMAP (Institutional Policy on the Management of Academic Programs).

Article 20 of the College Act is very clear on the nomination of the Director General and the Director of Studies. They are both hors-cadres and are nominated by the Board of Governors. Nowhere is it mentioned that changes can be brought to these two positions or the nature of their responsibilities.

As determined by the College Act, and implemented in the colleges, the mandate of the Director of Studies is first and foremost to promote and to define the conditions for student success by ensuring the quality of existing programs in which students are enrolled. More specifically, the following can summarize the role of a Director of Studies.

- ✚ Implement programs that are accepted by the Ministry.
- ✚ Plan, organize and offer all credited courses (DEC and AEC).
- ✚ Plan, organize and supervise teaching and teaching support.
- ✚ Admit students and sanction the completeness of a DEC.
- ✚ Develop and administer policies and by-laws that will support and monitor pedagogical life and rules.

When one looks at the responsibility of the Director of Studies as Chairperson of the Commission of Studies, the importance of the position is once again understood as fundamental to the accomplishment of the College's mission.

The College Act stipulates that the Commission of Studies must give its opinion to the Board on any question submitted to it by the Board in matters within its jurisdiction. More specifically, the following must be submitted to the Commission before being discussed by the Board:

- ✚ proposals for institutional policy on the evaluation of learning achievement and procedures for the certification of studies;
- ✚ proposals for institutional policy on the evaluation of programs of studies;
- ✚ proposals for programs of studies envisioned by the college;
- ✚ the selection of learning activities that are within the jurisdiction of the college;

- ✚ any draft by-laws or policies relating to the rules, procedures and criteria governing the admission and registration of students;
- ✚ the draft strategic plan of the college for matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission.

As Chairperson of the Commission of Studies, the Director of Studies is at the heart of all pedagogical matters initiating the planning process right up to the accountability for the pedagogical life in the College. He or she is accountable to the Director General, the Board of Governors, the Ministry and the *Commission de l'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial* (CEEC) for all matters enumerated in the law.

According to Champlain College By-law 1

In its By-law 1, Champlain College abides by the College Act. The responsibilities of the Director of Studies cannot be changed even if the College is present in different regions through a campus structure. Mandates can be given to the Director of Studies and the way things are accomplished can be further defined in policies, but the basic roles must remain and must be accomplished by the Director of Studies and his/her team.

CRC's By-law 1 states the following where the Director of Studies is concerned.

In accordance with the Act, the Director of Studies is appointed by the Board.
(...)
(...)
Under the authority of the Director General and in cooperation with the Campus Directors (Lennoxville, St. Lambert, St. Lawrence) or their delegates, the Director of Studies:

- a) is responsible for matters affecting the pedagogical life at all locations of the College;
- b) oversees the improvement and development of the academic life at the College;
- c) ensures the quality of education in the College;
- d) is responsible for the application of policies resulting from the general regulations of the Government and the bylaws of the College pertaining to academic programs;
- e) performs other related duties assigned by the Director General;
- f) performs such other responsibilities as the Board shall assign to the Director of Studies by bylaw or resolution.

While these statements show the importance of the position of Director of Studies, they do not talk about how academic management is to be organized.

There could be further indications that the Director of Studies is responsible for the management (planning, organizing, directing, controlling and evaluating) of all the programs and resources of the pedagogical departments; and that he or she is responsible for the development, implementation and execution of the strategic and student success plans related to academics.

It seems that the wording of By-law 1 is not complete enough to account for the very important responsibilities of the incumbent, but general enough to give them an overwhelming sentiment.

Hence, the first recommendation:

Since the Director of Studies is a hors-cadre who is by law accountable for the administration of all programs and policies pertaining to academics, it is recommended to add one component to By-law 1 in order to specify this important responsibility related to the administration of academics.

There would also be a need to better define the cooperation with the Campus Directors. What does « in cooperation with the Campus Directors (Lennoxville, St. Lambert, St. Lawrence) or their delegates,» mean?

Since we are going to further analyze the structure and roles, additional recommendations will follow. Suffice to say that By-law 1 would gain in defining an administrative relationship between these positions. The fact that one incumbent is hors-cadre and the others are cadres and that it is said that they must collaborate can be confusing and may create conflicts and misunderstandings, even with the best of intentions.

Another important aspect to address is the title of the position: Director of Studies. It is a translation from French, Directeur des études.

I am of the opinion that it would be important to abide by the law for the title of the Academic Dean. Insofar as the College Act is concerned, there is ONE Academic Dean as there is ONE Director General. Both these positions are

important and the titles are gratifying and correspond to high-level positions and responsibilities. In other English education institutions, the Academic Dean title is highly considered and respected.

It is recommended that the title Director of Studies be changed to that of Academic Dean. Consequently, the local deans could bear the title of Associate Deans.

It is important to note that this could have an impact on other “Deans” such as the Deans responsible of Student Services, which would then require further consideration.

Chapter 2

Results

Why have the Directors of Studies struggled to perform this role in the reality of the structure of Champlain College leading to incumbents' consideration of other positions?

The structure: Looking downward

When we analyze the organizational chart of CRC, it is obvious that the role of the Director of Studies is not one of a line manager in charge of all the pedagogical activities and development; the position is one of staff management and not line management.

In many cases, Directors of Studies were dynamic teachers and deans and, as such, are eager to manage pedagogy, supervise academic committees and lead the pedagogical evolution of the College. Offering these persons a staff role is like “putting a cap on the passion”, as someone mentioned.

It is certainly a challenge to occupy the position and get things done in the present structure, but are we giving a Director of Studies the chance and tools to do the very best for the College? I do not think so.

The Director of Studies is not hierarchically related to any deans or personnel located on each of the campuses. This person does not supervise the programs development nor does he or she supervise the execution of all different tasks that we usually expect from the Academic Dean. The Director of Studies has to convince and work hand in hand with the Campus Director who is fully in charge of all the campus personnel. The Director of Studies is seen like the person responsible for the application of the policies, yet has no authority on the persons who will make it happen. As one pointed out: “You feel like some kind of Governor General...”

What is there to be said about a person who has the task of convincing very busy individuals who answer to another Director in this complex geographic setting? It was mentioned that even the best willing dean did not have the time to respond to two persons. One is seen as giving the orders, the other, as adding to

the burden. Even if former Directors of Studies were able to rally people around their objectives and contribute to the campuses' activities, it is a far cry from the true sense of the law.

If we want the Director of Studies to exercise his or her duties according to the law, it has to be mentioned in the By-law, the title has to have meaning and the person has to be able to provide leadership, give directions, appraise and evaluate the academic personnel who will make things happen.

The structure: Looking upward

If, as Director of Studies, one feels like a Governor General, reading final drafts, signing documents and working on policies, one could ask if there is enough difference in such a structure between the role of the Director of Studies and that of the Director General? Is there not an overlap between the two roles? Once again, the Director of Studies would be in a problematic situation leading to all kinds of misunderstandings and potential conflicts.

Could one source of the problem be the lack of a true difference between these two positions? By the same token, it would mean that there is a possible loss of leadership for the whole community.

Another important consideration to bring forward is the major change in the responsibilities and the accountability of the Director of Studies. The responsibilities that have dramatically changed and grown might partly explain the difficulties. Looking back at the 80's, there was no obligation for a Director of Studies to provide a Student Success Plan, an IPESA (Institutional Policy on the Evaluation of Student Achievement), an IPMAP (Institutional Policy on the Management of Academic Programs) or to evaluate programs and receive and implement the CEEC's recommendations. Currently, the Director of Studies is in charge of all these dossiers, is evaluated consequently and is accountable for such dossiers. The role has changed and the Direction of Studies is not only about writing policies, it is about taking a good hard look at how things are done with regard to the academic life of the College.

Can a Director of Studies function without the collaboration and intertwined work of his or her team and faculty? Can we have all these expectations towards someone who has no real lever to make it happen?

The gap is widening and the incumbent of the Director of Studies position understands all the responsibilities yet, feels unable to fulfill them.

Academic management: roles and responsibilities

Academics and economies of scale

In a previous section, we mentioned that the structure of CRC in providing services from a central office allows the development of economies of scale. Can the same thing be said about academics?

I am strongly of the opinion that the management of academic affairs being so sensitive to student success and to the management of people requires the Director of Studies to be very active and knowledgeable of what academic management means. By-law 1 talks about pedagogical life... In order for a Director of Studies to be able to account for the pedagogical life of the College, there has to be a genuine presence where this life is happening. So, contrary to the other Directors, including the Director General, can there be a value-added by having a Director of Studies present at the College-wide level?

The presence of a Director of Studies on campus can be the way to gather troops to understand changes, to implement new regulations and to reflect on possible opportunities and best practices. One does not develop strategic gains by reacting to changes, once they have the information. There is a need to be proactive, alert and innovative about pedagogy. The gains of having a Director of Studies present on campus, meaning information, communication and leadership, outweighs the possible economies of scale of having him or her at College administration developing policies and trying to coordinate through the deans.

This is not to say that the work performed by the personnel at the Director of Studies Office at the center is not useful, but only that it would gain from being better “grounded” in the reality of a campus. This reality was mentioned during many interviews: the lack of understanding and even mistrust while performing different evaluations, on one side, and the sentiment of not being able to help as much as could be done, on the other side.

The discussions with the personnel on different campuses has led to the understanding that there might even be some diseconomies of scale brought by communication problems between a remote Director of Studies and the Deans and programs located on the campuses. Some technical programs are in need of a

closer relationship and direct discussions with the Director of Studies who is sitting at the *Commission des affaires pédagogiques* (CAP) of the Fédération des cégeps. Important program changes are presented and discussed at CAP and the local Academic Deans participate in program committees concerning those programs that are offered by their own College. Locally this new information should be transmitted and explained to program faculty before they learn about it elsewhere, or worse, remain non cognizant of it. The potential of Champlain College to become a leader in certain programs might end up hindered by this lack of communication or leadership related to change. Giving information in a remote manner is one thing; explaining and showing the change and how to seize the opportunities is quite another; this is where the communication breakdown happens.

A comparative analysis of responsibilities

At some point in the study, the managers closer to the College's academic area were asked to fill out a table about the regular activities performed in Academic Management. The results show clearly that the local deans are involved in all the activities that make the College work plus the production of the academic calendar, the choice and process concerning program evaluations and also the planning of pedagogical days. The Director of Studies is confined to annual planning and being accountable for student success, the production of policies and by-laws and initiating, conducting all pedagogical orientations and reflections, and supporting the application of new programs.

Legally, the accountability lies within the Director of Studies, but the incumbent of the position has barely a word to say about the organization of the semester in any campus.

This information reveals that the model adopted by the previous administration (G. Cutting and B. Daigneault) of a "high-level" Director of Studies responsible for policy and working at a project basis is exactly what is implemented.

Dimensions

In the following sections, I will present a summary of what was mentioned in the interviews and responses to questionnaires.

Academic vision

According to the interviews and the responses to questions, the geographical distance was seen as a barrier for the Director of Studies to be able to communicate and develop a College pedagogical vision. An academic vision is transmitted not once a month or every other week, it is a continuous stream of actions and thought.

The Director of Studies represents academic credibility and people need to witness and feel his or her presence and leadership.

“Ped” days are usually an important momentum to lead and instill the vision. While pedagogical days do happen in different campuses, it was mentioned that the Director of Studies does not plan, lead or even participate in the discussions. While the Director of Studies is supposed to be the “captain of the local ship” (*personal communication teacher*), there are no true and honest discussions.

Pedagogical leadership

The Director of Studies is responsible for the execution of the mission where pedagogy is concerned; he or she has to see it happen, bringing adjustments if need be. There is a need to build a community, to build trust over and above the regular operations. Of course, classes are given and the regular operations are accomplished due to the deans’ excellent abilities to make it happen, but still, at some level a strategic guidance is missing. The Director of Studies, Campus Directors, and Academic Deans need to be working closely.

Nothing is more important to a teacher than knowing that the Director of Studies has ideas and vision and knows how to steer the ship; that the Director of Studies is involved and understands pedagogy in and out. Pedagogical leadership is about relationships.

The comment on communication was brought up very often. Having your Director transmit information about changes or other important matters is different from reading an office memo about what went on at the CAP. The pedagogical leadership finds its roots in change explanation and implementation.

Faculty and staff mentioned that depriving them from this leadership is equivalent to denying these pedagogical discussions. It is seen as a lack of trust and respect.

Student success

There were questions about the efficiency of the pedagogical counselors in Sherbrooke: while those counselors were saying that they had both the willingness and the ability to better serve and be closer to pedagogy, it was also mentioned on the campuses that there was often a confusion of roles, even if the help was welcomed. There would certainly be a gain if a Director of Studies in authority could bring it all together because in the end, students would be better served.

Student Services are also an important component of student success. It was mentioned that a closer link between a Director of Studies and Student Services would again benefit the students. A strong relationship between Student Services and pedagogy will undoubtedly help develop well-rounded individuals. Students who participate in sports or cultural activities while performing well in class will develop the ability to balance their life and eventually become good citizens. Again, this could have an impact on other “Deans” such as the Deans responsible of Student Services, which would then require further consideration.

In Continuing Education, the College wants to respond to community and industry needs, but once in the classroom, the students deserve to be accompanied. The pedagogical vision that can be developed and implemented for adult education is crucial for their success. Again the role of the Director of Studies can be very important by assisting in bridging needs across the campuses and working directly with Campus Directors.

In short, student success requires that regular education, Continuing Education and Student Services have a strategic academic thinker above it all. This person should be the Director of Studies.

Teamwork

An academic team has to be “tight” and communication has to travel with great fluidity. It is impossible to build a team if there is no authority. It was mentioned by personnel of all divisions of the College that they do not feel that they are related to the Ministry or to the CEEC in any fashion. The campuses do not get information about changes in rules or upcoming events. By the same token, they

will also say that the Director of Studies does not know all that is happening on the campuses.

As previously mentioned, the Deans may find it very difficult to respond to two persons when one of them is not their supervisor. Instructions from the Director of Studies are seen as an addition to the numerous tasks that have to be performed.

There is an academic team composed of individuals who register students, administer the workloads, perform program evaluations and certify students, but there is no academic team reflecting pedagogy. This cannot be done from a remote central office.

Efficiency

There is no value-added brought by the Director of Studies in this structure. This person is in charge of all the important dossiers and yet, does not control anything.

Should there be an important academic mistake committed on any of the campuses, the Director of Studies would be accountable by law for this misstep. Of course the Campus Directors would stand up for him or her and offer explanations, but the Director of Studies would remain accountable.

Summary: The preceding analysis based on College interviews has led to the understanding that the notion of an “academic team” is a very incomplete one in the present structure. In my opinion, the College would gain by having three strong academic teams, autonomous and differentiated, but all contributing to the CRC mission.

Whatever the change in the Academic or College structure, it is recommended to bring together the Director of Studies and the Deans within a hierarchical relationship in order to encourage the development of a real academic team, improved leadership and overall pedagogical development.

Challenges

The first part of this chapter assessed the roles and responsibilities of the Director of Studies with the help of all the input received through the questionnaires and interviews that were conducted within the community. I have also summarized this input according to dimensions that characterize the work of a Director of Studies.

This next section will identify the challenges that will further help us in determining and assessing the recommendations pertaining to the structure. These challenges will serve as guiding principles for the rest of the study.

The challenge of legality

The previous content has shown that the College Act defines the roles and responsibilities of an Academic Dean.

CHALLENGE 1: A better qualitative fit between By-law 1 and the College Act in order to reflect all the important responsibilities in defining the role of this pedagogical leader of the College.

The challenge of sound administration principles

In the management of an organization, the structure of the organization consists in defining relationships based on hierarchy, a structure of authority that will eventually bring the organization to success. There are different ways to exercise this authority, some ways softer than others, but the hierarchy is important. It is the base of the plan, to get things done, to evaluate and praise the good work.

CHALLENGE 2: The recognition of the necessary hierarchical relationship that should exist at the pedagogical level between the Director of Studies and the Campus Deans.

The challenge of pedagogical leadership

In post-secondary education institutions, faculty and staff very often have Master's degrees and PHDs. They are well-educated and will claim to belong to a community and, as such, fully participate in it. This means consultations and discussions. In this setting, the role of the Director of Studies is crucial as the

leader of pedagogical exchanges, introducing new approaches, practices and government changes, motivating troops, etc. The Director of Studies is the “champion of pedagogy”.

CHALLENGE 3: Introduction of a fuller academic life at the campus level brought by the actions of the Director of Studies.

The challenge of limited resources and monetary cost difference

In the actual context of resource scarcity and cuts, it is crucial for CRC to make the best use possible of its resources and persons. As we have seen there seems to be a missing element in campus pedagogical leadership, while we have two hors-cadres at College administration.

CHALLENGE 4: Development of a model that will respect the roles of the Director General and the Director of Studies and not present overlaps, while maintaining the understanding that the Director of Studies reports to the Director General in his capacity as the individual accountable for all aspects of College operations. As well, it must be a model in which the academic management and leadership will respect the management of the rest of the campuses’ services.

The challenges of history and distance

It has been mentioned often that, for Champlain, the distance constitutes an important determinism when analyzing different opportunities of change. Pedagogical leadership and relationships being the true ingredients of a sound Academic administration should be, as much as possible, shielded from the negative aspects brought by the distance factor.

CHALLENGE 5: Develop a model in which the Academic administration will be able to develop its leadership mitigating the barrier of distance as much as possible.

Chapter Summary

This second chapter has identified that the reason for having central services (economies of scale) does not apply for the management of academics. Pedagogical management should occur where the students, faculty, deans, Student Services and Continuing Education are located given that the

development of leadership is inseparable from the persons and the discussions that take place and shape the academic management.

Pedagogical life requires that a Director of Studies be anchored in the academic environment, to understand what is going on and to stimulate pedagogical innovation. This in turn will create an interesting working environment, respectful of the personnel's potential.

A good working environment is also to be developed for the Director of Studies. The incumbent of this position has a difficult job and having the administrative means and tools to do it is critical.

The position of Director of Studies should be valued and respected. This person is the pedagogical leader of the College and as such, should have all the gratification that such responsibilities command, and that he or she be recognized as a College leader when on campus.

This respect and gratification should come from three sources:

- 1- by a revision of the position's roles and responsibilities in the College By-law (according to the College Act).
- 2- by a change in the title to Academic Dean: it should belong to the person who is executing the definition of the position and has been chosen according to the College Act and By-law1.
- 3- by the implementation of a hierarchical link between the Academic Dean and the academic personnel, as everyone else requires in their own field.

Chapter 3

Change of structure recommendations

The scenarios concerning different propositions for structure change are presented in the table attached. We have used the challenges to analyze the options.

Comparative Analysis of Scenarios

Scenario	Advantages/Benefits	Disadvantages/Costs	Critical Factor of Success
A. Status-quo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ No change to administer ✚ No monetary cost difference 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Legality ✚ Administration principle ✚ Pedagogical leadership ✚ Distance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Enhance the meetings and committee work between the DS, Deans and CDir ✚ Presence of DS on campus
B. Matrix structure in which the DS and CDir are responsible for the Deans in different regards; DS in Sherbrooke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Legality ✚ Administration principle ✚ Pedagogical leadership and line of command ✚ No monetary cost difference 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Change management ✚ History (Danger to fall back to the previous structure) ✚ Distance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Support from the Director General and CDir ✚ Presence of DS on campuses
C. Matrix structure in which the DS and CDir are responsible for the Deans in different regards; DS in St Lambert	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Legality ✚ Administration principle ✚ Pedagogical leadership ✚ Limited resources ✚ Working environment ✚ Distance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Change management ✚ Other campuses' reactions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Support from the Director General and CDir ✚ Presence of DS on campuses
D. 1 DS located in St Lambert and supervisor of all academic departments including the campuses The CDir manage all other services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Legality ✚ Administration principle ✚ Pedagogical leadership ✚ Working environment ✚ Distance ✚ Limited resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Change management ✚ Readjustment in the CDir's responsibilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Timing to work out ✚ Gradual implementation ✚ Presence of DS on campuses

<p>E. 3 DS (1 in each campus) and complete academic independence (3 Com studies) The CDir manage all other aspects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Pedagogical leadership ✚ Working environment ✚ Monetary cost difference ✚ Distance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Legal changes required ✚ Change management ✚ CDir would be losing influence over their campus ✚ Limited resources ✚ Costly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Would have to work out the link between 3 Commission of Studies and Board of Governors
<p>F. DS in each campus is also Campus Director (Lanaudière model) 3 Com studies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Pedagogical leadership ✚ Working environment ✚ Not so far from the existing structure ✚ No selection process required ✚ Limited resources ✚ Monetary cost difference ✚ Distance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Legal changes required ✚ Change management ✚ Campus director having academic background ✚ Work on the Commission of Studies and campus pedagogical committees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ What happens to the Board of Governors? Degree to which we accept the Lanaudière model has to be defined
<p>G. The CDir are under the supervision of the DS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Legality ✚ Structure similar to the present model ✚ Limited resources ✚ No monetary cost difference ✚ Distance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Change management ✚ CDir having academic background ✚ CDir would be losing influence over their campus ✚ Pedagogical leadership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✚ Change management strategy

DS: Director of Studies
CDir: Campus Director(s)

From the previous models, consultations have led me to abandon the C & D Models as it is not collectively wished that one Campus gain more importance in the present structure. The E Model mostly due to the high costs incurred will not be retained either for further analysis.

Discussion of the three models retained and final recommendations

In the next section we will further define the following three models:

- Model B: Matrix structure in which the Director of Studies and the Campus Directors are responsible for the Deans in different regards

- Model G: The Director of Studies supervises the Campus Directors (DSCD)
- Model F: The Campus Director becomes a Campus Director of Studies

Model B: Matrix structure in which the Director of Studies and the Campus Directors are responsible for the Deans in different regards.

In this model the Director of Studies is located in Sherbrooke and he or she is responsible for the Academic Office and shares the supervision of the Deans with the Campus Director. While the Campus Directors would still have the responsibility of supervision of the Deans for day-to-day “operational” tasks, (e.g. teacher workloads, budgeting, etc.), the Director of Studies would exercise all strategic and tactical decision-making and management related to the functions of the Director of Studies.

The straight line of command between the Director of Studies and the Deans on campus ensures that the Director of Studies is responsible and accountable for the academic administration from top to bottom, in the following areas as per the Colleges Act:

1. Implement programs that are accepted by the Ministry.
2. Plan, organize and offer all credited courses (DEC and AEC).
3. Plan, organize and supervise teaching and teaching support.
4. Admit students and sanction the completeness of a DEC.
5. Develop and administer policies and by-laws that will support and monitor pedagogical life and rules.

The Campus Directors continue to act in support of the academic operations and development, including management of the other components complementary to academics such as:

- a. Required facilities : classrooms, gym, labs and offices
- b. Information technologies: labs, software, computers, technologies, the web site, the telecommunications, etc.
- c. Financial budgeting and budget updates
- d. Human resources aspects: selection of personnel and allocation, legal advice, etc.
- e. Screening of opportunities and development on Campus of Continuing Education activities
- f. Student services

The following diagram can best illustrate this kind of management structure. The numbers refer to the actions performed by the Director of Studies while the letters refer to the action of other services managed by the Campus Director. This model relies on hierarchy but also on the good will and collaboration between the Campus Director and Director of Studies.

Director of Studies Role Campus Director Role		Strategic and Tactical Decision-making				
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Operational Decision-making	a.					
	b.					
	c.					
	d.					
	e.					
	f.					

This management model is used in modern organizations and is quite inspirational concerning all the teamwork and collaboration that can happen at any intersection of the matrix. This model can be conducive to more reflection on how things are done.

At first glance the matrix model doesn't represent any monetary cost differences. This model would have the benefit of improving the pedagogical leadership and also conform to the College Act. There wouldn't be a necessity to revise the patent letters.

Of course this model does not resolve the distance issue and the necessary presence of the Director of Studies on campus. However, due to the fact that the Deans would be more closely linked with the Director of Studies, it is my opinion that such a way of doing would greatly improve the situation and bring harmony to an Academic team.

The downside of such a model resides in the fact that there would be a change in responsibilities for the Campus Directors as the Academics would not rely on their coordination anymore. There would be a need to re-evaluate the role and responsibilities of the Campus Director in light of this change. It would be critical

to manage this change with tact and “doigté” required by such a situation. Could the development of new projects in Continuing Education benefit from this availability of Campus Directors?

Another possible pitfall might be the danger to fall back to the previous model. Therefore, it would be essential for the Director General and the Board of Governors to support the Director of Studies and the Campus Directors in their revised role. In order to establish the new line of command, influence and trust between the Deans and their Director of Studies, there would be the need for a very regular presence of the Director of Studies on the campuses, and mostly in the early stage of the change.

Model G: the Director of Studies supervises the Campus Directors (DSCD)

In such a model, the pedagogical leadership would come from the Campus Directors who would remain the Deans’ supervisor. The difference would now be that the Campus Director would be reporting to the Director of Studies located in Sherbrooke. In such a model, we more formally recognize the fact that the campus are first and foremost, academic entities and as such, should be governed by the Director of Studies. Even if the hierarchical link between a Campus Director and a Director of Studies is not a usual one, it is one allowed by the Plan de Classification.

Since the Director of Studies would manage and monitor all the academic activities and development on the campuses, the model is respectful of the College Act. As we would be using the same resources, the difference in the monetary cost wouldn’t be significant either.

The Campus Directors are presently very knowledgeable of pedagogy and such a change would mean a change in mindset for them, but as Campus Directors, they have had to manage the academic side. This would mean devoting more time to academic committee participation and getting closer to students and faculty to gain a better understanding.

An important drawback is brought by the introduction of a formal level of management between the Deans and the Director of Studies. In the past model, one could think that collaboration and communication could exist between the Director of Studies, the Campus Directors, and the Deans. This model reinforces

the hierarchy which is equivalent to adding another administrative level, thus positioning the Director of Studies still further away from the academic action.

F- The Campus Director becomes a Campus Director of Studies

This model would transform the position of Campus Director into a “Campus Director of Studies”. It has the benefit of giving more responsibilities to the people who are already present on campus, while at the same time improving the pedagogical leadership on each campus.

As of now, the persons in the Campus Director positions are very knowledgeable of pedagogy and such a change would mean a change in mindset for them, but, as mentioned before, they have had to manage the academic side. Again, it would mean devoting more time to academic committee participation and getting closer to students and faculty. It would mean being present at the CAP table and representing their campus (or constituency).

As for the Commission of Studies, depending on the final decision on the patent letters from the Ministry, there would be a need for the CRC to change the by-law concerning the Commission of Studies to maybe recognize three Commissions of Studies within the CEGEP. At this point, however, there are already pedagogical committees on each campus. The blending of the discussions and decisions brought to the Board of Governors could happen between the Director General and the three Campus Directors of Study. Should this option be the final choice, my recommendation would be to live by the model of one Commission of Studies and three local ones in order to analyze the situation and see what is feasible and what might best fit with the role Champlain’s central office wants to exercise.

Concerning the legal feasibility, there would be the need to engage in discussions with the Ministry and the first step would be to ask for derogation in the short-term, with the possibility of a change brought to the College’s letters patent in the nearby future. The derogation could concern the possibility of transforming the position of Director of Studies into three Campus Directors of Study.

Whether we consider the application of the College Act, the leadership aspect, or the distance factor, this model appears to be the best suited. The costs on the other hand, both monetary and non-monetary are quite important. On the non-monetary side, the time required for a change in patent letters, added to the uncertainty of the outcome, are bound to add to the global cost. Monetarily

speaking, according to the Director of Finance of the College, transforming CRC into the Lanaudière model would mean a difference of approximately 230 000\$ to 318 000\$. This of course could bring up the question of our motivation to do it in a less costly fashion. It is for sure the most costly model of the three.

Chapter Summary

Given the above analysis, the three last models are all very worthwhile and resolve the difficulties that had been identified. Choosing one of them requires balancing the idealistic point of view and the feasibility and stability aspects embedded in each.

While the Campus Directors of Studies model is very attractive from the idealistic point of view, it represents uncertainty and costs substantially higher than in the two other cases. The matrix and the DSCD are less disruptive from the past, but will require some change management strategies in order to smoothly accomplish the transition and to not fall back to old practices. The matrix model is, in my view, the preferred one between the two because it does not introduce another layer of management between the Deans and the Director of Studies. The Campus Directors will continue to report to the Director General while the Deans will report to the Director of Studies on issues and matters directly related to the academic and pedagogical mission of the College. This model presents more cohesion for the academic thought and the development of a true team able to cope with distance and time.

Chapter 4

Model Analysis

So far, this study has demonstrated the need to give each campus a pedagogical leadership through the action of a Director of Studies. It has also demonstrated that to be in line with the College Act, the Director of Studies has to be responsible and accountable of the whole academic process.

It has further recognized that Champlain is a reality of three campuses and a central office that have managed to live together and provide excellent services to students for a long time. Under the supervision of Campus Directors the campuses have developed and are successful. However, the interviews have shed light on the need for more pedagogical exchanges and projects to develop on each campus and these require coordinated efforts and teamwork supervised by the Director of Studies.

Having heard the whole community on the subject of the position and responsibilities of the Director of Studies, having reflected on the more practical aspects of the choice and the importance of not submitting the organization to stress and uncertainty, I would recommend that Champlain Regional College opt for either the matrix structure option, or the Campus Director becoming the Campus Director of Studies Model.

What is best for Champlain Regional College? It has been shown that it is a solution that would abide by the law, and it has also been demonstrated that it is a solution that would contribute to the development of a strong pedagogical leadership, of a clear and shared vision on pedagogy, and the establishment of a true dialog between the Director of Studies and his/her team. Can this happen with both models? I think the answer is yes.

If the Matrix Model speaks about more continuity and less costs, the danger of falling back to the former structure excluding the Director of Studies is certainly an important and possible pitfall.

Consequently, the critical factors of the success of the implementation of this model would then be:

- A constant monitoring by the Director General to ensure that the structure is respected and that people abide by their role;

- A clear definition of roles: the Deans respond to the Director of Studies and they work collaboratively with the services; and
- A change in the College By-law 1 (as recommended) to enhance the importance of the pedagogical management process as being a responsibility of the Director of Studies

The Campus Director becoming Campus Director of Studies Model is a more risky choice at first, but a choice that could lead to very interesting pedagogical developments in the future. It would mean internal and external changes encompassing a series of short, medium, and long-term actions coupled with an organizational reflection process.

The following table can summarize some aspects of the foreseen change along with the short-term and longer-term actions needed.

Aspects	Short term actions	Long term actions
Legal aspects	Derogation needed to have the three Campus Directors of Studies	Change of letters patent for CRC to change to the Lanaudière model or definition of a new model
Director of studies	The Campus Director is named Campus Director of Studies	The Campus Director is a hors cadre remunerated as in the Lanaudière model
Commission of studies	Three local pedagogical committees and the traditional Commission of Studies	a) Three Commissions of Studies OR b) One Commission of Studies (plus 3 local) becomes an instance of integration of information in a new model in which there is one Board of Governors
Board of Governors	One Board of Governors	a) Three Conseils d'établissement and one Board of Governors in the Lanaudière model OR b) One Board of Governors
By-Law 1	Temporary modification	Modification
By-Law 2 (Commission of studies)	No modification	Modification

Other working committees	<p>a) Committee on the Commission of studies: Campus Directors of Studies and Director General (...) meet to manage transition and study the Commission of Studies needed in the future</p> <p>b) Committee on the Board: DG and Campus Directors of Studies (...) evaluate the need for Conseils d'établissement or to continue with one Board of Governors</p>	Director General Committee with the three Campus Directors of Studies. (present in the Lanaudière model)
Director General Advising Committee	No change	No change

The question to tackle will be to define to what extent the CRC wants to implement the Lanaudière model. The discussions to have with the Ministry might also concern the possibility to bring changes without necessarily adopting the whole model of Lanaudière. Such a question is also dependent on the role played by the central office in Sherbrooke, hence the institutional reflection process.

The short-term the following steps could be:

- ❖ Get a derogation to transform the position of Director of Studies into three Campus Directors of Study;
- ❖ Name the Campus Directors as Campus Directors of Studies;
- ❖ Allow the pedagogical committees to work as they are doing chaired by the Campus Director of Studies and maintain the overall Commission of studies with a rotation in chairmanship;
- ❖ Maintain the Board of Governors as is;
- ❖ Initiate consultations and discussions to better understand and develop the College's specificities in blending the three differing realities into ONE vision;
- ❖ Pursue with the implementation of the model concerning the Commission of Studies and the Board of Governors.

The next questions for Champlain Regional College to address will concern the scope in time, in investment, and in change management that it is willing to consider in order to choose one model or the other.

Conclusion

The two last chapters have explained how two models are better suited to resolve and clarify the situation of the Director of Studies at Champlain Regional College.

My final recommendation would be to opt for a Director of Studies per campus. Two major reasons justify my choice, the first of which is conceptual and the second, historical. While the first reason will justify my choice for the model with three Directors of Studies, the second reason will caution the College about choosing the Matrix model.

College education is part of Superior Education. While it is not University teaching and learning, in CEGEPs, we are slowly bringing our students to higher levels of academics. This reality should, in turn, make a difference on the organization of academics. The development of learning and teaching communities is central to this level of education. In recent years, pedagogical research has grown in CEGEPs and we have become aware that this level of learning and teaching is not the same as the precedent and the following ones. It has made a place of its own.

Superior education means high-level instructors with Masters and Doctorate degrees who form a community. Programs are communities and should be lead by a Director of Studies whose main preoccupation will be to develop the pedagogy, the learning and teaching that occurs on campus, to instill a vision. These strategic and tactical directions are vital in that they allow continuous critique and improvement. In a setting such as the three Champlain campuses, the distance and the size make it so difficult, nearly impossible for one person to spearhead all these possibilities, this potential. A Director of Studies needs to be rooted in his/her environment.

The second reason to justify my recommendation is that given the past history of Champlain and the difficulties for the Director of Studies to have a role based on accountability with the necessary authority, it is my duty in finishing this report, to caution the College (before implementing the Matrix model), about the huge probability to fall back to the previous model and difficulties. In my vision: it is too close for comfort!!! If we could implement a matrix model with the presence of a Director of Studies on each campus, I would be less inclined to think that it could return to what it was.

Bibliography

- Champlain Regional College. (2002, June 147). *Policy for the Evaluation of Programs Leading to a Diploma of College Studies*. Sherbrooke, QC: Author. Retrieved from <http://admin.crc-sher.qc.ca/wp-content/themes/champlain/pdf/policies/PolicyProgramEvaluationDEC.pdf>
- Champlain Regional College. (2003, May 21). *Institutional self-evaluation report*. Sherbrooke, QC: Author.
- Champlain Regional College. (2005, June 17). *Institutional Policy for the Evaluation of Programs Leading to an Attestation of Studies (A.E.C.)*. Sherbrooke, QC: Author. Retrieved from <http://admin.crc-sher.qc.ca/wp-content/themes/champlain/pdf/policies/PolicyProgramEvaluationAEC.pdf>
- Champlain Regional College. (2006, April 26). *Overview and Evaluation of the Responsibilities of the Director of Studies*. Sherbrooke, QC: Author.
- Champlain Regional College. (2009, September 25). *Bylaw Concerning the Commission of Studies*. Sherbrooke, QC: Author. Retrieved from <http://admin.crc-sher.qc.ca/wp-content/themes/champlain/pdf/bylaw/bylaw2.pdf>
- Champlain Regional College. (2009, September 25). *Institutional Guideline for Student Involvement*. Sherbrooke, QC: Author. Retrieved from <http://admin.crc-sher.qc.ca/wp-content/themes/champlain/pdf/policies/InstitutionalGuidelineforStudentInvolvement.pdf>
- Champlain Regional College. (2009, September 25). *Policy on the Revision of Academic Programs leading to a Diploma of College Studies*. Sherbrooke, QC: Author. Retrieved from <http://admin.crc-sher.qc.ca/wp-content/themes/champlain/pdf/policies/PolicyonAcademicPrograms.pdf>
- Champlain Regional College. (2009, October 28). *Bylaw Concerning Student Success*. Sherbrooke, QC: Author. Retrieved from <http://admin.crc-sher.qc.ca/wp-content/themes/champlain/pdf/bylaw/bylaw8.pdf>
- Champlain Regional College. (2011, February 16). *Bylaw Concerning Students' Admission to DEC Programs*. Sherbrooke, QC: Author. Retrieved from <http://admin.crc-sher.qc.ca/wp-content/themes/champlain/pdf/bylaw/bylaw7.pdf>
- Champlain Regional College. (2011, June 17). *Institutional Policy on the Evaluation of Student Achievement*. Sherbrooke, QC: Author. Retrieved from <http://admin.crc-sher.qc.ca/wp-content/themes/champlain/pdf/policies/IPESA.pdf>
- Champlain Regional College. (2013, October 25). *Bylaw Concerning the Appointment, the Renewal of Appointment, and the Evaluation of Senior Executive*. Sherbrooke, QC: Author. Retrieved from <http://admin.crc-sher.qc.ca/wp-content/themes/champlain/pdf/bylaw/bylaw3.pdf>

Champlain Regional College. (2013, October 25). *Bylaw Concerning the General Administration of the College*. Sherbrooke, QC: Author. Retrieved from <http://admin.crc-sher.qc.ca/wp-content/themes/champlain/pdf/bylaw/bylaw1.pdf>

Champlain Regional College. (2012, March 7). *Director of Studies* (Unpublished job description). Sherbrooke, QC: Human Resources, Champlain Regional College.

Champlain Regional College. (2015). *Institutional Policy on the Management of Academic Programs* (Draft policy submitted for approval). Sherbrooke, QC: Author.

College Education Regulations (RLRQ, Chapter C-29, r. 4). Retrieved from http://www2.publicationsduquebec.gouv.qc.ca/dynamicSearch/telecharge.php?type=3&file=/C_29/C29R4_A.HTM

General and Vocational Colleges Act (RLRQ, Chapter C-29). Retrieved from http://www2.publicationsduquebec.gouv.qc.ca/dynamicSearch/telecharge.php?type=2&file=/C_29/C29_A.html