



**Consultations on the  
Government of Canada's  
Proposal to Establish  
a Canadian Learning Institute**



**Summary Report**

**By**

**Dr. Benjamin Levin, University of Manitoba  
Shirley Seward, CEO, Canadian Labour and Business Centre**

**February 2003**



**Consultations on the  
Government of Canada’s Proposal  
to Establish a Canadian Learning Institute**

**Summary Report**

---

**Table of Contents**

<b>Introduction</b> .....	1
<b>1. Overall Views</b> .....	4
1.1 Views of Provinces and Territories.....	4
1.2 Views of Stakeholders.....	5
<b>2. Proposed Mandate</b> .....	7
2.1 Views of Provinces and Territories .....	7
2.2 Views of Stakeholders.....	8
<b>3. Proposed Governance and Structure</b> .....	10
3.1 Views of Provinces and Territories .....	10
3.2 Views of Stakeholders.....	11
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	13
<b>Appendix A: List of Participants</b> .....	15

## **Introduction**

### **Background**

In the Speech from the Throne of September 30, 2002, the Government of Canada committed to work with Canadians, provinces and territories, business and labour organizations and other stakeholders “to create the skills and learning architecture that Canada needs”. In particular, it committed to “building our knowledge and reporting to Canadians about what is working and what is not”.

At the National Summit on Innovation and Learning on November 18, 2002, the Honourable Jane Stewart, Minister of Human Resources Development, speaking on behalf of the Prime Minister, signalled the Government of Canada’s intention to work with its partners to develop a Canadian Learning Institute.

On January 9, 2003, Minister Stewart announced that she had asked Dr. Benjamin Levin of the University of Manitoba and Ms. Shirley Seward, Chief Executive Officer of the Canadian Labour and Business Centre, to undertake an initial round of consultations regarding the broad parameters of a proposed Canadian Learning Institute, including knowledge and information needs, mandate and organizational structure.

Envisaged as an independent, pan-Canadian organization that promotes and supports evidence-based information on all areas of lifelong learning, the mandate of the institute was proposed as follows:

- Informing Canadians regularly on Canada’s progress in learning;
- Promoting knowledge and information exchange; and
- Supporting experimentation in innovative approaches to learning.

The Government of Canada has indicated that the success of such an organization requires the active collaboration and participation of the full range of learning system partners. Provinces and territories have an important constitutional role in relation to education. Business, labour and learning institutions play a critical role in the provision of learning opportunities and have a strong interest in the proposed mandate of the Canadian Learning Institute. Many other important stakeholders, including national Aboriginal organizations, early childhood and literacy organizations, as well as municipalities and policy research think tanks

play an active role in the area of lifelong learning and have an important stake in the establishment of the proposed institution.

### **Consultation Process**

Consultations were undertaken during the last three weeks of January and the first half of February, 2003. They provided an opportunity for provinces and territories, and a wide range of stakeholders to express their views on the proposed mandate and organization of the institute and their willingness to participate.

While Dr. Levin consulted primarily with provincial and territorial governments and national learning organizations, Ms. Seward met with business and labour organizations, national Aboriginal organizations, early childhood and literacy organizations and other stakeholder organizations. When possible, we both participated in meetings.

We met with all provinces and territories, and more than 50 national level organizations with a strong interest in education, learning and labour market issues. In a few cases, participants considered the process, from their point of view, as one of information gathering rather than consultation, and this is noted in Appendix A of the report.

This report outlines the views expressed over the course of these consultations, but comments are not attributed to specific individuals or organizations. The report identifies areas where there seemed to be agreement and areas where views diverge, under three main themes:

- Overall views
- Proposed mandate
- Proposed governance and structure

We are submitting our report on the consultations to the Minister of Human Resources Development, and a copy will be sent to everyone with whom we have consulted. We thank all those who took the time, often on very short notice, to meet with us. We greatly appreciated the participation and candour of all those with whom we met. The time frame was very short, and we are conscious that we were unable to meet with all important groups in the country.

We take comfort in assurances we have received from the Government of Canada that this was meant to be an *initial* consultation to seek views at the early stage of development of the proposed Canadian Learning

*The Canadian Learning Institute: Consultations Report*

Institute and that provinces and territories, and other interested parties will have future opportunities for input and participation as plans progress.

Any errors or omissions are solely our responsibility.



---

Dr. Benjamin Levin  
University of Manitoba



---

Shirley Seward, CEO  
Canadian Labour and Business  
Centre

## **1. Overall Views**

### **1.1 Views of Provinces and Territories**

Provinces and territories recognize the importance of and are very interested in developing policies in support of lifelong learning. They report being actively involved in these efforts in their own jurisdictions, and see the importance of links across the areas of learning from early childhood through adolescence to adult education and workplace learning. Provinces and territories are also supportive of the value of high quality information in shaping policy and practice in relation to learning. All agree that this is an area where the collaboration of various parties could improve Canada's understanding of learning. Several jurisdictions expressed their readiness to participate and their hope that they might benefit from the proposed institute.

Provinces and territories also expressed a variety of concerns about the proposed Canadian Learning Institute. Territories and smaller provinces were generally less critical than were the larger provinces. Provinces and territories view the Canadian Learning Institute within the broader context of their relations with the federal government on matters of learning. This is an area where federal-provincial/territorial agreement has been less advanced relative to some other policy fields, such as the National Children's Agenda where there is a joint agreement on a framework and principles. This is not the case in the skills and learning area, which makes progress more difficult.

Provinces and territories clearly regard education as being a matter of provincial/territorial jurisdiction. In some provinces and territories, 'education' is understood to include all areas of learning while in others there is a greater inclination to recognize the importance of a national perspective in areas such as early childhood development or workplace learning.

From the standpoint of provinces and territories, the federal government has taken a variety of actions over the last few years (such as Canadian Foundation for Innovation, Canadian Millennium Scholarship Foundation, Canada Research Chairs, and so on) in what provinces and territories see as an area of their jurisdiction. Although the Government of Canada has said that the Canadian Learning Institute could proceed in partnership with provinces and territories, there is some concern among provinces and territories whether this will in fact be the case.

Most provinces and territories expressed the view that the creation of the Canadian Learning Institute was not among the issues of most importance related to learning. Investment or reinvestment in learning programs was given much greater importance.

Provinces and territories generally felt that there were already a number of initiatives underway in relation to improving knowledge and information about learning, including examples such as the Pan-Canadian Education Indicators Program and the Post-secondary Expectations Project of the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada. Several jurisdictions had doubts that the creation of a new institution in this field was the best strategy to make progress and could result in funds being used to support an institution instead of being used to achieve important objectives around information. Although provinces and territories did agree that more information would be helpful, they did not seem to feel strongly, as suggested by the Canadian Learning Institute proposal, that progress on learning in Canada is hampered by very important gaps in our knowledge.

## **1.2 Views of Stakeholders**

We consulted with national and Quebec-based business and labour organizations. They were very supportive of the proposed Canadian Learning Institute. While there was an appreciation of the importance of all aspects of lifelong learning, most business and labour leaders stressed that the focus should be on adult and workplace learning. They talked about the importance of skills upgrading, recognition of credentials of immigrants, inter-provincial mobility and literacy. They spoke persuasively of skills shortages, and the importance of continuous learning in the context of an aging workforce. They argued that there is a critical gap in knowledge and information in adult and workplace learning area, and this gap must receive special attention. This view was shared by many of the sector councils.

National education stakeholders, early childhood groups, municipal organizations and many other non-governmental organizations were also supportive of the concept of the Canadian Learning Institute. They saw the need for a pan-Canadian effort to focus more attention on lifelong learning, both formal and informal. Different groups placed priority on different elements of lifelong learning, including early childhood development, elementary and secondary education, post-secondary education, and adult and workplace learning. Many groups

stressed the importance of issues such as literacy and prior learning assessment in the workplace, and they felt these issues should be included in the broad mandate of the Canadian Learning Institute.

All stakeholders were sensitive to federal/provincial/territorial jurisdictional issues in the area of formal education, especially with respect to the elementary and secondary education system. This led some stakeholders to want to focus on other areas, such as adult learning where they felt that the federal government has more scope. Others said that jurisdictional problems should not impede the proposed institute's activity in the formal education system, but that this should be handled in cooperation with the provinces and territories.

Although there was general support for the goals of the proposed institute, there were some reservations and caution expressed by some stakeholders. National Aboriginal organizations said that investments in program and services that meet the basic learning and education needs of their communities should take precedence over the establishment of a new information institute. Other stakeholders, including literacy groups and disability groups, were concerned that important issues relating to the needs of particular groups and regions (e.g. minority official language communities; rural and remote areas) could be "lost" in a very broad lifelong learning approach.

Others, including many business and labour leaders, felt that the objectives of the Canadian Learning Institute were valid and important, but that they could be achieved by mandating and supporting already existing institutions and mechanisms. Some research organizations wanted assurances that their own work in the area of lifelong learning would not be duplicated or displaced.

## **2. Proposed Mandate**

### **2.1 Views of Provinces and Territories**

There was little consensus among provinces and territories regarding either the overall mandate of the institute or its three proposed functions.

There was broad agreement that the second of the three proposed areas of work for the Canadian Learning Institute – **Knowledge/Information Exchange**, or mobilizing knowledge for action – was important and positive. The view was expressed that any new efforts in this area should give priority to building on or complementing existing work being done by a variety of organizations including some provincial and territorial governments.

In regard to the proposed mandate around **Informing Canadians** of progress on matters of learning, provinces and territories expressed divergent views. All provinces and territories are already engaged in some form of public reporting on indicators or outcomes. In regard to possible national indicators, some were interested in creating and reporting on these (while often noting that this would be a challenging task from a technical point of view), while others were concerned that national reporting would inevitably be unfair to jurisdictions with higher need levels or lower fiscal capacity. They also questioned how the reporting function could be carried out without turning into an evaluation of provincial and territorial policies.

In regard to the **Experimentation and Innovation** function, a majority of provinces and territories were supportive while several were quite concerned, feeling that this activity had the potential to influence provincial and territorial policy priorities or to give inappropriate leverage to federal interests in an area of provincial/territorial jurisdiction. Some jurisdictions noted that provinces and territories varied greatly in their ability to cost-share experiments with a consequent potential to allow a few jurisdictions to dominate this agenda.

Several jurisdictions thought that the mandate was too broad for a single organization and that it might be more advisable to limit the mandate either by taking different approaches to some of the main sectors (e.g. handling adult and workplace learning separately from elementary, secondary and post-secondary education) or by eliminating one of the proposed functions (although there was no agreement on which one).

Some jurisdictions took the view that most or even all of the work proposed for the Canadian Learning Institute could be carried out through the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada or the Forum of Labour Market Ministers engaging with other partners rather than through a new entity.

There was also a concern that current opportunities for provinces and territories to partner with Human Resources Development Canada on particular initiatives not be displaced or transferred to the Canadian Learning Institute, with a consequent loss of support for various programs. Issues were also raised regarding how the activities of the institute might relate to current work not only in Human Resources Development Canada, but also in other departments such as Industry Canada or Canadian Heritage.

## **2.2 Views of Stakeholders**

There were areas of agreement and points of divergence regarding the three parts of the mandate amongst the stakeholders.

There was strong support for the **Knowledge/Information Exchange** role on the part of most of the groups consulted. There are good sources of information already in existence generated by the federal government, provinces and territories and a wide range of stakeholders. However, this information is not always easily accessible, nor does it always reach the people and communities who need it most. A number of groups recognized that there is currently no one organization in Canada which is mandated to promote information sharing and knowledge exchange amongst the many players involved in learning at a pan-Canadian level.

Many stakeholders stressed the importance of sharing “best” or “innovative” practices, as well as information about what does not work, in order to encourage greater uptake of innovation. For many, knowledge and information sharing was the most important role that the Canadian Learning Institute could play; but at the same time this must lead to action, change and improvement. This means that the information sharing process itself must be innovative; it must have practical use, and it must utilize the existing networks of all stakeholders.

Many stakeholders saw the **Experimentation** role of the institute in a positive light, although for most stakeholders it was not as important as

the role of **Knowledge Exchange**, or the development of a national framework of indicators associated with the **Informing Canadians** role. Some stakeholders felt it was premature to embark on experimentation until the new institute had pulled together existing information, including information on existing innovative practices. Others supported the innovation role, since it would lead to practical action and change.

The role that elicited the widest range of views was **Informing Canadians** regularly on Canada's progress in learning, particularly the development of indicators. Some stakeholders felt this would be the most critical role of the proposed institute, as it would ensure accountability for the learning investments of governments, learning institutions, business and others, and it would lead to change and reform. Other stakeholders worried that this part of the mandate would create jurisdictional tensions and sensitivities, particularly in the area of elementary and secondary education, and this would undermine the success of the other parts of the mandate.

Stakeholders suggested that in moving forward in this area, the Canadian Learning Institute should work closely with the provinces and territories, which are already doing work on the development of indicators in the area of formal education. Stakeholders stressed a collaborative process should be used to ensure that the definitions of the indicators have broad acceptance and validity. For example, some business groups cautioned that existing measures of workplace training are not designed to adequately reflect training efforts in small and medium sized businesses, where most training is informal and unstructured. Some stakeholders, including childhood groups, stressed that the indicators should be much broader than economic and labour market measures and that we should think about "learning for life", not just "learning for work".

Many emphasized that there was a need to ensure that high quality data are available in Canada, if the mandate of the Canadian Learning Institute is to succeed. Many provinces and territories and other stakeholders stressed the value of the national longitudinal surveys currently supported by Statistics Canada and Human Resources Development Canada, for example, the National Longitudinal Survey on Children and Youth and the Adult Education and Training Survey. They considered these to be an important source of information for many stakeholders as well as an effective tool for advancing our understanding of the issues related to lifelong learning.

### **3. Proposed Governance and Structure**

#### **3.1 Views of Provinces and Territories**

The independence of the proposed Canadian Learning Institute was important to many provinces and territories. Some felt that it would be difficult for an institution to be independent if it was mainly funded by annual appropriations from the federal government and thus could potentially be vulnerable to having its funding cut or withdrawn. At least one province thought that the cost of an institute should be shared by multiple partners.

Provinces and territories generally agreed with the proposal that the Canadian Learning Institute be a non-profit corporation. There was also broad agreement that a governance structure must be efficient and that the size of a governing body should not be too large. At the same time, they did express a number of concerns on governance issues.

They wondered how it might be possible to have a governance structure that provided meaningful input from across the country. Smaller provinces and territories were particularly sensitive to the possibility that their unique situations and needs could get ignored in a national institution. It will be challenging to set up a structure that reflects the diverse interests of regions and organizations while at the same time paying attention to the different learning sectors. Experience with other pan-Canadian organizations has shown how difficult this task can be.

Provinces and territories believed that they collectively needed to have a strong role in the governance structure of an institute if one is established. While they recognized the interest of many social partners in learning issues, they are highly aware of their constitutional responsibility for elementary through to post-secondary education. Some jurisdictions thought that it would be inappropriate to have a governance structure that included a wide range of other stakeholders, and that these areas should be managed largely or entirely by the governments that have responsibility for them.

Several jurisdictions noted that progress on information and reporting in other areas – early childhood development and health, for example – emerged slowly and as part of broader federal-provincial-territorial discussions rather than as proposals emanating from the Government of

Canada. They expressed the view that more intergovernmental discussion would be more likely to lead to more effective joint action. Those familiar with the Canadian Institute for Health Information saw it as a promising model, although one that was rooted in and drew support from a larger federal-provincial/territorial policy agreement.

### **3.2 Views of Stakeholders**

An overwhelming majority of stakeholders agreed that the proposed Canadian Learning Institute must be independent of government, and not unduly influenced by ideological and political pressures. However, some stakeholders cautioned that too much independence could also result in little impact, especially with respect to influencing public policy.

There were a range of views regarding the governance of the institute. Stakeholders fell into four main groups:

- Many stakeholders felt that the governance structure should be small and efficient. They were comfortable with the inclusion of four major groups: governments, business, labour and learning organizations. They were sensitive to the importance of securing the input of a broader range of stakeholders; but felt this could best be done through other mechanisms such as advisory committees, “associates” from stakeholder groups connected to the institute, or a non-executive group of members;
- A second group stressed that the Board of Governors should be much larger, and should include representation from a wide range of stakeholders. This group of stakeholders did not believe that other mechanisms such as committees would give them the role in governance that they wanted;
- A small third group suggested an “eminent Canadians” model, instead of a stakeholder-based governance structure. Board members would be selected on the basis of their integrity, expertise and influence; and
- One or two groups felt that the institute represented not only one, but several, sets of activities that had their own cultures and may require their own governance and operational structures.

Given the tension between the need for an effective, efficient governance structure and the need to ensure full stakeholder involvement, many stakeholders stressed that the way in which the organization *operates and functions*, is just as important as its governance structure. One promising approach, which emerged from the discussions, might be to construct the Canadian Learning Institute as the “hub” of a wheel, with spokes reaching out and partnering with existing “nodes of expertise” or existing institutions involved in the different areas of the lifelong learning mandate of the institute.

## **Conclusion**

Almost everyone with whom we spoke can see benefits in the better application of information and knowledge to issues of learning, whether this is to assist individuals in making learning choices, educators and learning organizations to provide the right programs and services, employers and workers to build the learning capacity of their organizations, non-governmental organizations to more effectively deliver services and provide public policy input, or governments to make optimal policy decisions.

As our report shows, however, and as one would expect in a country as diverse as Canada, our respondents expressed a wide range of views about the need for and potential role of a Canadian Learning Institute. These range from optimism to cynicism; from strong support of the idea to considerable concern about its merits and potential efficacy.

We are conscious that some provinces and territories have reservations about this proposed institute, particularly as it relates to the formal education system that lies in their jurisdiction. We are equally conscious that the majority of non-governmental stakeholders are very supportive, and would be disappointed if no action were taken.

A number of key areas of consensus emerged from the consultations. These include: developing collaborative partnerships and alliances; recognizing the mandated roles of provincial and territorial governments in regard to formal education; making effective use of existing institutions and networks; supporting and building on existing knowledge bases and expertise; and the critical importance of mobilizing knowledge in a practical way so that it leads to action and change.

We also believe, as does the Government of Canada, that a Canadian Learning Institute requires active participation by many parties if it is to be successful. In our view the success of the institute would require that:

- 1) Its activities provide practical value to the many different parties across Canada that use or produce learning information.
- 2) It is an information and knowledge institute, not an advocacy institute. One of its primary roles should be to improve our level of knowledge about learning issues and to share information that mobilizes action, without taking public policy positions on learning issues.

- 3) It embodies strong, effective partnerships with federal, provincial and territorial governments, business, labour, learning institutions, and a range of stakeholders actively involved or interested in different aspects of lifelong learning. It will be important that the institute recognizes the mandated roles of provincial and territorial governments in the area of formal education, and be seen to complement, extend and strengthen work already underway across Canada around issues of information and learning. The organization must aim to increase capacity across the country.
- 4) It develops a governance structure that is efficient yet allows effective input from many sources. It should be an independent institute, respected and trusted by all parties.

If the above issues can be successfully addressed, then our consultations indicate that a Canadian Learning Institute could make a useful contribution to the development of learning in Canada.

## Appendix A: List of Participants

### PROVINCES & TERRITORIES

#### Government of Newfoundland

Vivian Randell, Deputy Minister of Human Resources and Employment  
Bruce Hollett, Deputy Minister of Youth Services and Post-Secondary Education  
Harold Press, Deputy Minister of Education  
Gerry White, Assistant Deputy Minister, Department of Health and Community Services  
Rachelle Cochrane, Assistant Deputy Minister, Post-Secondary Education, Department of Youth Services and Post-Secondary Education  
Wayne Penney, Assistant Deputy Minister, Policy and Planning Division, Department of Human Resources and Employment  
Glenn Loveless, Director, Program Development Division, Primary, Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education

#### Government of Prince Edward Island

Paul Jelley, Deputy Minister of Development and Technology  
Leo J. Walsh, Deputy Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs  
Shauna Sullivan Curley, Deputy Minister of Education  
Rory Francis, Deputy Minister of Health and Social Services

#### Government of Nova Scotia

Dennis Cochrane, Deputy Minister of Education  
Marian F.H. Tyson, Deputy Minister of Community Services  
Stuart Gourley, Senior Executive Director, Skills and Learning Branch, Department of Education

#### Government of New Brunswick

Don Ferguson, Deputy Minister of Training and Employment Development  
Karen Mann, Deputy Minister of Education  
Roger Doucet, Sous-Ministre de l'Éducation  
Dave Easby, Assistant Deputy Minister, Planning and Corporate Services, Department of Family and Community Services  
Michel Thériault, Assistant Deputy Minister, Training Services Division, Department of Training and Employment Development  
Louise Boudreau, Executive Director, Post-Secondary Affairs Branch, Department of Education  
John Cunningham, Executive Director, Workforce Development Strategy, Department of Training and Employment Development  
Deborah Burns, Executive Director, Planning and Advocacy, Department of Training and Employment Development  
Susan Butterfield, Senior Policy Advisor, Department of Intergovernmental Affairs  
Anne Macies, Policy Analyst, Policy Section, Department of Education

#### \*Government of Québec

Jean-Yves Bourque, Sous-ministre adjoint à la direction générale de la planification et des services sociaux, Ministère de l'Emploi et de la Solidarité sociale  
Louis Gendreau, sous-ministre adjoint à l'information et aux communications, Ministère de l'Éducation

---

\* Representatives of the Government of Québec with whom we met considered the process to be an information session rather than a consultation session.

Michel Monette, directeur des affaires canadiennes et internationales, Ministère de l'Emploi et de la Solidarité sociale  
 Sylvie Malaison, conseillère, Ministère de l'Éducation  
 Michèle Turgeon, conseillère, Ministère de la Famille et de l'Enfance  
 Clément Bourque, analyste conseiller, Ministère du Conseil Exécutif

**Government of Ontario**

Kevin Costante, Deputy Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities  
 Bill Forward, Assistant Deputy Minister, Training Division, Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities  
 Judith Wright, Assistant Deputy Minister, Strategic Planning and Elementary/Secondary Programs Division, Ministry of Education  
 Jessica Hill, Assistant Deputy Minister for Post-Secondary Education Division, Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities

**Government of Manitoba**

Pat Rowantree, Deputy Minister of Advanced Education and Training  
 Tannis Mindell, Deputy Minister of Family Services and Housing

**Government of Saskatchewan**

Craig Dotson, Deputy Minister of Learning  
 Bonnie Durnford, Deputy Minister of Social Services

**Government of Alberta**

Shelley Ewart-Johnson, Deputy Minister of Human Resources and Employment  
 Lois Hawkins, Assistant Deputy Minister, Information and Strategic Services Division, Ministry of Learning  
 Marcia Nelson, Executive Director, Strategic Services, Ministry of Human Resources and Employment  
 Sherry Thompson, Director, Intergovernmental and Policy Research, Ministry of Children's Services

**Government of British Columbia**

Gerry Armstrong, Deputy Minister of Advanced Education

**Government of Yukon**

Judy Moore, Deputy Minister of Education  
 Gordon McDevitt, Assistant Deputy Minister of Advanced Education  
 Colin Kelly, Superintendent of Schools, Department of Education

**Government of Northwest Territories**

Dr. Loretta Foley, Deputy Minister of Education, Culture and Employment  
 Lesley Allen, Assistant Deputy Minister, Advanced Education and Careers, Department of Education, Culture and Employment  
 Dan Daniels, Assistant Deputy Minister, Education and Culture Branch, Department of Education, Culture and Employment

**Government of Nunavut**

Tom Rich, Deputy Minister of Education

**ABORIGINAL ORGANIZATIONS**

**\* Assembly of First Nations**

Susan Howard, Policy Research Officer for Education  
 Lynn Chabot, Policy Analyst, Aboriginal Human Resource Development Agreements - Youth

**\*Congress of Aboriginal Peoples**

Debra Wright, Consultant

**\*Inuit Tapirit Kanatami**

Donna Kisoun, Policy Advisor  
 John Cheechoo, Special Projects Coordinator

**\*Métis National Council**

Wenda Watteyne, Executive Director  
 Pauline Huppe, Director, Youth Initiatives

**Pauktuutit – Inuit Women's Association**

Catherine Carry, Special Projects Coordinator (input by e-mail)

---

\* Representatives of these organizations with whom we met considered the process to be an information session rather than a consultation session.

**BUSINESS & LABOUR  
ORGANIZATIONS**

**Alliance des manufacturiers et  
exportateurs du Québec**

Paul Arthur Huot, Président directeur  
général

**Alliance of Sector Councils (The)**

Gary Greenman, Executive Director,  
The Alliance of Sector Councils

Bob Cook, Executive Director,  
Canadian Technology Human  
Resources Board

Grant Trump, President & Chief  
Executive Officer,  
Canadian Council for Human  
Resources in the Environment  
Industry

Gail Larose, Secretary General,  
Canadian Alliance of Education  
and Training Organizations (TASC  
Observer)

George Ramik, Project Manager,  
Canadian Automotive Repair and  
Services Council

Wendy Swedlove, President, Canadian  
Tourism Human Resources  
Council

Johanna Oehling, Executive Director,  
National Seafood Sector Council

Kelly Lendsay, Executive Director,  
Aboriginal Human Resources  
Development Council of Canada

Jean-Philippe Tabet, National  
Coordinator, Canada Career  
Information Partnership

Paul Swinwood, President, Software  
Human Resource Council

**Canadian Apprenticeship Forum**

Keith Lancaster, Executive Director

**Canadian Chamber of Commerce**

Nancy Hughes Anthony, President & Chief  
Executive Officer

Michael Murphy, Senior Vice-President,  
Policy

Rob McKinstry, Policy Analyst

Les Chapman, Principal Consultant,  
IBM Business Consulting Services

Jill Proctor, Principal Consultant, IBM  
Business Consulting Services

Dave Santi, Manager, Personnel,  
Dofasco Inc.

**Canadian Council of Chief  
Executives**

David Stewart-Patterson, Senior Vice-  
President, Policy

**Canadian Federation of Independent  
Business**

Catherine Swift, President & Chief  
Executive Officer

**Canadian Labour Congress**

Kenneth Georgetti, President  
Barbara Byers, Executive Vice-  
President  
Kevin Hayes, Senior Economist

**Canadian Manufacturers &  
Exporters**

Perrin Beatty, President & Chief  
Executive Officer

**Chambre de Commerce du Québec**

Michel Audet, Président

**Conseil du Patronat du Québec**

Gilles Taillon, Président

**Fédération des travailleurs et  
travailleuses du Québec**

René Roy, Secrétaire général

**National Union of Public and  
General Employees**

Larry Brown, National Secretary  
Treasurer

Mike Luff, National Research  
Representative

**United Food and Commercial  
Workers of Canada**

Michael J. Fraser, National Director

**LEARNING ORGANIZATIONS**

**Association of Canadian Community  
Colleges**

Gerald Brown, President

**Association of Universities and  
Colleges of Canada**

Robert Best, Vice President, National  
Affairs

Christian Sylvain, Director,  
Government Relations and Public  
Affairs

Herb O'Heron, Senior Advisor, National  
Affairs

**Canadian Alliance of Student  
Associations**

Rob South, Government Relations  
Coordinator

**Canadian Association of Principals**

Hugh Fraser, President

**Canadian Association of University  
Teachers**

James Turk, Executive Director

**Canadian Education Association**  
Penny Milton, Chief Executive Officer  
Valerie Pierre-Pierre, Research Officer

**Canadian Federation of Students**  
Ian Boyko, President  
Robert Duffy, Researcher

**Canadian Millennium Scholarship Foundation**  
Norman Riddell, Executive Director & Chief Executive Officer  
Laura Chapman, Associate Chief Executive Office

**Canadian School Boards Association**  
Marie Pierce, Executive Director

**Canadian Teachers Federation**  
Dr. Julius Buski, Secretary General

**ADULT LEARNING, LITERACY & TRAINING**

**ABC Canada Literacy Foundation**  
Christine A. Featherstone, President

**Fédération canadienne pour l'alphabétisation**  
Luce Lapiere, Directrice générale

**Canadian Association for Prior Learning Assessment**  
Bonnie Kennedy, Acting Executive Director

**Frontier College**  
John Daniel O'Leary, President

**Laubach Literacy of Canada**  
Robin Jones, Executive Director

**Movement for Canadian Literacy**  
Wendy DesBrisay, Executive Director

**National Adult Literacy Database**  
Charles Ramsey, Executive Director

**EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT**

**Canadian Association of Family Resource Programs**  
Alla Ivask, Executive Director

**Canadian Child Care Federation**  
Sandra Griffin, Executive Director  
Anne Maxwell, Director of Research & Information Services

**National Children's Alliance**  
Harvey Weiner, Deputy Secretary General, Canadian Teachers' Federation

**OTHER ORGANIZATIONS**

**Council of Canadians with Disabilities**  
Marie White, President/Chairperson  
Laurie Beachell, Executive Director

**Canadian Ethnocultural Council**  
Anna Chiappa, Executive Director

**Federation of Canadian Municipalities**  
James Knight, Chief Executive Officer  
Sharri Hanley, Policy Analyst

**Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council**  
Janet E. Halliwell, Executive Vice-President

Ned Ellis, Vice-President, Programs

**Jacquelyn Thayer Scott**  
Past Chair, Expert Panel on Skills, Prime Minister's Advisory Council on Science and Technology

**RESEARCH ORGANIZATIONS**

**Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives**  
Bruce Campbell, Executive Director  
Heather-jane Robertson, Board Member  
Erica Shaker, Researcher, Education  
Marita Moll, Research Associate

**Canadian Policy Research Networks**  
Ron Saunders, Director, Work Network  
Kathryn McMullen, Senior Research Officer

**Conference Board of Canada**  
Gilles Rhéaume, Vice-President, Policy, Business & Society  
Michael Bloom, Director of Education & Learning

**Institute for Research on Public Policy**  
Hugh Segal, President

**The Fraser Institute**  
Dr. Michael A. Walker, Executive Director