

**How can a Student-Centered approach inform
Student Complaint Policy
Revisions to be more Inclusive?**

**by
Gail Little**

Provincial Instructor Diploma Program, Vancouver Community College, 2020

Project Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Education

in the
Educational Leadership Program
Faculty of Education

© Gail Little 2022
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
Summer 2022

Copyright in this work is held by the author. Please ensure that any reproduction or re-use is done in accordance with the relevant national copyright legislation.

Declaration of Committee

Name: **Gail Little**

Degree: **Master of Education**

Title: **How can a Student-Centered approach inform Student Complaint Policy Revisions to be more Inclusive?**

Committee: **Chair: Michelle Nilson**
Associate Professor, Education

Michelle Pidgeon
Supervisor
Associate Professor, Education

Tina Fraser
Committee Member
Adjunct Professor, Education

Becky Cox
Examiner
Associate Professor, Education

Ethics Statement

The author, whose name appears on the title page of this work, has obtained, for the research described in this work, either:

- a. human research ethics approval from the Simon Fraser University Office of Research Ethics

or

- b. advance approval of the animal care protocol from the University Animal Care Committee of Simon Fraser University

or has conducted the research

- c. as a co-investigator, collaborator, or research assistant in a research project approved in advance.

A copy of the approval letter has been filed with the Theses Office of the University Library at the time of submission of this thesis or project.

The original application for approval and letter of approval are filed with the relevant offices. Inquiries may be directed to those authorities.

Simon Fraser University Library
Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada

Update Spring 2016

Abstract

The College of New Caledonia (CNC) released a Strategic Plan recently which emphasized dedication to a student-centered approach to teaching and learning. The institution values student feedback and provides a formal student complaint resolution process. It was outdated at the time of this research and did not reflect societal changes.¹ This mixed methods research using quantitative survey and semi-structured qualitative interviews was conducted in 2021-2022 with first- and second-year CNC students to understand student needs related to this policy and process. The key findings are that plain language and easy access are fundamental for modern, culturally sensitive, post-secondary policies. Furthermore, the author recommends an increasing focus on relationships between staff and students to guide future policy revisions in an evolving institution.

Keywords: Student-centered; Complaint resolution; Policy revision; Quality assurance; Policies and trends in post-secondary; Student rights; Inclusive

¹<https://cnc.bc.ca/about/policies>

Table of Contents

Declaration of Committee.....	ii
Ethics Statement.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
Introduction.....	1
Literature Review.....	2
Complaint Resolution.....	2
Quality Assurance.....	4
Student Centered Approach.....	6
Context and Purpose of Research.....	11
Methodology.....	13
Recruitment Process.....	14
Data Collection Procedures.....	14
Survey.....	14
Interviews.....	15
Analysis.....	15
Limitations.....	15
Findings.....	17
Discussion.....	19
Student perspectives on rights and complaint resolution.....	20
Recommendations.....	20
Recommendations for Future Research.....	24
References.....	25
Appendix A. 3rd party Consent Form.....	27
Appendix B. Online Survey Consent Form.....	28
Appendix C. Informed Consent for Focus Group.....	31
Appendix D. Participant #1 Interview.....	35
Appendix E. Participant #2 Interview.....	46
Appendix F. Survey Questions.....	55
Appendix G. Letter of Invitation.....	58

Introduction

Over the past 50 years, tens of thousands of people have accessed education through the College of New Caledonia (CNC) located in central British Columbia. In 2019-2020, CNC served students comprising of 1613 Indigenous students, 2122 international students from 38 countries, students with disabilities, and domestic students in academic, vocational, trades and continuing education programs (CNC, 2021). Staff at the institution have encountered concerns about the Student Complaint Resolution policy [E-1.27](#), which is intended to provide students with a process for filing complaints. When students wanted to submit a complaint because they felt mistreated, experienced racial prejudice or experienced unprofessionalism, our resolution process was not sufficient or practical, so the students were not satisfied. On many occasions' students reported feeling overwhelmed enough by the thirteen-page document, to deter them from proceeding. The process and the policy are currently not student-centered at the CNC. Consequently, the research was conducted to determine how the institution might best develop a better system. Before collecting quantitative data, I reviewed recent literature about institutional complaint resolution, making this a mixed method study.

Literature Review

The results align well with my findings from primary research. I focused on the following topics:

- Complaint resolution
- Quality assurance in public institutions
- Student centered approach to policy updates
- Trends in Post-Secondary Institutions' policy and procedures

Complaint Resolution

When student concerns are not quickly acknowledged in a respectful way onsite at the time of the complaint, they can escalate and result in costly unnecessary interventions outside of the institution. According to Simmons and Brennon (2017), institutions are moving towards increased interaction between citizens and the services they consume. Complaint resolution is an example of an area where many post-secondary institutions have learned to engage the students and improve internal responsiveness based on their needs. In the past, when policies were originally developed, complaints were commonly addressed in a manner that disassociated the person from the administration handling the issue (Simmons & Brennon, 2017). Wharf and Mackenzie (2017) discussed the pitfalls of the outdated hierarchal approach to complaint resolution in a manner consistent throughout the literature review. The needs of students' concerns are not met using a single approach. Much of the literature around complaint resolution mentions flexibility, cultural safety, and immediate responsiveness (Wharf & Mackenzie, 2017). It is widely understood that institutional problems must be solved within the context of the culture, because assimilation can be the result of a biased approach (Kovach, 2021). Complaint resolution in today's institutions is generally understood to be more of a fluid and inclusionary process

than it was in the past and this is a result of a more culture conscious society (Kovach, 2021).

A recent mixed methods study about reputation management (Ku et al., 2021) focused on how companies responded to social media complaints and how the study participants' (students) personal perceptions of their own involvement affected the final results. The study focused on 247 students in a university. It was a quasi-experimental qualitative study which found that unsuccessful complaint handling eroded trust between students and the institution. The authors also noted that independent self-identity was linked with erosion of trust. The findings of this study suggest the need for firms to take into consideration consumer self-identity when dealing with internet-based grievances. Companies need to thoughtfully tailor communication to build trust among observers who self-view predominantly as independent. This can be approached by demonstrating a genuine wish to problem-solve. Essentially, collaboration and feeling like they are part of a group is important for students. This study is relevant because it can guide policy makers towards an understanding of underlying psychological processes that might affect complaint resolution at the college (Ku et al., 2021).

Wiley publishes legal cases about American campuses which can serve as a snapshot of possible worst-case scenarios where student complaints were not appropriately solved at campus level and needed court intervention. The 2019 May edition highlights a few relevant cases by Willits and Gelpy (2019). For example, there is a short case letter in a legal publication from Columbia University that is particularly relevant. The letter describes a case where a student was denied multiple accommodations based on her disability. After the case ruled in her favour, the following accommodations were mandated by the courts:

1. Disability services must notify instructors that the student is able to leave when she feels triggered without repercussions.
2. A 2009 case for sexual misconduct is not to be discussed by any staff or students.
3. Training is to be provided for all staff for diversity and inclusion.
4. The institution must keep all appointments with the student (Willits & Gelpy, 2019).

Quality Assurance

Stalmeiger, a cognitive psychologist at Maastricht University in the Netherlands, together with three educational scientists from the same institution, conducted a mixed methods study within their university which focused on quality assurance. Specifically, the authors found that when course instructors are responsible for pass/fail grading, it is often difficult for students to provide constructive feedback (Stalmeijer et al., 2016). Evaluation questionnaires were used in this study to explore the concept of involving the students in the process. The qualitative study explored a variety of summative and formative assessments of quality within the university where the study was conducted. The research team analyzed data through a combination of quantitative and qualitative techniques. They used a Likert-scale questionnaire, semi-structured focus groups, and a critical incident technique and concluded that when included in a powerful way in quality assurance, students felt that they were more in charge. They also reported that they ended up more focused on their studies after quality assurance measures were taken. Furthermore, they searched for common ground more frequently with staff, and they faced the potential for power differential head on. Students from health sciences programs were given quality assurance training, and then the opportunity to evaluate the training and reflect on their internal quality assurance role. The group suggested future research on further ways to help students contribute to the quality assurance process and build the competencies of the students themselves in the review process (Stalmeijer et al., 2016).

In 2001, Biggs stated that it is important to carefully consider what is meant by the term quality (Biggs, 2001, as cited by Goff, 2017). A 2017 study by McMaster University professor Lori Goff looked at how quality assurance processes are implemented within a variety of post-secondary institutions around the world. For her empirical data, Goff conducted semi-structured interviews with administrators in 21 universities throughout Ontario. Goff requested volunteers from a wide array of senior administration across the province to participate. Willing participants were questioned to determine their recommended strategies for implementing quality assurance processes. Goff found that a variety of approaches are currently taken in Ontario with varying degrees of success. The final result of Goff's research was that a more complex spectrum with three main approaches to quality assurance is recommended, including: 1. defending quality, 2. demonstrating quality, and 3. enhancing quality (Goff, 2017). Goff interviewed administrators responsible for policy to explore conceptions, strategies, and approaches to policy reform. Goff concluded that senior university administrators need to consider student input and study their strategies for implementing quality assurance processes. She stated, "there are new interests in creating policies, processes, and frameworks to help assure and account for this educational quality" (Goff, 2017, p.179). McMaster University has since implemented pre-mid-end of course feedback through their online platform. This literature described the quality assurance framework that was developed by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents in 2017 in response to international trends in quality assurance and implemented by 21 Ontario universities in 2011 (Goff, 2017).

Goff stated that complaint resolution involves a complex spectrum of responses with three main approaches: an approach aimed at defending quality, an approach aimed at demonstrating quality, and an approach aimed at enhancing quality. It is important to not only improve the quality of programs to reflect shifting trends in society, but it is also important to define quality assurance itself. The study states that defining quality is a difficult task, and recommends an inquiry approach (Biggs, as cited in Goff, 2017). Even in

complex situations the best way of enhancing quality for students in any institution is to put them at the center of the process.

Student Centered Approach

An article by Isaeva et al. (2020), described their qualitative study at an 8000 student Estonian university. Specifically, their study explored how dialogue between the students and their institution can guide decision makers towards quality assurance. For their research, these scholars carried out semi-structured interviews with 27 students from various departments. Through careful transcription and coding, the researchers confirmed that student roles and responsibilities must be made very clear to them in order to effectively involve them in the quality assurance process. The team used specific quality assurance phases to guide their conclusions during the coding phase. “After discussions, the following categories were determined as pre-conditions for improving a dialogue for better student engagement: (1) distributing information; (2) establishing a relationship; (3) building a partnership; (4) partnership for improvement” (Isaeva et al., 2020, p.8). Additionally, the data were analyzed to explore what the pre-conditions are for a dialogue that improves student engagement in the quality assurance processes. This study confirms that student engagement and collaboration between them and administration are critical elements of modern policy reforms. The article makes a strong argument that relationships are important between the institution and the students. Furthermore, students must be consultants rather than informants in the process, and there are benefits for students and institutions when this is undertaken properly (Isaeva et al., 2020).

Capelos et al., (2016) provided valuable insights for post-secondary policy reform through a citizen-centered frame. As water filtration experts in a regional district setting, they found that the reputation of that institution can influence the behaviour of the citizens. They argued that organizations need to look more deeply into the specific components of reputation for a better understanding of

the overall impact on water usage compliance, which in this research project would be student compliance. The quantitative study was conducted in a government institution through survey data collection and analysis. The researchers defined reputation as a collective assessment and simplified characterization of an object, which contains evaluative judgements. It is a distribution of specific images, favourable or unfavourable, embedded in networks of multiple audiences such as citizens, specific stakeholders, or interest groups (Wartick, 2014, as cited by Capelos et al., 2016). They found that favourable perceptions of certain components of the reputation of that water company shape the levels of satisfaction with organizational outputs. This can be directly linked to the “organizational output” of post-secondary institutions in the sense that if policy is reformed to improve the college’s reputation, that could have a positive impact on student success overall, based on these findings (Capelos et al., 2016).

The Canadian general population is becoming more diverse, and it is imperative to meet holistic methodological needs. CNC has recently demonstrated a commitment to reforming the institution’s image by updating the strategic plan. Canadian Indigenous researchers are finding ways to apply their own epistemologies into their research work. Indigenous methodologies are often absent when scholars learn how to conduct research (Adebayo et al., 2014). We must come to understand Indigenous ways of being within the contexts of capitalism, individualism, and private property. This means considering the opinions of elders and the community in all decisions around policies and procedures (Adebayo et al., 2014). According to Adebayo et al., there have been examples of institutions taking the perspective that consultation with elders is primitive or inferior. Conflict can be addressed through different mechanisms than the one currently employed, such collaboration, mediation, cooperation, conciliation, and negotiation. Adebayo’s book also has valuable information about differing views on complaints. Understandings of conflict could possibly be based on a different epistemology i.e., the Indigenous and related practices. Chapter 9 of this publication is of particular interest. Mallory Primm (2014)

conducted a case study of the Swaziland Law Courts in order to highlight how Western institutions might successfully integrate existing conflict resolution procedures into an Indigenous system. That case study was conducted through archival research, extensive surveys, interviews, and observations of arbitration. It concluded that although procedural inconsistencies existed within that system, individuals there value the presence of a formal conflict resolution system when traditional methods fail to solve conflicts. The study notes also that the system has a strong reliance on oral arbitration, collaboration, and holistic problem solving involving all parties, as opposed to a top-down approach. Linda Tuhiwai Smith says: 'the word itself, "research", is probably one of the dirtiest words in the Indigenous world's vocabulary (Adebayo et al., 2014, p.123).

University of Victoria researchers Potts and Brown (2015) discussed the importance of revisiting critical, Indigenous, and anti-oppressive approaches for policy revision. Their writing on research and resistance outlines how academics can take an anti-oppressive approach to research in academic and business settings. This approach can also be taken by policy designers in post-secondary institutions. Potts and Brown describe how academics, researchers, and people in positions of power can commit to social justice. They state that anti-oppressive research involves "making explicit the political practices involved in creating knowledge" (Potts & Brown, 2015, p.17). It requires making a commitment to the people you are working with, personally and professionally, in order to mutually foster conditions for social justice through research. It starts with paying attention to, and shifting, how power relations work in and through the process of doing research" (Potts & Brown, 2015, p. 17). This text also points out that many of us are implicated in sustaining systems of inequality. The authors contend that knowledge is not socially constructed and political but is instead produced through the interactions of people in various social locations. This provides justification for my research that students must be involved in the complaint resolution process themselves, and not be considered passive consumers of policy. The authors also state that attending to relationships is at the heart of all research tasks. "Before we can enter into authentic relationships with others, we

need to be vigilant about our own biases and motivations and attend to the gap between how we see ourselves and how others may see us” (Potts & Brown, 2015, p.22).

The authors also wisely suggest that questioning is a part of research that can be scrutinized from an anti-oppressive standpoint. They suggest asking “who says this, is a question that needs to be studied, and whose interests are served by this research question” (Potts & Brown, 2015, p. 24). Making meaning is discussed from the frame that it happens throughout the process of research or policy reform. The ongoing process of making meaning from research should involve reflection upon issues of power, which lurks in all our reflections and decisions. The authors conclude the chapter with the caveat that there is no fixed set of methods to ensure anti-oppressive research or policy reform. Instead, they conclude that it is important to have allies and methodologies that support anti-oppressive research (Potts & Brown, 2015).

The Conference Board of Canada (2014) outlined basic expectations for postsecondary institutions to consider when implementing and maintaining internal policies. Quality is directly correlated with positive experience for all students’ experiences. That report states that institutions are actively embracing quality assurance as a way to demonstrate their quality and continuously improve. The authors of that article also note that there is a lack of standards in Canada which affects student mobility (Conference Board, 2014). Also, in 2014, the Legislative Assembly passed Bill 14 based on conclusions set at the Annual General Assembly of First Nations in Regina Saskatchewan. That ruling officially laid out regulations about post-secondary education in Canada as it pertains to First Nations’ citizens. The primary resolution in that bill was that First Nations in Canada have the right to post-secondary education with equal and fair access for all students. Of particular interest is article 14 (3), institutions shall take “effective measures to ensure that this right is protected and also to ensure that Indigenous peoples can understand and be understood in political, legal and administrative proceedings, where necessary through the provision of interpretation or by other

appropriate means” (Assembly, 2014, p. 1). Both legal documents remind post-secondary policy makers of the importance of involving a diverse set of voices in all decision-making processes at the institution.

Recently, Simons was commissioned by the Legislative Assembly of British Columbia to publish the text describing an act called Bill 6, which identifies and addresses barriers such as the one presented by CNC’s outdated policy. The bill, which was published in 2021, is broken into seven parts. In the first part, barriers are identified, and accountability is discussed. In part three, an accessibility plan is proposed for institutions such as the College of New Caledonia. The four sections in the latter part of the document are most useful for this research. Here, standards are provided, development of standards is described, and basic principles are outlined. The rights of indigenous people and policy reform are also discussed in part four. The bill allows for monetary penalties for institutions who fail to adhere to accessibility rules as outlined by inspectors. Mitchell, Thomas, and Smith (2018) published an article about cultural safety. It outlines previous literature and research around decolonization through the eyes of diverse authors. The authors advocate for allyship and “depowerment” in post-secondary settings in order to encourage improved relations overall between indigenous and non-indigenous students (Mitchell et al., 2018). The concepts of power imbalance between traditional post-secondary administration and diverse student bodies are discussed and solutions are provided which can be related to policy reform. They offer four practice principles for decolonizing the academy and the community psychology classroom, which will be useful for the general student-centered feedback policies research for this project.

Context and Purpose of Research

In the 2021-2026 Strategic plan, CNC identified respect, accountability, integrity, transparency, and relationships as top values (CNC, 2021). In an institution of its size with a high population of indigenous and international students it is important for students to have a channel to voice concerns, provide feedback, and submit formal complaints for an opportunity for both student and institution to learn, build respect, integrity, and transparency in their relationships. The outdated thirteen-page Student Complaint Resolution policy (E-1.27) was developed three decades ago, presumably to provide students an opportunity to advocate for themselves. Seen through a post-colonial lens, the document can be interpreted as complex, top-down approach, patriarchal, and technical jargon, despite an official commitment by the college to be progressive, consultative, and student-focused. In fact, previous studies have shown how institution-centric policies and procedures can actually cause more harm than good in an academic setting (Capelos et. al., 2016). According to Chin (2015), some policies can be misinterpreted as ethnocentric due to wordiness and complexity. Such ethnocentrism needs to be addressed in all institutions as the population demographics change. The College of New Caledonia, like other institutions was formed with an industrial and colonialist worldview guiding its development. Now, there is a mistrust of this view and people are moving towards a more global and person-centered approach. The policy researched for this report is an example of an outdated, complex document. The College of New Caledonia's list of policies can be found [here](#) and E.1.27 among many other, similarly outdated policies for insights on its structure and content. Primary concerns with this policy are vocabulary, the length, and the complexity of the process.

There is a disconnect between the reality and the commitment that the College of New Caledonia has publicly made. "We are responsive to the diverse needs of our students, our employees, and the communities in our regions. In a dynamic, consultative environment, we deliver quality programs and promote the success of every student" (CNC 2021, p.13). On one hand, the institution seems dedicated to change, but outdated policies such as E-1.27, created and last updated in 1990, are still in use. The terminology, process, and colonial approach are no longer relevant or supported by societal expectations. The College of

New Caledonia's recent strategic plan suggests that these are priorities for the school, however, the interviews and survey suggest that demonstrating, enhancing, and defending quality in our complaints process are still areas for growth at CNC.

The purpose of this research was to address E-1.27. This Student Complaint Resolution policy has core issues that can impact the college's overall reputation. Through a survey and two interviews with current students, the research questions were:

1. What hindered or helped students when engaging with CNC policy in the past?
2. After reviewing our policies, what revisions would students want to see implemented in the next policy update?
3. What are the main issues that our students discuss among themselves when considering their rights as CNC students?
4. What type of resolution(s) do students expect from CNC when a complaint is submitted?

Methodology

O'Leary (2017) stated that in cases where the results may be expansive in mixed methods approach can help solidify the findings. The mixed-method approach was used in this study to allow for a deep observation of many factors and opinions about this policy. According to O'Leary (2017) the mixed-methods approach allows researchers to work towards both knowledge and change, as well as formal evaluation of hard data. Studies with mixed methodologies navigate traditional divides and employ quantitative and qualitative approaches in a single study. For this research, clear, unbiased questions and first-hand accounts were considered in an objective way. As O'Leary stated about mixed-methods research, "if well handled, they can capitalize on the best of both traditions while overcoming their shortcomings" (p.17). In this case a combination of qualitative and quantitative data guided the findings and helped with the recommendations toward making changes to the policy that has an impact on students at the College of New Caledonia.

Recruitment Process

The target population for this study were currently enrolled CNC students. A third-party recruiter was used to recruit students using a voluntary sign-up process. Specifically, Grace Dyck, Instructional Skills Coordinator at the Centre for Teaching and Learning, acted as a third-party representative and she set up a recruitment booth in the Gathering Place (a student-hub) at the College of New Caledonia (CNC) Prince George campus. A letter of invitation was provided to all students who indicated interest (Appendix G- Letter of Invitation). The recruitment process began once I had ethics approval from Simon Fraser University (SFU) in October 2021 (Appendix A shows the approval letter for this research) and CNC in December 2021. From the recruitment booth, which ran one day from 11:00 am until 3:00 pm, there were a total of 50 students who had shared their email knowing they would be invited to participate in this research. The data collection began in March 2022, when Grace Dyck emailed 50 students from various programs with a link to Survey Monkey and the survey closed on April 4th.

Data Collection Procedures

The mixed methods design of this study (using both survey and interviews) was important to ensure that students had multiple ways to share their thoughts and experiences related to this policy. The following section briefly describes the data collection tools used in this study.

Survey

According to O’Leary (2017), “the most common way to collect primary data is through surveys and interviews” (p.18). I used [SurveyMonkey](#) through my SFU student account and developed 16 exploratory questions built to identify the level of knowledge and previous engagement CNC students have with the complaint policy. Prior to sending out to students, I piloted the survey to three co-workers to identify any barriers, confusing questions, or ethical dilemmas. (See Appendix F for survey). Each survey participant was asked if they would be interested in participating in a future focus group (Appendix B for the survey

invitation; Appendix C for the agreement to participate in focus group). The survey took approximately ten minutes to complete. Fourteen students participated in the survey out of 50.

Interviews

From those who participated in the survey, four initially indicated interest in participating, however, only two students responded to a request for scheduling. Due to the low response rate for interest in participating in a focus group, the focus group changed to individual interviews using the same questions (See Appendix D and Appendix E for interviews). Each interview was done via Zoom and were recorded with participants' permission. The interviews lasted 45 minutes. I then reviewed the audio transcripts from the interviews to remove incorrect, duplicate, identifying or incomplete information collected and used the transcripts for the research analysis.

Analysis

The survey was analyzed for quantitative data to understand the students' current engagement with the Student Complaint Resolution policy. Semi-structured Interviews were recorded using Zoom transcription service. Transcripts were saved with reference to the participants as a number, reviewed for accuracy and edited to eliminate errors and personal identifying information. A copy of the transcript was emailed to each participant for a final review and approval. I then analyzed the transcripts by reviewing each transcript several times using track changes to identify the frequency of words, phrases, and personal experiences.

Limitations

There were only two students that responded to the invitation to participate in focus groups. Scheduling conflicts meant that the focus group turned into one-to-one interviews. I transcribed each interview and analyzed them through an appreciative inquiry lens, and this meant that I needed to connect the survey results, interview results, and literature review information and synthesize it. Time constraints interfered;

however, I did identify patterns and themes. The small number of participants may have skewed the results, as they did not represent all of the cultures and backgrounds that I had originally hoped to include.

Furthermore, I had a limited knowledge of conducting primary research at an institution. There is a lack of previous studies from similar institutions in a Northern community college. My topic of a student-centered approach to policy review was further limited by the withdrawal of the Centre for Teaching and Learning to act as a third party for contacting students. There are strict guidelines around conducting research and privacy rules which appeared as limitations within the process. I followed the ethics procedures for both SFU and CNC where I conducted the research, which included paperwork and meetings with administration. Furthermore, COVID 19 moved interviews online as participants were still cautious to participate face to face. I had a small sample of participants to glean primary data, however, secondary data in the form of books and journals did align well with the findings from my research interviews and surveys so that I could draw conclusions.

Findings

The majority of the students surveyed for this research (61.54%) are in their first year of studies at CNC and 38.46% are in their second year. When asked if the participants were aware CNC has a student complaint policy, seven out of the thirteen respondents, or 53.85%, were not aware that CNC has a student complaint policy. Of the six participants who are aware there is a policy, when asked if they know how to find it, only three students answered yes. This suggests that less than 10% of CNC students from a mixed group know where to locate CNC's student complaint policy.

Many of the students surveyed and both interviewees indicated that the policy itself is a barrier to successful complaint resolution. Of the five students that responded to the question "have you wanted to submit a complaint but chose not to?" two students answered yes and three answered no. From their responses, it raises the question if the formal complaint policy process meets all students' needs at CNC? For example, three students indicated in the survey that they had used email to submit a complaint in the past as opposed to the formal process. Of the four respondents with experience using the policy, 50% responded "other" to the question "were you satisfied with the results of your complaint". Of the remaining two, one was satisfied, and one was not. Therefore, out of the thirteen students surveyed, one student was satisfied with the policy experience when a complaint arose.

Four students responded to the next question that they were not satisfied with the policy procedure, half said the reason is that a resolution was not found and the other two chose not to specify. Four students answered the survey question about the topic of their complaints. Half of those did not elaborate, and the other two responded with "faculty" and "grade appeal". Twelve respondents replied to the question "how would you prefer to have complaints resolved?" Six students replied email was their preference and six students replied to a formal meeting with a conflict resolution facilitator was the preference, while four

respondents or 33.33% would prefer a talking circle, three respondents prefer an informal discussion facilitated by a third party, for example a CNC Student Union representative

The first respondent to participate in the virtual interview, self-identified as a second-year student in the nursing program. In my analysis, I have eliminated some of the specific data to preserve the identity of the student. This interview confirmed the theme that accessibility is important. The respondent stated they are familiar with the policy, but they do not know it well. They are aware that it's thirteen pages long and very complex. The student stated that the policy is "not memorable or accessible". This participant stated that often students' roles and responsibilities are not clear enough at the CNC.

The student confirmed that complaints can be emotional, and a policy should make it easy for people to come forward with concerns. "Students have different reasons and different needs for outcomes, the policy must be less complex" (Participant 1, Personal Communication). The re-occurring theme of accessibility was also addressed by this student when they discussed literacy levels and said that personal interactions are superior to written communication. "Some people just want awareness of their issues, and some want a more private process to solve complex personal issues. Some peers have felt that they were experiencing discrimination and the current process did not fully serve their needs" (Participant 1).

Feedback specific to courses was a concept that was important to this interview participant. The theme of student engagement was recurring during the interview, "in situations like missing parts on the exam which can result in an unfair grade, the student was not motivated to proceed because she could pass anyway and the process was too complex" (Participant 1, Personal Communication).

The second interview participant had varying experience within the CNC Administrative Program as a student, in the institution as an employee, and as a

student at another local post-secondary institution. They stated that the process felt like there was no personal involvement from the institution even though they spoke to the Dean and their communication with the other party was damaged as a result, the relationship element of the resolution process was not there. This is consistent with the recurring theme that student engagement needs to be student centered, not institution centered as it currently is. The complexity of the current process was a concern echoed by this student and present in much of the literature.

Currently, there is a perceived biased approach in the internal process because often there is not a specific way of dealing with complaints in the absence of a modern complaints resolution policy and procedures. Simplify the process but allow for some variation on how the problem can be resolved, according to specific situations. (Participant 2)

The participant had complained about an instructor, but felt that nothing was ever resolved, which suggests that the process is incomplete and unsatisfactory in its current state. The respondent discussed a lack of value put forward by the college in response to the students' feedback or complaints and an emphasis was placed on protecting staff from anything negative (Participant 2). The recommendation from this student was to insert a link in Moodle for student input (Participant 2). This is consistent with my findings from the literature review which highlighted the importance of engaging students directly and intentionally. Both interview participants also made it very clear during our conversations that they believe the College of New Caledonia could benefit from a more inclusive and engaging complaint policy.

Discussion

One of the most common themes in the literature, surveys and interviews was engagement. Capelos et al.'s (2016) statement that quality assurance in educational policies depends on the level of engagement with students. Students need to feel empowered and included in policies. The participants interviewed in this research stated that the current policy was not accessible enough. In other

words, autonomy and engagement would improve the process. Similarly, Isaeva et al. (2020) found from their research that dialogue, or at the very least, communications between students and administration, can make a significant difference in complaint resolution.

Student perspectives on rights and complaint resolution

One of the research questions for this study was, “what are the main issues that students discuss among themselves when considering their rights as CNC students?”. The students in the survey indicated that they believed they had the right to know more about the course they were taking and to be informed about all processes and procedures. The CNC Strategic Plan essentially promises that students will have their voices heard and their cultures respected. One of the interview participants stated that often students’ roles and responsibilities are not clear enough at CNC, which aligns well with the research and indicates that engagement and inclusion are critical for complaint resolution in today’s institutions. The majority of students said that they believe they should be easily able to state their concerns, however, the CNC complaint resolution process was difficult to find and navigate once found. The majority also said that complaints should be handled differently going forward.

Recommendations

Culturally safe policies and procedures are expected by students and staff at institutions today. Student concerns can range from informal to formal complaints, including point-of-service complaint resolution, to verbal feedback. Official student complaint policies such as E.27 at CNC are important because they have the potential to affect reputation and in a worst-case scenario, negatively impact students who have genuine complaints. Currently the process is detached and not point-of service. My experience was reflected by the interviewees and survey respondents. That is, the process is not student-focused and even though students directed to the policy in its current form declined to use the policy procedure and asked if a different avenue was available. Both interviewees suggested that the widely used program, Moodle, which all

CNC students access for their records and classes, could provide a point-of-service option which could be more accessible and user-friendly than the current system is. Indeed, if current trends are ignored and this paradigm shift is not respected at the College of New Caledonia, there may be consequences that permanently impact the institution.

The interview participants provided recommendations for the CNC specifically, and the literature provided general recommendations. The following is a summary of the recommendations gathered by this mixed-methods research, followed by discussion and personal recommendations.

1. The policy can be less complex
2. Provide a procedure that allows for personal communication about the issue
3. Pre-mid and post course surveys can provide feedback to guide administrators
4. Listen to the students
5. Use Moodle as a platform for submitting concerns and employ a respectful campus employee or team to respond to concerns
6. Quality assurance should be a top priority
7. Align with the recent strategic plan for collaboration and a student-first approach
8. Address issues quickly and keep everyone informed during the process
9. Consider cultural sensitivity and offer talking circles and other resolutions for minor issues

Based on the primary and secondary research conducted, the research concludes that when student concerns are not quickly acknowledged in a respectful way, preferably onsite and at the time of the complaint, issues can escalate and result in costly unnecessary interventions outside of the institution. The survey results confirm that students prefer email correspondence or in-person complaint resolution. As Isaeva et al. (2020) found in their study at a

post-secondary institution, relationships are central to effective complaint handling.

The word complaint itself might present barriers to students, especially those from cultures where complaining is frowned upon. The College and Institute Act which governs CNC and other institutions does not use the word complaint anywhere in its documentation (BC Legislature, 2021). This is because the term “complain” can alienate many people and discourage fair dispute resolution in situations where mediation may be required. Plain writing can improve accessibility for many students (Government of BC, 2020). On the other hand, complaints can be welcomed and handled efficiently. When this happens, it can improve and address gaps in the overall experience of the delivery of the service improving and addressing gaps in public service delivery (Simmons, 2017). Effective complaint systems built into easily accessible infrastructure such as Moodle not only can help students feel safe and “heard”, but they can also reduce the number of resources required to address complaints (Simmons, 2017). Currently the process is confusing, and thus takes up additional resources, and as the research showed, the majority of serious issues are not resolved in a timely or fair manner with the current method.

This research concludes with the recommendation that the College of New Caledonia uses a plain language, two to three-page, culturally inclusive policy. It could be an accessible link embedded in the students’ Moodle shell. This would allow all students to give feedback easily throughout their studies. The link could also be available to students immediately upon registration and easily accessed online or at campus without printing or signing of paper documents or direct interaction with the persons involved in the problem(s), until a mediator supports that interaction if necessary. College of New Caledonia staff members can be trained to address the complaints in culturally safe and fair ways that demonstrate a desire to help both parties mediate the problems. A response should happen within five business days of the initial complaint and in an impartial way. Students should have access to an appeal process if the

complaint is not handled in a way that is fair and impartial. Institutions such as CNC could benefit from future research about how student cans easily contribute to the quality assurance process before, during and after attendance to the intuition in the form of mandatory surveys as part of registration.

Recommendations for Future Research

There is very minimal research available about the implications of the concept of complaining itself. Some of the literature and the students themselves suggested that the policy is inappropriate or difficult to navigate, however, the actual reasons for that might be subconscious if there are underlying assumptions that come along with the word complaint itself. A textual analysis of a document such as an outdated college policy involving students could highlight some of the underlying problems in terminology and word choice in policy.

References

- Adebayo, A.G., Benjamin, J.J, and Lundy, B.D. (2014) *Indigenous Conflict Management Strategies: Global Perspectives*. Lexington Books.
- Assembly of First Nations. (2017). Annual General Assembly. Resolution #14.
- BC Legislature. (2021). College and Institute Act. Victoria BC: [Queen's Printer](#)
- Brown, L., & Strega, S. (2015). *Research as resistance, second edition: Revisiting critical, Indigenous, and anti-oppressive approaches* (2nd ed.). Women's Press.
- Capelos, T., Provost, C., Parouti, M., Barnett, J., Chenoweth, J., Fife-Schaw, C., & Kelay, T. (2016). Ingredients of institutional reputations and citizen engagement with regulators. *Regulation & Governance*, 10(4), 350-367.
- Chin, J. L., Trimble, J. E., & Garcia, J. E. (Eds.). (2017). *Global and culturally diverse leaders and leadership: New dimensions and challenges for business, education and society*. Emerald Publishing Limited.
- College of New Caledonia. (1990). Prince George, BC. Student Complaint Resolution. College of New Caledonia.
- College of New Caledonia. (2016). Prince George, BC. Strategic Plan [2016-2020](#). College of New Caledonia.
- Goff, L. (2017). University administrators' conceptions of quality and approaches to quality assurance. *Higher Education*, 74(1), 179–195. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-016-0042-8>
- Government of British Columbia. (2020). [Plain Language Toolkit for Accessibility and Inclusion](#).
- Holzer, H. J., & Baum, S. (2017). *Making college work: pathways to success for disadvantaged students*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Howard, A., & Edge, J. (2014). *Policies, Laws, and Regulations*. The Conference Board of Canada.
- Isaeva, R., Eisenschmidt, E., Vanari, K., & Kumpas-Lenk, K. (2020). Students' views on dialogue: improving student engagement in the quality assurance process. *Quality in Higher Education*, 26(1), 80-97. DOI: 10.1080/13538322.2020.1729307

- Ku, Hsuan-Hsuan, Shang, Rong-An & Fu, Yi-Fan, (2021). Social learning effects of complaint handling on social media: Self-construal as a moderator. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*. 20(21), 11-13.
- Kovach, M. (2021). *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations, and Contexts, Second Edition* (2nd ed., pp. 109-120). University of Toronto Press.
- Mitchell, T., Thomas, D., & Smith, J. (2018). Unsettling the settlers: Principles of a decolonial approach to creating safe(r) spaces in post-secondary education. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 62(3-4), 350-363. doi: 10.1002/ajcp.12287
- O'Leary, Z., (2017). *Essential Guide to doing your Research Project*. (3rd ed). Sage.
- Potts, K & Brown, L, Eds. (2015). Becoming an anti-oppressive researcher. *Research as Resistance: Revisiting Critical, Indigenous, and Anti-Oppressive Approaches* (2nd ed.), Canadian Scholars' Press,
- Simons, H. (2021). Bill 6 – 2021: Accessible British Columbia Act. <https://www.bclaws.gov.bc.ca/civix/document/id/bills/billscurrent/2nd42nd:gov06-1>
- Simmons, R., & Brennan, C. (2017). User voice and complaints as drivers of innovation in public services. *Public Management Review*, 19(8), 1085-1104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2016.1257061>
- Stalmeijer, R., Whittingham, J., de Grave, W., & Dolmans, D. (2014). Strengthening internal quality assurance processes: Facilitating student evaluation committees to contribute. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41(1), 53–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2014.976760>
- Wharf, B., and McKenzie, B. (2016). *Connecting policy to practice in the human services*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Willits, R. & Gelpi A. (2019). Early resolution agreement resolves student's complaint. *Campus Legal Advisor*, 19(9), 9–10. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cal.40017>. Wiley Periodicals.

Appendix A. 3rd party Consent Form



Date: September 2021

Re: Research proposal: **How can a Student-Centered approach inform Student**

Complaint Policy revisions to be more inclusive?

I, Grace Dyck, on behalf of the Centre for Teaching and Learning at the College of New Caledonia, consent to act as a third party to contact research participants on behalf of Gail Little, MEd. Candidate, Faculty of Education, SFU.

I agree to send initial email invitations and follow up reminders, as directed by Gail Little, for the purpose of recruiting participants for this research study. Invitations will be sent to students enrolled at the College of New Caledonia. The purpose of this study is to explore the perspectives of students and their engagement in the CNC Student Complaint policy.

Sincerely

Grace Dyck

Education Technology and Instructional Skills Coordinator

Centre for Teaching and Learning

Appendix B. Online Survey Consent Form



SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
ENGAGING THE WORLD

How can a student-centered approach inform student complaint policy revisions to be more inclusive?

Date: September 2021

Thank you for considering participating in a survey on how a student-centered approach informs CNC's student complaint policy revisions to be more inclusive. Before you decide whether to participate, please take time to review the following information. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact, myself, Gail Little or my senior supervisor, Dr. Michelle Pidgeon.

I, Gail Little, am conducting this survey as part of a research project exploring CNC students and alumni experiences and perspectives of the CNC Student Complaint Policy. I am a Master's candidate at SFU and an employee of CNC. This research is part of a Master of Educational Leadership program and is being supervised by Dr. Michelle Pidgeon, Faculty of Education, SFU. I will present the results of this research in the form of a written report to my faculty supervisor, as well as a public poster session at the 2022 Summer Institute at CNC.

The purpose of this research is to learn how a student-centered approach informs CNC student complaint policy revisions to be more inclusive. The 10-15-minute survey explores an attempt to gain insights on the current student engagement with the student complaint policy. You may choose not to answer any of the questions, and you may also

end your participation in the survey at any point in the process. This is a **minimal risk study**. The stress involved in completing the survey will be no more than the stress that you encounter in your daily life.

Data Collection: The data collected for this survey is confidential and your name and any description of your participation will be kept in a password protected computer in a locked office. The data collected using SFU's Survey Monkey is hosted in Canada and implementation meets the requirements of BC's FIPPA legislation. SurveyMonkey, Inc. is US-owned, and application and data are hosted at the SFU data center and support is provided by SFU staff in Canada. The server for this data is stored in the USA so recorded content is subject to the USA Patriot Act and Clarifying Lawful Overseas Use of Data (Cloud) Act. These laws allow government authorities to access the records of host services and internet service providers. After I complete my MEd degree requirements, I will destroy all printed material or online data collected that is linked directly to you: analysis of the data may be used in future journals, presentations at conferences, or CNC policy updates as appropriate.

Participation in this research is voluntary. You can decide to stop participating at any point in the process, for any reason. There are no negative consequences for withdrawing your participation, and I will erase/destroy any information already collected from you. In

the case of anonymously collected data, I will not be able to identify it as yours so will not be able to remove your data once survey responses are submitted. If you have further questions, you may contact me. If you would like to talk to my faculty supervisor, you can contact Dr. Michelle Pidgeon.

If you have any concerns about your rights as a research participant and/or your experiences while participating in this study, please contact Dr. Jeffrey Toward, Director, Office of Research Ethics (SFU).

By submitting your responses to the survey, you indicate that you have read the information provided and agree to participate.

Appendix C. Informed Consent for Focus Group



SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
ENGAGING THE WORLD

How can a student-centered approach inform student complaint policy revisions to be more inclusive?

Date: September 2021

The research team will abide by the latest provincial health guidelines in relation to the COVID19 pandemic

Please review the current student complaint process before participating in this study.

Thank you for considering participating in an interview on CNC Student Complaint policy revisions. Before you decide whether to participate, please take time to review the following information. If you have any questions or need additional information, please ask! If, after reviewing this information, you are interested in participating, then we will go forward with the interview.

I, **Gail Little**, am conducting this focus group / interview as part of a research project exploring CNC student perspectives of the complaint policy. I am an employee of CNC and a student of SFU, and this project is a **requirement for the Masters in Educational Leadership program at SFU**. I am **supervised by Dr. Michelle Pidgeon**, Associate Professor, Faculty of Education, SFU. I will present the results in a written report as well as a public session at the 2022 Summer Institute at CNC.

The purpose of this research is to learn how people perceive the current policy. If you choose to participate, I will invite you to join a focus group to be held at CNC for a 60-minute virtual interview. The video and audio of the focus group will be recorded to assist with data analysis. A copy of my transcription will be provided to participants upon request. Audio-recordings, transcripts, and other information will be kept on a password protected personal computer in a locked office. The list matching participant information and pseudonyms will be stored separately in a locked filing cabinet in a secure office within an office at CNC. I will destroy the recordings after they are transcribed and/or at the completion of the research project. Zoom privacy states employees do not access meeting, webinar, or messaging content (specifically, audio, video, files, and messages) unless directed by an account owner, or as required for legal, safety, or security reasons. <https://explore.zoom.us/en/privacy/?zcid=1231>

I will ask you to talk about your experience on how the CNC student complaint policy can be more inclusive and have a student-centered focus in the revisions. You may choose not to answer any of my questions, and you may also end the interview at any point during the scheduled time and withdraw your data. This is a **minimal risk study**. The stress involved will be no more than the stress encountered in daily life. I will keep everyone's identity **confidential** to reduce risk. It is mandatory that all information is confidential, and the entire session is to remain private. I encourage participants not to discuss the content of the focus group to people outside of the group; however, I cannot control what participants do with the information discussed.

Appreciative Inquiry Guiding Questions, students will be guided clockwise to answer

- Can you please tell me a little bit about yourself and your role at the College of New Caledonia?
- Are you familiar with the student complaint policy and procedures in place by the college? Can you please describe your understanding of them?
- In your opinion, what is the best way to respond to complaints?
- In a scenario where you feel your rights were violated in some way at the institution, what would be a perfect outcome in your opinion, can you please describe in detail?
- What revisions would you want to see implemented in the next policy update?
- What are the main complaints students discuss among themselves?
- What type of resolution(s) do students expect from CNC when a complaint is submitted?

Remuneration: Participants will be provided an **honorarium of \$20.00**.

With permission, the audio of the focus group will be recorded to assist with data analysis. A copy of my transcription will be provided upon request. Audio-recordings, transcripts, and other information will be kept on a **password protected** personal computer in a locked office. The list matching participant information and pseudonyms will be stored separately in a locked filing cabinet in a secure office within an office at CNC. I will destroy the recordings after they are transcribed and/or at the completion of the research project.

After I complete all the requirements, I will destroy the data. **Participation in this research is voluntary.** You can decide to stop participating at any point in the process, for any reason. Your decision to participate (or not) will not be shared with anyone. There are no negative consequences for withdrawing your participation, and I

will erase/destroy any information already collected from you. If you would like to talk to my faculty supervisor, you can contact Dr. Michelle Pidgeon, PhD, Associate Professor.

If you have any concerns about your rights as a research participant and/or your experiences while participating in this study, please contact the SFU Office of Research Ethics.

Signing this consent form indicates that:

- You agree to participate in this research and to have the focus group audio recorded.
- You understand that you are free to stop participating in this research at any time.
- You acknowledge receipt of honorarium of \$20.00.

Printed Name of Participant
(MM/DD/YYYY)

Signature of Participant

Date

Appendix D. Participant #1 Interview

Interviewer: So, reminder that there is no right or wrong (answer) it's only about, you know, perspective and thoughts and general discussion around it. So, we'll get started.

Interviewer: Could you please introduce yourself and your role at the College, for example, first year second year student and your Program.

Participant #1: Second year student in the NCBNP (Northern Collaborative Baccalaureate Nursing Program).

Interviewer: Fantastic okay so do you have any personal experience with the CNC Student complaint policy?

Participant #1: I am supposed to be educated on it, but not really.

Interviewer: So, you yourself haven't had to submit a complaint?

Participant #1. No

Interviewer: Okay, and have you reviewed the complaint policy?

Participant #1: Well, I've reviewed it before but don't remember all of it.

Interviewer: No problem at all, so when you reviewed it what were your initial thoughts on it?

Participant #1: It seems complicated and more effort than it's worth to submit a complaint, if you have to go through so many steps.

Interviewer: Yeah, that's a very common comment, I get that. Thank you.

Participant #1: Because if you just address the length of it, it seems, I think it's like 13 pages long, the wording is very, a lot of jargon.

Interviewer: And it seems like quite a process if you just want to submit a complaint, is that summarizing what you're saying?

Participant #1: yeah.

Interviewer: Okay.

Interviewer: So, aside from the length of it like you said, and it feels more work than it's worth, what other potential barriers might students face when trying to engage in a complaint process would you say?

Participant #1: I didn't even know that, like, that protocol or whatever existed, so it feels like just lack of knowledge, that there is a way to file complaints formally, will stop students because I didn't know that existed.

Interviewer: And you're a second-year student.

Participant #1. Yes, yeah.

Interviewer: So as a student not even knowing (the policy) is there, that a process is (available), and when you do find the link it's a bit overwhelming.

Participant #1: Yeah

Interviewer: Yeah, okay.

Interviewer: Now that you are aware of it, is there anything about it, that would be appealing to engage in it.

Participant #1. I don't remember.

Interviewer: If now that you know there is a process in place would that be more likely for you to say, "okay, if I have a complaint, I know that there's something there I can access?"

Participant #1: I mean, since I'm in my last semester I probably wouldn't put much effort into it anyways. Just because I'm finding out about it, [and] I'm just like almost about to leave CNC, like it's not worth it.

Interviewer: I understand.

Participant #1: I think a lot of students feel that way.

Interviewer: It makes sense from what you say, "I'm a second year (student) I'm just learning about this I'm in my last semester, it's not really worth it", so technically if you did have any complaints about whatever (for example) faculty, you would kind of go "it's too late, forget it" and move on. So, in other words CNC wouldn't necessarily learn about your concerns. Is that correct?

Participant #1: yes.

Interviewer: So just based on general, you know, your thoughts and conversations, you may have heard other students engaging in and I'm not asking for names or specifics, or anything like that, but would you be able to speak to some of the complaints that students may experience while at?

Participant #1: Umm, I know one student has accused the entire nursing department of racism like on multiple occasions, because she keeps failing tests and she thinks that they're just purposely failing her.

Participant #1: But I've seen her education and style. So, she's like filed appeal processes, but I don't know [if] she's ever filed [an] official complaint.

Interviewer: So, in her world, in her mind, people are against her?

Participant #1: Yes, yeah.

Participant #1: and her school is against her getting her nursing degree.

Participant #1: wow, like maybe you just need to practice for the tests!

Participant #1: And not do dumb stuff sometimes.

Interviewer: Well, you raise a really good point about what some students may complain about versus reality or what might actually be happening.

Participant #1: Or I know last year, a lot, or like I know a bunch of students complained this year directly to the Dean about like clinical and stuff. One of the instructors kept canceling clinical days and they thought that they weren't going to get the skills they needed to progress through.

Participant #1: [I] don't think they went through the formal process for a complaint or if they just went to the Dean, or like [said] look we're not getting our hours, the instructor's not doing her job, I'm concerned.

Participant #1: So, I don't know how they go about that, but they did switch instructors, so something happened.

Interviewer: Okay, this is very good. So, in your discussions or either just hanging out, or at the campus housing or anything, have you noticed any other complaints that may have surfaced.

Participant: I mean I complain quite a bit about an acting Supervisor sometimes because he likes to suggest things for housing that last year, we like tried to do, and they didn't work out like health and wellness events.

Participant #1: Like the zoom events or, I get like painting events, but like information about health and wellness events never went well.

Participant #1: He wants to make those mandatory and I had to like to tell him at multiple meetings that one or two students went to every one of those events and that making events mandatory is very difficult for students with different schedules because they're not mandatory at main campus so.

Interviewer: Yes.

Participant #1: [I] had a lot of fights with him about that, but he finally got it.

Participant #1: And then um I noticed a few students were complaining about the previous Manager not being here and then not having someone in office once the Administrative Assistant wasn't here [and] whatnot.

Participant #1: or like even now, some of the students like ask the Admin Asst. questions, but because she's untrained the students are frustrated because they can't get their questions answered and they're left in the dark and I can't answer them because I don't know what's happening either.

Interviewer: yeah, frustrating for sure.

Participant #1. Like it's not her fault.

Interviewer: yeah, I know. I can relate to that, when you ask a question, you just want answers or direction on where to find the answers. It's just the not knowing that can build the frustration.

Participant #1. yeah.

Interviewer: So, I think that's a good theme, we're using housing as an example, but I think that can also be carried over into the general population of students. Frustration, or having concerns and not necessarily knowing where those answers, or where to find them so that's a good connection there as well.

Interviewer: Is there anything else that comes to mind?

Participant #1: I know a lot of people complain about like the scheduling but, like the class offerings at the College because a lot of people trying to take electives over the summer, but it feels like the College isn't providing a lot of course options for intercession right now, compared to last year.

Participant #1: And since they're just kind of a fresher course that it says that it will be offered in fall and intercession semesters on like the course catalog on the portal but then when you go to intercession there's no course listed and then their plans for getting courses then kind of have to switch last minute and now everybody's panicking.

Interviewer: Yeah. I mean especially like you know, students like yourself in their final semester and trying to wrap things up and what you expected to be there is not there.

Participant #1: Especially like for the nursing students, in particular, we have to, we only get six electives in our program, and they have to be very specific standards for them and with our second-year schedule is very difficult to get those electives and so getting them done and intercession is pretty much the only way to get the majority of them done.

Participant #1: And then it's also cheaper than the University and if they leave and how to do them at the University it's another like \$300.

Interviewer: That adds up.

Participant #1: Yeah so. I'm speaking to that from like a nursing perspective.

Participant #1: CNC doesn't really communicate what restrictions on courses mean. Like I know when it says Law 294 is reserved for business students that just means for right now, at a certain date they'll open it up to all students it's just priority.

Interviewer: That's right.

Participant #1: And year two nursing students have to register within their clusters and then at a certain date we can register for whatever courses, we want within nursing.

Interviewer: That is correct.

Participant #1: And nobody understands that everybody's panicking because it's not communicated.

Interviewer: That's right, how would students know that if it's not communicated.

Participant #1: I only know these things because, like, I read into everything, registration and I make my own schedule, regardless of what CNC gave me. If I don't like a course, I'm switching it. And so, I have to be on the know of those days.

Interviewer: I get it.

Participant #1: Well, you kind of know the rules, so if you're going to bend them or go outside of them right, you have to read into it [to] know what's going on.

Participant #1: I only registered in one course that CNC said I had to sign up for nursing this Summer, this year, because they tell you exactly which sections and like which time slots to register for, and I think I only stayed in one and, like switch the rest of the day that they said.

Participant #1: Like I didn't like my schedule, [so] I'm making it mine.

Interviewer: Yes, I get it. You know that's what it's all about, it has to work for you right?

Interviewer: Okay, these are great examples, thank you.

Interviewer: What are your thoughts around events and activities?

Participant #1: Like CNC doesn't advertise them.

Participant #1: because they're always like, I know they have to be during like working hours because, like the people running them. To be there during working hours, but then everybody's always in class and can't go. Because class times from nine to 12 or whatever, yeah, we should go like I'm in class until 12 and then the meeting ends at 12:30 or no meeting event.

Interviewer: Yeah. That's so true.

Participant #1: Which is a bit of a struggle.

Interviewer: yeah so, it's almost better if it's, are you thinking more evening and weekend kind of schedule?

Participant #1: You see that's the thing, nobody wants to go to school on a weekend and nobody wants to go to class, go home and come back, so it's just like you're damned if you do damned if you don't.

Interviewer: That makes sense, yes, so it's finding those pockets in between classes.

Participant #1: There is a lot more people [and] in person classes. So, it's easier to finesse whereas like last year I only ever saw-like healthcare students at the school because they all have classes.

Interviewer: Yeah, definitely more people on campus now.

Interviewer: um, what else might there be to learn about faculty? Do you hear students talking about faculty, and again I don't need particulars but the overall faculty? Are students happy?

Participant #1: I know there's some beef with instructors that do Math 104. I don't know if, like multiple ones teach it, but I know the one that taught all the classes for its last year. Lots of students complained about it, I think one person actually did like, bring it forward, but I don't know how they did.

Participant #1: Because they mentioned like someone in their family died and then he [instructor] was just like really? so [still] do the exam at the [same] time.

Participant #1: But apart from that it's just a lot of us hearing rumors from older students and then kind of go into classes with that precedented idea.

Participant #1: which I don't like because my instructor for clinical was like known to fail students, a clinical group, like half or clinical group would drop out nobody would fail, but they'd all drop out.

Participant #1: Because they were at risk of failure, and then I'm here and I'm like passing pretty good, so. I think a lot of people hold what previous students say too high in their minds and let it destroy their relationships with their professors.

Interviewer: (That) makes a lot of sense.

Participant #1: Because I keep having to remind them, I'm like guys like, we were told this, but she has proven herself wrong so like you need to get over that idea that she's going to fail, you because evidently, she's not right now.

Interviewer: I was an academic advisor for several years and I heard that a lot from students. Trying to help them choose courses and they don't want to go in a particular course that they've heard about an instructor. But you know you said something really interesting there.

Interviewer: I've heard complaints about if let's say the math instructor, we will use that as an example, I heard several students complain and maybe only one student will come forward.

Interviewer: So even if students are complaining we at CNC institution may never know because we don't necessarily hear about it, would you agree?

Participant #1: yeah, especially with the set at the end, like the course review like survey monkey or whatever there's not really a lot of room to put like your comments into it, because there is the one thing, but it's more so, how the course was taught rather than how the instructor taught the course.: Like any what you're learning objectives, out of it that's like basically what it was, or like. A comment section is more so for like.

Participant #1: How the instructor could improve resources is they could have had in the classroom rather than how could the instructor have improved whatever. And like points for math 104 like I went in not hearing that the instructor was really good and then he was not like one of the diagrams or to the diagrams didn't show up on my test like on Moodle.

Participant #1: And I was like dude I can't answer these questions so then he just said, I got one of two marks for each question for attempting. I'm like but buddy I didn't even get to attempt, the full question I should be able to do that portion again and he was like well we averaged it. I'm like, okay.

Interviewer: I'm sorry.

Participant #1: I was already struggling in that class, I'm like you know what, I'm just going to take this because that means I got a pass.

Interviewer: So, you again raise great points. If there are surveys, at the end of the course it's more about the learning outcomes versus how they instructor taught. But those are often at the end of the program you're not getting anything

in the middle and/or if something comes up by then your kind of, I don't mean you in particular, but students in general could be like, I'm done the course, I passed, I don't care I'm just moving on instead of submitting any form of complaint at that point.

Participant #1: Yeah good, like the questions are on like, use multiple resources or whatever use multiple learning activities, like if they had videos and practice questions, technically, yes. They did have multiple learning activities, but were they effective? That question is not asked.

Interviewer: Good point.

Participant #1: The learning objectives were explained at the beginning of the Semester like yeah, they were but where they met? Not really.

Interviewer: Yeah, and so that is where I think this answer may be different for each student, because you use, the nursing students use Moodle Is that correct?

Participant #1: yeah, at the end yeah.

Interviewer: yeah, so is, is there anything on Moodle that allows students to submit feedback or comments?

Participant #1: I know, like some professors will put like a raise your hand like discussion forum area so that way, if you have any questions, you can like always to put them in there or suggestions. And like some will ask for suggestions, at the end of the course, so they can make their course better. So, like last year or last Semester in pharmacology, I'm sure it was asked like what parts of the course, would you want more incorporated? So, a lot of us said that we liked like the review games that we did at [the] end [of] the class. Even though they made the class longer it helped us to kind of solidify our information, so she said she'll try to incorporate more learning activities where it's like, more involved next year or whatever, or like, how did we find the times for the exams? Like did we feel overwhelmed with the time constraint, or whatever?

Participant #1: So, she asked us in person, so that way, we had like a board of suggestions of what we liked [and] what can be changed, I know another instructor did that as well. And for two or three, which is families and she actually ended up switching the textbook for the spring because everybody said that the textbook felt useless to the course. She switched it to a novel that we read. We could reflect on like end of life, care and how that affects families, rather than, "What is family health or whatever?"

Participant #1: Read the whole novel so. I feel like that change was good, because I actually feel like I learned something from reading the textbook for once.

Interviewer: So, from the feedback she acted quickly which was nice.

Participant #1: And then she got good feedback from it, because she asked us about it because obviously, she cares to see if it did anything. [Then] students actually want to do the readings and can actually reflect on them in class.

Participant #1: You probably like try and understand the content, more than if you're just ignoring the readings and just like have that disconnect. I think instructors that do their own self emails (??) also like care more than the instructors I just sent out (??) and call it a day. Because like I've noticed that like when instructors put out those emails like even last year, I could see a difference and like how they approached teaching compared to those that just do their job show up[and] go home.

Interviewer: You really noticed that difference?

Participant #1: yeah, like I know my one instructor said that she starts every week with a review of the previous week before the current stuff to see how well we prepared for the class.

Participant #1: And then, depending on how which questions we struggled with she'll focus more on that content throughout the lecture, so she uses that as a review of what we already know, and what she wants us to know at the end, which I think is fun. But she got that comment, like a few years ago that they'd prefer to have that, as part of the course at the beginning, rather than at the end see what they've learned.

Interviewer: It's a great way to do a review.

Participant #1: Review before we [have] even done the class to see where we're starting with them for me.

Interviewer: Good wake up activity.

Participant #1: I'll play that yeah. Especially on a Monday.

Interviewer: And, before I move on to the next question is there anything else that comes to mind for that?

Participant #1: I don't think so.

Interviewer: Those are good, really helpful, thank you.

Interviewer: This could speak to you or maybe in general with students, you have a sense of what may work well for students, if you were to submit a complaint through the formal complaint policy process. If you had a complaint with the Faculty or CNC or whatever, how would you want to see it resolved and in what method would you like?

Interviewer: If something you were really passionate or upset about or whatever, how would you like to see things resolved?

Participant #1: I think it depends on the severity of the complaint and like what the complaint entails like for the one person that accused everybody of racism what's good enough for her is that she passed her class. She appealed her grade and won after appealing it four times. And she thought that was good enough for her and now she's here, whereas I know like with the math issue that one person that had a funeral to go to during the final and the instructor didn't make the accommodation.

Participant #1: I don't think even like having like an accommodation later being able to retake the final at a better time would have been enough for her because of how upset she was with it.

I think we've been having like to take the course again almost without pay because she didn't feel like she got her learning outcomes or support from the instructor. So, I think it depends on what the issue is, and like how it affects the person.

Interviewer: So, going on that theme there shouldn't be just one way to resolve things there should be almost like multiple ways to resolve complaints?

Participant #1: Everyone's satisfied with different outcomes and, like some people need less some people need more or like some people want to complain, just so it's like aware not really so they're trying to change anything for themselves and hold a non-be anonymous with that, whereas.

Participant #1: Other people want it to be known that they made the complaint, so that they can get the change for themselves, so I think having options can create the individualized complaint process where everyone feels heard, appropriate to what they want the outcome to be, but if there's only one outcome available then they'll be like well I don't want this to happen so I'm not going to complain.

Interviewer: Yeah, like really two key pieces you mentioned there's like sometimes people just want that awareness piece like, "hey this isn't working, heads up, and I want to express it, but I don't want to make a big deal about it, I don't want to go through this whole process, I just want people to know so we can improve on it. And then there's people that want to complain, but want to see resolution all the way through?

Participant #1: Yes.

Interviewer: That's good, that's good insight. Thank you.

Interviewer: If you were suddenly given the task of revising the policy, and I know you didn't go through it in detail [and] that's okay, what revisions or inclusions would you want to see implemented in the next policy update?

Participant #1: I think, make it simpler to understand because, like in class we learn about different levels of literacy and like as it pertains to English. And like there's international students here that really would benefit from it being simplified, you know because they don't understand English because you first have to like to pass your exams to like be here. But it just makes more sense because, like when I look at any policy, since we have to review them all the time for nursing, they just use vocabulary that to make it seem like extra fancy when it could just be simplified, especially for student use. We're not like legislators, making these policies or whatever, or like just students, some of us are like 17 coming out of high school.

Interviewer: Yeah, no it's true, so plain language. Simpler process.

Participant #1: mm hmm and then yeah. I know once I get there, but I know like with any policy it's always because I'm like it's too much effort to read the words right now.

Interviewer: yeah.

Participant #1: And you're emotional about it, because if you're complaining about something you have like a lot of emotion behind it, if you're like have that reason to complain you just want something simple, so you don't like to overwhelm yourself even more.

Interviewer: That's bang on that's it, that's exactly it and going back to your earlier comments. If you have a complaint there's high emotion and you don't even know about the process or where it's located you know, and that adds on another layer as well, and then, when you do find it it's very complex in language and process.

Interviewer: Okay, let me just check my questions here.

Interviewer: Okay, I think that basically covers the questions. Is there anything you want to add, or do you have any questions?

Participant #1: I don't think.

Interviewer: Awesome.

Interviewer: I'm going to stop the recording.

Appendix E. Participant #2 Interview

Interviewer: Alright, so (Participant #2) thanks for joining me and just a reminder this is a research project for my Masters course with Simon Fraser University. I am going to ask you some questions about your experience with the CNC student complaint policy. There are no right or wrong answers. You may pass on any question or stop the process at any time, and you will still be paid. Okay you ready to start?

Participant #2: Proceed, yes, yes.

Interviewer: Okay, great. So, could you please introduce yourself and your role with CNC?

Participant #2: For sure. My name is _____, I was a student at CNC first through the UT program. Then I ended up doing a full time, one-year ABT administrative assistant program and that's when the incident happened. After that program I worked for CNC and then, as I was working for them, I also continued to be a student. I was also taking a few more part time UT courses. I worked there from May 2015 to gosh what was that November 2021? Doing a little bit of everything.

Interviewer: That's fantastic Thank you. Do you have personal experience with the CNC student complaint policy?

Participant #2: I do.

Interviewer: Okay, do you want to tell me what happened around your experience and whatever you are comfortable sharing?

Participant #2: For sure, um, so this was when I was in the ABT program. There were two faculty who ran the program. The program coordinator and the faculty and it was pretty clear that there was discussion between the two.

Participant #2: (child singing nearby participant #2 while on the phone) ...I'm sorry, I'm trying to drift away from this singing. I can't complain about being serenaded. Okay, my apologies I'm....

Participant #2: The program coordinator had plans to retire soon, so there was kind of like that transferring of things, crossover of training that kind of stuff even though, like that the secondary instructor had been there for a while.

Participant #2: I'm, there had been a few incidences leading up to like the formal complaint that I feel are like the worst, worthy of note, because they had caused kind of like conflicts, I suppose, between like this instructor and myself, and it

wasn't actually just me, it was a few of us. But it's kind of started with there being a team building exercise. It was very confusing but that's okay that wasn't it...um but photos were taken, and she's (Instructor) was like "cool, so I'm just going to post these to the Facebook group hope everybody's cool with that? let me know if you're not but I'm going to assume that you are and post them unless I hear somebody say otherwise". I was doing my practicum in communications at that time and there was like literally my job to scan in the media releases, and I was just like this, like sorry, but like you can't really operate like this, like everybody might be okay, with it, but like we can't make that assumption. The assumption actually has to be on the opposite side of things, and we need to like have formal, you know, permission to be posting our pictures publicly and then there was another incident where we were doing a communications course and the elections are coming up and the topic was, "tell me who you're voting for, and why". Like, well, this isn't might not be the most appropriate question because you don't know if you're putting people in a place, they are uncomfortable or not and I've had people tell me personally, that they weren't comfortable with it so. I just kind of said maybe we need to like find a different way to do this.

Participant #2: And it was a really complicated relationship, like she was also teaching the financial course for the first time and math is my strong suit and there were literally times where she would come to me before the lesson be like, "I've got this right, right?"

Participant #2: And then the incident that happened is for the communications course we were always allowed to like study our previous quizzes to prep for the upcoming test and we like did that, before. (speaking to her child...Do you need help down? Okay, fine).

Participant #2: Okay. All right, that is.... (I'm going to try to isolate we'll see how that works (she was saying she was going to try to separate from the distractions of her young child)).

Participant #2: Okay, so really all it was, was we got written up for cheating because we had used our quizzes to study for the upcoming test, but that was a practice that had literally been encouraged up until then. And so, it was just like really unclear to us as to like why all of a sudden that wasn't Okay, and we did well on that test, but like we did well on all the tests that wasn't an anomaly, we did well in the course. But for that test we got written up for cheating because we had studied using the same methods that we had studied previously. We raised the complaint, because we did not feel that it was fair, there was four of us, and it was the same for who had kind of been involved in other things up until then.

Participant #2: And so, yes and the experience with the Dean was less than helpful, the experience with the student union was really frustrating and less than helpful. I assume, those are maybe separate things to get into after.

Interviewer: Do you want to expand on that, or do you feel that is part of? If so, yeah go ahead.

Participant #2: Oh, I definitely think that's part of it um yeah so, we were written up and then, we were like this is absurd there's been a pattern of ridiculous this whole year, this is not cool, we were really frustrated with it. And if we were to be honest, like, also it was like very like, oh my gosh if this person is going to be like taking over the program, this might not be good.

Participant #2: And so, we just wanted to like raise our concerns, so we went first to Student Union, and you know what? part of me, I don't know which order came first at this point, because this was a few years, but I do know that we tried to get support from the student Union. And the employee at the time, like would not support us because she too had had an incident with this same instructor the year prior. I believe may have been two years, but I think it was literally the year prior. So, because she had had a negative previous experience with this instructor, she didn't feel that it was appropriate for her to support us in our complaint, or you know, like whatever. And so, we were like "okay."

Interviewer #2: There seems to be a pattern here and people don't know if they don't know. And like we think it would be really valuable to like to have the support because right now it's like feels like our word against her word type situation. Which is really unfortunate. So, we got like the cold shoulder from the student Union, like she didn't, wouldn't, refer us to somebody else there. I just want to note that I know that employee is no longer with the student Union. And my experience working with Student Union so far in later years seems better, but I wasn't a student at that capacity anymore, so I have hopes. Maybe she's grown since then, but uh, but it was, it was very frustrating. Because it was like what are you? This person was supposed to go to for like literally exactly those kind of stuff because, of course, when we had our meeting with the Dean, and one of the other faculty even told us, and maybe this isn't exactly the case but, but we were told from another faculty was like, "well it's the deans job to protect their faculty so of course it's not going to go great on your end", and that's really what it was. So, we like, I don't know if all four of us went to the Dean, I think it may have just been the two of us, because some of the girls were like really uncomfortable right, because that was kind of like the trend of things. Like something would upset a group of people, but they didn't feel comfortable and then. Maybe me too it was uncomfortable so that I was like, "well I'm not going to say something. You know?"

And so yeah anyway, so I think I told the truth is that actually went forward to the Dean, but it was like you know we're like we explain that to how like we are trying to represent others, just like, "I'm really uncomfortable and or worried about their like position in the class or like their grade or anything like that, like consequences."

Interviewer: So, during, I mean Gawd, I'm really sorry, you went through this whole frustrating process but did at any point faculty, Dean or student Union mention to you that there was a student complaint policy and a process application or any of that?

Participant #2: We were like kind of desperate for like a formal route of things and I don't think that we were given it because I would have. If there was like a thing that we could have submitted or done.

We tried, we talked to the program coordinator and like other faculty. We talked to the student Union, and we talked to the Dean, and I don't know that at any point we were pointed towards a formal thing, because I know I would have been because I've had a different incident at the university.

Participant #2: And there (University) we tried, when we were directed to the student complaint policy and the other student who was impacted didn't want to because she didn't want her name associated with it, because she was appointed. That's cool and you know that there may be again consequences so sorry I'm just recalling that immigrant if I remember that. From that incident, this was a way bigger one I definitely would have remembered if we had been provided that opportunity, you know, we had on.

Interviewer: Okay, so... You know it's, it's nice for you to say, "well, these employees are no longer they're no longer there, but at the same time, it makes me wonder...."

Participant #2: Oh, the Faculty is.

Interviewer: The faculty is, and discipline has a process. Yeah um. Are you familiar with the CNC Student Complaint policy?

Participant #2: A yes.

Interviewer: You are now but...

Participant #2: Not at the time,

Interviewer: What are your initial thoughts on it when you think of the policy?

Participant #2: Oh, sorry I should have it in front of me so that....

Interviewer: No, no, no it's okay. Like it's just off even the top of your heads fine like when you think about the current CNC Student complaint policy, what are some?

Participant #2: thoughts that come to mind? was it when one of our emails?

Interviewer: yeah, the first one from the SFU email with the consent form.

Participant #2: So sorry. Just a little bit. nope. Sorry okay.

Interviewer: Are you looking at yours? Are you on your phone or your email?

Participant #2: I'm on my phone, I finally got it, sorry that one.

Interviewer: It's okay, I can share my screen if it is easier?

Participant #2: Oh, that's smart.

Participant #2: (reading aloud) Okay, this one has the... right... people first complaint against any, after the procedure administrative procedure, discrimination or harassment or operational freighters covered in the human. So, I think if we cannot first one, to be honest. that's always like.

Participant #2: I know the goal is to be very open and to be able to like to catch various things sorry I'm also I just scrolled up to see when it was last updated and oh my gosh! Oh, my gosh. Okay cuz I was like wait. To be honest, the filters like wait did they just like update it to be nice here? um. But I the one we're trying to say. So, I'll admit that, right now, like a part of my brain is also from my students are since the employment side of things, and if that's allowed to filter and.

Interviewer: sort of that yep.

Interviewer: The situation has to fit into that policy, or it doesn't really fit period, you know what I mean and as you said, "scrolled up and it's quite outdated" and lengthy and the wording and it's challenging it's uh for a student who's already frustrated to submit a complaint to that process.

Participant #2: Exactly, you would think that there'd be like a separate really easy straightforward procedures document that would just be like here's the situation do boom boom, I think, sorry one other note that I forgot to mention is that I also. Because of our experience and maybe it was just because of the negative experience with the student union and maybe that was an anomaly. But I'm like maybe if I had gone well, we would have felt more fair but because it was just like us and compensation against that, with the theme that's exactly what it felt like was like. Just like us against them, they had all the power and even though we felt that we had like been able to provide like a pattern of incidents and it was just like completely biased, because it was like, "Well, no, this is just my faculty and I'm not going to, even if I do you know if I am upset I won't let you know or something with like the type of vibe, and so it was so like.

Interviewer: yeah.

Participant #2: It would have been nice to have had. You know somebody was like odd bias somebody who's just. Like a mediator type role for complaints, who, just like facilitated the process instead of just like going deeper into the belly of the beast.

Interviewer: that's another great point is no matter who's dealing with it when it's an internal process that can feel out of balance automatically just based on being staff faculty who's ever dealing with it from the point of view of a student right it's like. it's going to its going to if I'm a student it's going to work in the faculty or dean's favor or whoever kind of just an automatic.

Interviewer: really good point just a couple more questions, thank you, I appreciate this um.

Interviewer: If you were to submit a complaint to CNC thinking back to when you're a student, if you had this complaint and you did, what would you want to see, how would you want to see them (CNC) resolve the issues?

Participant #2: I would have loved to have had an opportunity to like have it addressed with both parties at the same table. Just to kind of, again, because it felt so.... she said, they said, and so, if we had both had an opportunity to come together in a space. To like just kind of address the issue, I think it would have been a little bit easier to kind of like walk away from it now, I say that and, like some people might totally disagree, because it might feel like confrontational. That would make some people uncomfortable but for me. I also do kind of feel that like. And that's why policy is so important is because you have to have that. Factors in place to make sure that the student feels safe because that's so often the contact people don't want to make a formal complaint because they're scared of possible repercussions yeah so as I say that that's just like maybe, seeking resolution. I personally would have loved to have had an opportunity to just like, whatever because we obviously it's not like we've liked what came from it, but it would have been, they certainly walked away from it being like, I don't know we both were talking about it at the same time, so it couldn't be both people would have been able to represent themselves like, "oh no that's not what I said man, that was.... yeah.

Interviewer: I thought, which happens a lot, so based on your response it's almost maybe a possibility of having options of how it's resolved. You know doing a face to face, but maybe another student only checks the box on where you feel most comfortable.

Participant #2: Oh, my gosh what a student centric approach that would be. oh my gosh I think that actually be really great and sorry student centric just even saying that, just like brings it to my mind to of how like yeah like I just want to reiterate there's like that a power dynamic and so you really, this is really the Nikki thing to try to vote and. Try to do well. Because you have there's a lot of

like on doing that no I'm doing, but you know, like leveling out that needs to happen because so many people are so scared of repercussions and all that kind of stuff and so, giving them options, wherever possible, whatever that looks like even if it's minor or. Minor it would just like if it shifts even like an element of control with like Okay, you know, I have a decision here, I can make yeah just have a little bit little bit of power, a little bit of autonomy in like what.

Interviewer: Is the balance of power out a bit better.

Participant #2: mm hmm.

Interviewer: that's a great idea that's a good point okay um I think for on second last question, if you were suddenly given the task of revising this policy, what revisions or inclusions would you want to see implemented in the next policy update.

Participant #2: I would want to see expensive like research and like betting through various stakeholders and so that means the student Union that means students, that means. Like whoever and I, and I know that there's kind of a process to like have things vetted by some parties when policies are getting approved, but I mean like including these people on the ground and just getting. A really like a varied approach like this type of research that you're doing is so phenomenal for exactly that, and like that this is my opinion.

Participant #2: How you do the right thing you reach out okay what works what doesn't work and, like what works for this person or like these types of people that are being represented what work, because if we only look at it from that faculty lens or whatever it might be then. It's just like impossible to balance it out if you don't have proper representation. Which.

Interviewer: yeah, because we don't. We certainly don't poll the students to we just asked for faculty. To on the update is.

Participant #2: Like yeah. I'm faculty are super like I Like just a shout out to the faculty is like.... they're a little over works, you know any of you like, knowing the faculty agreement between like the university and the College and town, I know they're very different institutions, but like. You know it's a lot, so I totally understand the need to while we have to like balance things for students, we also need to support faculty for sure for sure.

Interviewer: They wear many hats.

Participant #2: loosely mm hmm.

Interviewer: Okay, and final question is, do you have anything to add or any questions about the process or anything else you would like to be factored into this research?

Interviewer: I guess I'm just nothing else to be factored in, but I am just curious.

Participant #2: Do you like, as an academic advisor do you know, if it seems like our people directing students to the policy? like are you guys seeing like is it coming through the advisors or like the student Union, what are you seeing?

Interviewer: My experience has been that as an advisor I directed a lot of students to it, but when they saw it, they were like no thanks. Yeah no, thank you, is there, another way, can I just send an email or whatever they really wanted nothing to do with it and then. So, even if the awareness is there and the engagement piece of it, it's just not as student union has been much more supportive and things like that, but again it's not that student Union doesn't want to support them it's the students who don't want to go through the whole process.

Participant #2: Yes, makes sense.

Interviewer: So, coming back to like you're saying simplify it.

Participant #2: Like just simplify it.

Interviewer: and make it more student focused and some options and because really ultimately, I feel if we can, this could be a great way to get student feedback on how to improve the institution as a whole, but if we can't even get the feedback from students, how else can they express themselves? How else do we know what we're doing right what we're doing wrong.

Participant #2: You know, and so this is kind of one of those ways into it and so we'll see, we'll see.

Interviewer: um so yeah, any other thing anything else you wanted to.

Participant #2: Just kind of one more point to amplify one of the points that you just said is like. You know, since not wanting to engage with it, and like, can I just send an email like why the heck not is it and, like, why is it any more difficult than having like your transcripts with you'd already have you know. Like there's just a page online right and to my information, I provide you know click the boxes, do you want it face to pick you want, you know, like. Do whatever, that is, but just like a one-page form and then it just goes off should whoever it goes off to whoever. Opposite that's what the institution like figures out who's best again they may actually invest some resources and, like a person or something.

Participant #2: To be able to do this well, but if it creates a better culture and a better dynamic between the students and the faculty of long term and it increases student retention and lines with Sam and you're hitting all your key boxes yeah now.

Appendix F. Survey Questions

1. I agree to participate
Yes

How can a Student-Centered approach inform Student Complaint Policy Revisions to be more Inclusive?

2. Based on the following answers, how do you self-identify as a student at CNC?
Aboriginal
Domestic
International
Other (please specify)
None of the above

3. Please choose one of the following to describe your level of study at CNC
First Year Student
Second Year Student
Other (please specify)

4. Are you aware CNC has a student complaint policy?
Yes
No

5. Do you know where to access the student complaint policy?
Yes
No

6. Have you ever submitted a complaint through the CNC Student Complaint Policy?
Yes
No

7. If yes, what was the topic of the complaint? Please click all that apply
Admissions process
Course registration process
Instructor / Faculty issue
Campus / Facilities issue
Mandatory pre-requisites / electives
Grade appeal
Class schedule (conflicts, times, no evening/weekend options)
No seat availability - waitlists

Lack of resources ie: tutors, advising, wellness, mental health
No career resources
Other (please specify)
None of the above

8. If yes, were you satisfied with the CNC Student Complaint Policy procedure?
Yes
No
Other (please specify)

9. If you answered no to question 7, why were you **not satisfied** with the CNC Student Complaint Policy Procedure?
No resolution found
Too formal and lengthy procedure
Did not result in my favor
I was never contacted or followed up with
Other (please specify)
None of the above
Other (please specify)

10. Have you ever wanted to submit a complaint but chose not to?
Yes
No

11. If you wanted to submit a complaint but chose not to, what stopped you?
Did not know who to contact
Did not know where to find policy
Did not want to submit a **formal** complaint
I was afraid to submit a complaint for possible repercussions
Resolved issue on own or with a CNC employee
Other (please specify)
None of the above

12. Have you submitted a complaint but through other channels ie: email or in person?
Yes
No
Other (please specify)

13. If you were ever involved in a student complaint procedure, what conflict resolution method would you like used to resolve your complaint?
Open discussion facilitated by third party ie: Student Union, Ombudsman, etc

Talking Circle
Email correspondence
Training in conflict resolution
A simple apology
Other (please specify)
None of the above

14. What comments would you like to share about the CNC Student Complaint policy that have not been asked

15. Would you be willing to participate in an upcoming focus group to provide further feedback for a student centered approach to policy revisions?

Yes

No

Name

Email Address

Phone Number

16. If you answered yes to the above question, please fill out the information below for follow up.

Appendix G. Letter of Invitation

How can a Student-Centered approach inform Student Complaint Policy Revisions to be more Inclusive?

An invitation to participate in this online survey.

Please take time to review the following information.

I, Gail Little, am conducting this survey as part of a research project exploring the College of New Caledonia (CNC) students' experience and perspectives of the CNC Student Complaint Policy. As a Master's candidate at Simon Fraser University (SFU) and an employee of CNC, this research is part of a Masters of Educational Leadership program being supervised by Dr. Michelle Pidgeon, Faculty of Education, SFU. The analysis of this research will be presented in the form of a written report to the faculty supervisor, as well as a public poster session at the 2022 Summer Institute at CNC.

The purpose of this research is to learn how a student-centered approach informs CNC student complaint policy revisions to be more inclusive. The **10-minute** survey will guide my attempt to gain insights on the current student engagement with the student complaint policy. You may choose not to answer any of the questions, and you may also end your participation in the survey at any point in the process. This is a minimal risk study. The stress involved in completing the survey will be no more than the stress that you encounter in your daily life.

Data Collection: Data collected for this survey is confidential and your name and any description of your participation will be kept in a password protected computer in a locked office. Data collected using SFU's Survey Monkey is hosted in Canada and implementation meets the requirements of BC's Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA) legislation. SurveyMonkey, Inc. is United States

of America (USA)-owned and application and data are hosted at the SFU data center and support is provided by SFU staff in Canada. The server for this data is stored in the USA so recorded content is subject to the USA Patriot Act and Clarifying Lawful Overseas Use of Data (Cloud) Act. These laws allow government authorities to access the records of host services and internet service providers. I will destroy all data collected after I have completed my Masters in Education requirements. Future analysis of the data, free of any connection to you may be done for journals, presentations, or policy updates.

Participation in this research is voluntary. You may decide to stop participating at any point in the process, for any reason. There are no negative consequences for withdrawing your participation. In the case of anonymously collected data, we will not be able to identify it as yours so we will not be able to remove your data once survey responses are submitted. If you have further questions, you may contact Gail Little. If you would like to talk to the faculty supervisor, you may contact Dr. Michelle Pidgeon

If you have any concerns about your rights as a research participant and/or your experiences while participating in this study, please contact SFU Office of Research Ethics.

OK

Question Title

I agree to participate

