

TRENT RADIO BoD AGENDA 26 April 2007

01. Chair's Opening Remarks and Agenda Approval
02. Presentation of Previous Minutes - 29 March 2007
03. Business Arising not covered in other reports
Radio Tarahumara Project: Romyne Wheeler piano performance postponed to the Fall of 2007.
04. Committee Reports
 - a) Sponsorship (A Kirkcaldy)
 - b) Fundraising & Membership
End of Season Gathering Knackwurst Sauerkraut Fundraiser **Sun, 29Apr07 Noon**
Good 'n Country Fundraising Dance **Sun, 30Sep07**
05. Operations Report
 - a) Production Manager's Report (J Staveley)
 - b) Programme Director's Report (L Paluck)
 - c) General Manager's Report (JK Muir)
 - d) Financial Statements to 31 March 06
06. "Indicators of Failure" report by Lily Mills, TCCBE participant
07. Any Other Business
08. Next BoD meetings c/b Thu, 14 Jun & 30 Aug 07 at 5pm
Director & Officer availability over the summer
09. Adjournment

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING held on Thursday, 29 March 2007,
at Trent Radio House, 715 George Street North, Peterborough, Ontario.

P R E S E N T: Meaghan Culkeen, Victor Heng, Al Kirkcaldy, Steve McNabb, and Dahn Mirabelli.

R E G R E T S: Christina Last

Also present: John Muir, General Manager

01 Notice of this meeting having been made to all the Directors, and a majority being present, the meeting was declared duly constituted and called to order at 5:05pm, with Dahn Mirabelli acting as Chair, and John Muir acting for Christina Last as Secretary. An agenda was agreed upon and discussion followed.

02. Presentation of Previous Minutes - 25 January & 08 March 2007

UPON A MOTION duly made, seconded and carried unanimously, the Minutes of the Board Meetings held on 25 January & 08 March 2007 were approved.

03. Business Arising: It was noted that the Meeting held on 08 March 2007 did not achieve quorum. **UPON A MOTION** duly made, seconded and carried unanimously, the Meeting held on 08 March 2007 was duly regularised.

04. Committees:

- a) Board Development: (Met on 22Mar07 to discuss fiduciary responsibility, the budget cycle and how to read financial statements.)
- b) TU Liaison: FOI request results - S McNabb (see attached). Discussion followed relating with making a further FOI request. It was thought the response would be best received in the summer, to be promulgated to the Membership at the Fall AGM. Mr. McNabb was warmly thanked for this report.

05. Operations Report.

- a) Financial Statements to 28 Feb 07: The GM presented the financial statements prepared by the Bookkeeper. (see attached).
- b) General Manager's Report (see attached)

UPON A MOTION duly made, seconded and carried unanimously, the Financial Statements to 28 Feb 07 were accepted as presented.

UPON A MOTION duly made, seconded and carried unanimously, the General Manager's Report, and any recommendations contained therein were accepted as presented.

06. Any Other Business.

- a) Radio Tarahumara Project - Romayne Wheeler performance 30 May 07: It was decided that Trent Radio will provide on-air promotions for this, and make a call for volunteers to poster.
- b) Referendum Results: 398 in favour & 583 against. There will be some discussion of this in the Programme Director's report at the next Meeting.
- c) Board Members were reminded of the request to complete Lily Mills' TCCBE survey.
- d) Planning next Board Meetings: The next BoD Meeting is set for 26 Apr 07 at 5pm and will include reports from the Programme Director & the Production Manager. Summer Meeting Dates will be set then.

07. There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 5:55pm.

Dahn Mirabelli, President & Chair

John K Muir, General Manager

Production Manager's Report for the period Sep06-Apr07- for BoD Meeting 27 Apr 2007 prepared by Jill Staveley

Another year in the can! It's really hard to believe that I've been here for 4 years now...so much has happened, and changed - and yet somehow it all seems the same. We've had a great year - really productive, and patient. It seems that we will be losing some of our strong part-time staff & volunteers, who will be greatly missed, but opens up the joyous pattern of new faces, new ideas and new promise for our lovely, ever changing yet always staying the same, broadcast facility.

Studio C has taken on a new role this year as the centre for our archiving projects. We have set up the Digital Ingest Station for Music & Spoken word in Studio C, and amalgamated the computers as one unified space. This has been great for keeping the work organised, and centralised, but has eaten up a little more of Studio C time in general. This hasn't proven to be a problem this year, as our project roster was slower than past years, but might become an issue for work schedules and availability of space in the future. Something to consider.

Compared with previous years, our Studio C activities have been less day-to-day, or project based, and we have been working on testing out our off-site, live broadcast capabilities.

Attached is a total list of Studio C projects to date (showing us with a slow year). With my official last day of work at Sadleir House on 15 June 2007, I am looking forward to focusing on Trent Radio in general, and Studio C specifically in the Fall.

Local Music Archive Database: Meriah Caswell was hired on as one of our OWSP staff this year. She came on board with a strong interest in Library and Archiving activities. I put her to work on the Local Music Archive project, which has been a goal of mine since I started working here. She took this task on with energy, and we are very, very, very close to having a physical Local Music Archive Database (LMAD) in the Alternative Resource Library at Sadleir House, as well as the resource being available in-house for Trent Radio Programmers & Volunteers.

Spoken Word: It continuously seems that we are fortunate to have totally self-motivated, independent workers plugging away at the Massive Spoken Word archive project. Mariana Marx has done a great job this year, totally self-sufficient, and completely reliable - the perfect fit for the Spoken Word Archive project. There are still organisational details that need to be looked at for the archive, but our main focus and push is still the digitisation process.

PM Assistant: I felt very stretched with an assistant this year, mostly due to my responsibilities outside of Trent Radio. Though it was great to work with Andrew Iliadis, and be able to rely on him for technical support with independent Studio C projects, I don't feel like I was able to offer him the direction, structure and creative inspiration needed for him to truly succeed this year. I feel that the assistant position is a great asset to me, and to Trent Radio, while at the same time being a learning experience for the assistant. This position can only really thrive when I have enough time and energy to focus on the teaching/learning aspects of the position, and if said employee has a flexible schedule (preferably not a 4th year student). I strongly feel that next year, with the ability to focus on Trent Radio, that I will be able to deliver a more productive project roster at Trent Radio, providing a more coherent space for learning and creativity.

Community Profiles: Andrew Iliadis has taken on this project as part of his role at Trent Radio this year. We have been focusing on members of our community who are actively involved on more than one level (eg/ artist, shop owner, bar tender, events organiser, administrative personnel). As with every other activity involving members of this community, it has been very difficult to make schedules fit - and thus, we have realised that in order to get the material needed to make these programmes happen, we've had to go off-site, and bring the goods home for editing. Andrew has been working off-site to interview people at their places of employment (Andrea Forsell, Pig's Ear Tavern; James Kent, The Spill Cafe)

Incoming Music: Added approximately 1,200 CDs (from CD15400 - CD16200)

There's not much to say here. Christina Last filled the position swiftly and smoothly...almost like she's always been here. We have been able to stay on top of the incoming music. It is recognised that we still need a few more organisational methods to keep incoming music tidier, and less confusing, but we are working on this.

Creation of Music Director duties in the OWSP position for Sept 2007: We have been looking at re-working our OWSP positions for September 2007, and are in the process of creating a job description for a Music Director. (Jean Reno Lives!) This person would be responsible for dealing with artists and promoters looking for charting information, and dealing with tracking enquiries. This position will encompass a few different responsibilities pertaining to incoming music, working in conjunction with the Incoming Music Archivist.

Failures...Challenges

Scheduling: This has been the first year where class scheduling has been more of an issue than others, mostly because the majority of archiving work is now concentrated in Studio C. In the long run, it makes sense to use that space for this purpose, and to work hard at making schedules meet. After our experiences this year, I feel that I have learned and am now aware of how this is a problem, and a solution for us. I have also noticed a trend of students taking similar courses (same discipline) working & volunteering here. This shows the tendency for "Radio Folks" to cluster in some ways, but also shows the specific ways in which we draw from our Student Community. This year especially I noticed 3 of our OWSP employees (and many more programmers/volunteers) with the same class schedule (making scheduling a little difficult in terms of space and focus), which makes me wonder how we are seen by students from "other disciplines". Not making a statement, and simply asking a question - is there a need, or relevance in looking at what Trent Demographic participates in Trent Radio?

Assistance for Technical Projects - needs to be better defined: Every year we find ourselves with a different group of people, who have varying radio & technical skills. It is difficult to anticipate what will happen each year, but I would like to propose that we have set hours during the week that are geared toward people using Studio B as beginners. During these hours, technical assistance can be made readily available, especially encouraging people to NOT feel "bad" for interrupting us.

Repairs: It has been evident this year that when gear is broken, wonky or ill, there doesn't seem to be a clear path of communication. I think that it would be a useful system if we had a specific report for Programmers/Volunteers to fill out, and a specific place for them to put it. This would help us determine the actual time/date when the gear stopped functioning correctly, and it would provide us with a tangible task list for repairs, as well as show us trends in gear damage, wear and tear.

More Presence with Operators...from me I think: It is my goal this Fall to have more presence and communication with our evening Operators in general. I feel with my time and focus so driven towards Sadleir House in the past 3 years, I have not been able to fully apply myself to this part of the job. Communication and awareness on all sides will only improve our ability to determine problems quickly, as well as to encourage creative projects in Studio C with a wider range of programmers & volunteers.

Reminder Workshops, Technically Oriented: In the past I have attempted to offer workshops and refreshers for audio projects. Scheduling has been the main issue in not seeing these happen. I would like to work with a group of Board Members, Volunteers, Programmers and anyone else involved in Trent Radio to organise a list of specific workshops that would be of value in developing our community. I also hope to instigate more projects that can be used as learning opportunities and provide original creative content for the station.

Trent Radio Studio C Project (Past, Current and Planned) Listing

SCP#	Project Description	Artist/Organiser	Date(s)	\$	OFF Site	ON Site
01	Beta Broadcast	Josh Fewings, Brian Sanderson et Al	Feb04			X
02	Beyond Beat Matching	Hans Finkeldy	28Mar04			X
03	Gorgeous Georgie Revue III	Mathias Kom, Charlie Glasspool	Jul/Aug 04			X
04	Mid Summer Night's Scheme	Mike Duguay & the Special Lights	07Nov04			X
05	Radio Dramas	James Kerr	Nov04-Apr05			X
06	4 Song Demo	Kelly Rose	04Dec04			X
07	Live & Local Radio Project Day	Jill Staveley	17Mar05		X	X
08	CD Tracks	Mike Martyn & Stephen Fearing	20Mar05			X
09	Demo (unfinished)	Four Feathers	Mar/Apr05			X
10	Demo	Adam Genge	Mar05			X
11	MacBeth the Musical ('twas a rough night)	Mathias Kom & Charlie Glasspool	Jun07			X
12	Manifesto	Shelagh Young	Sep07			X
13	Jugend Demo	Jugend (Mathias Kom, Daryl from Amsterdam)	Sep/Oct05			X
14	demo/teaching	Ronaldo Vaca-Pereira	Jan-Dec05			X
15	Gorgeous Georgie Revue #IV	Mathias Kom, Charlie Glasspool	Nov/Dec05	n/a		X
16	demo/teaching	Dave/Trevor Dunn	Jan/Feb06	n/a		X
17	Live & Local Radio Project Day	Jill Staveley, Trevor Dunn	10Mar06	n/a		X
18	Ryan & Ben Show	Ben Rough & Ryan Smith	Jun-Aug06	n/a		X
19	JMSO	Mathias Kom & Mary Jane	Jun06	\$50		X
20	Kawartha Chordsmen	Casey VanHooeydonk	Jun-Sep06	\$150		X
21	RC4G Final Performance	RC4G	Jul06		X	
22	Live & Local Radio Project Day (on the lawn)	Jill Staveley, Andrew Iliadis, Dahn Mirabelli	10Aug07			X
23	Sabbath Hymns	Or Pardes (Paula Baruch)	Feb07			X
24	Score&Shoot	PAU (Drea Nasaer, Curtis Driedger, Michael Morrit)t	Feb07			X
25	Emergency#15, Programme C	Bill Kimball, Live Broadcast	Mar07		X	
26	12 Hour Poetry Marathon	Cooked&Eaten	Apr07		X	

Programme Director's Report for the period Sep06-Apr07- for BoD Meeting 27 Apr 2007 **prepared by Laurel Paluck**

With failure comes knowledge. I'm not sure who said that, but I'm saying it now.

In our attempt to raise our levy this spring I've learnt this: many students trapped up on main campus just don't know what Trent Radio is, and subsequently may not be aware of the broader community. Let's get them in here and let them know. Participation is the essence of the Trent Radio experience, in this report I've included some ideas generated during the spring campaign, which I believe could be implementing to invite the curious yet tentative folk in. Feel the love.

Programming and Events Year in Review

September 2006

- Interior of Trent Radio house receives fresh paint
Couch replaced by benches
- Pre season begins Sept 05
- Clubs and groups day at Trent U Sept 06
- Programme Proposal workshop Sept. 12 at Peterborough Arts Umbrella
- Trent Radio Open House Sept 09 noon-6pm
- Programme idea's workshop at Trent Radio Sept. 11
- Studio A training begins Sept. 15
- Programme proposal deadline Sept. 15 noon
- Proposal selection committee Sept 17
- Co-op Student begins Sept.18
- Programmers interviewed and scheduled
- Interviews and hiring of all OWSP positions completed by Sept. 21st
- Audio Art Workshop hosted by Dahn Mirabelli, featuring Brian Wagner Sept. 23
- Referendum and Levy campaign set, Campaigning began Sept. 25
- Fall 2006 Broadcast Season begins Sept.25
- Trent Radio participates in Doors Open Peterborough Sept 30

October 2006

- Levy raise is not secured due to lack of voter turn-out.
- TCCBE students produce World Food Day Programme Oct. 16th
- James Kerr hosts Radio Drama Workshop
- P.C.V.S. E.S.L. Students Special Programming Project
- Trout Rodeo Fall season Schedule Printed
- Audio Art Hallowe'en Special Broadcast
- Municipal Candidates Interviews and special broadcasting w/ Tom Donoghue

November 2006

- Candidates debates recorded and broadcast
- Programme Development with Club Connexion Francaise Scheduled for Jan 07
- Programme Development with Alzheimer's Society Scheduled for Jan 07
- TR Programmer Profiles bi-weekly in The Arthur
- Brainstorming for TR February Fundraiser with Miriam Stucky and Candace Shaw begins

December 2006

- Fall Season Ends 15th at noon w/ Open House
- Good 'n Country Marathon! 15th-16th
- Entre Season begins 18th

January 2007

- Entre Season Ends Jan. 3rd
- Spring Season Begins Jan. 8th
- Spring Programming revisions begin
- Club Connexion Francaise and Alzheimer's Society begin regular programming
- 9 new programmes scheduled
- TRadio Dance Party feat. Sword and Guerra at Sadlier House Jan. 29th.

February 2007

- James Strath students tour Feb.5th
- Levy Campaign idea's begin w/campaign committee
- Levy Campaign meetings with Arthur, Trent Women's Centre
- Co-op student Kyle Dorricott interviewed & training begins
- Reading Break-Feb. 19th-24th
- Peterborough Downtown Bluesfest 22nd-24th
- Dance Party "1989" at Sadleir House feat. DJ's Dahn Mirabelli & Andrew Iliadis

March 2007

- Singer Songwriter Radio Project Day w/Simon Ward & Andrew Iliadis Mar. 1st
- Campaigning Begins Mar 5th - 8th
- "Score & Shoot" video project collaboration with PAU
- Live Broadcast of PND Emergency Dance Fest Mar. 22nd via internet connection
- Trout Rodeo deadline 23rd. printed 27th
- Discussions with Donna McCue re: Aboriginal Radio next season
- Planning for International Poetry Day (13 Apr) with Cooked & Eaten

April 2007

- Summer Executive Producers search begins
- Poetry day live broadcast from the Spill w/Canadian Authors Ass. : Friday 13th
- Summer Programme Proposals due 22 Apr noon/ followed by Summer Selection Committee
- Last day of Spring Broadcast: 27th
- Knackwurst 'n Sauerkraut BBQ and OPEN HOUSE/Party scheduled 29th

Staff & Volunteers 2006/07

Operators

Monday – am: tba, noon: tba, eve: Cam Malcolm
Tuesday – am & noon: Yvonne Lai, eve: Kerry Day
Wednesday – am: Leigh Macdonald, noon: Devon Thomas, eve: Andrew French
Thursday –am: tba, noon: Ray Barker, eve: Andrew Illiadis
Friday –am: tba, noon: tba, eve: Misha Paramonov /Dan Mirabelli
Saturday- am: self support, eve: Ariel Sharratt
Sunday- am: self support, noon: David Grenon, eve: Jesse Thomas/Devon Thomas

Ontario Work Study Programme Positions

Studio A Trainer –Peter Greenall	Studio B and Digital Editing Trainer – Dahn Mirabelli
PD assistant Trout Rodeo Editor-Joe Fortin	PM assistant-Andrew Illiadis
Music Archivist –Christina Last	Spoken Word Archivist – Meriah Caswell
Physical Plant- Simon Ward	

Co-op Students

Fall: St. Peter's Jordyn McKinley (withdrew) Spring/ Holy Cross-Kyle Dorricott

Trends 2006-07

- Canadian and Local Music Programmes continue to be popular
- Religious programming: Catholic Council of Trent, Rabbi Cohen, Christian Gospel, and alternative spirituality.
- Interest in World music continues to grow
- Interest in Audio Art continues to grow
- Community programming with members from: Artspace, Older Women's Network, Tough Drum, Shrimps Comedy Troupe, Cooked and Eaten Reading Series, Peterborough Singers, The Orchard Spirituality Centre, PCVS ESL program, Club Connexion Francaise, Alzheimer's Society
- Trent U groups include Women's Centre, Trent Film Society, Arthur Newspaper, Kawartha World Issues Centre, Trent Works, Trent Student Catholic Ass., TCCBE, TSCA and TISA-(incl. HOLA, TACSU and other international student groups)
- Sharing of the Logger files has increased with programmers adding shows to their websites-the logger may become a model for, or a potential source of pod-casting.

Goals for Fall 2006

- Increase Presence on Main Campus- w/ Programmer Profiles in Arthur, Programming from Groups and Clubs, TCCBE projects,
- Increase Levy awareness-w/ exploring campaign strategies
- Get the Spring Levy

Goals for Fall 2007

- Conduct Operator and OWSP meetings and socials on a regular basis.
- Conduct formalized interviews with all programmers both new and returning
- Continue to increase Trent Radio Presence on Main Campus with "Truth in a Booth", TRadio Events, Programme Proposal Workshops, streaking across the bridge (weather permitting)
- To continue broadening our scope in the greater community through individuals and orgs.
- To consider and implement further fundraising strategies.
- Further experiments with remote broadcasting via internet connection

Campaign projects - Campus activity

Truth in a Booth: was a decorated mobile cardboard box containing a Trent Radio rep armed with a tape recorder. The booth was brought out from it's hiding spot in the "Seasoned Spoon", travelled around main campus to ask students a variety of questions. The responses were broadcast on Trent Radio. This friendly and fun project created a bit of a stir and stimulated discussion with students. I suggest this become a regular event next year-on a weekly basis, with the PD's assistant taking it on as their weekly project. (The actual cardboard box is perhaps not necessary.)

Project Share the Love: Programmers were asked to invite "new to us" students to be a one time guest and share their music, stories, and views on a regularly running programme. This project piloted for the month of Feb, with many programmers offering to mentor. Joe Fortin developed a simple schedule to accommodate the guests and hosts. I think this project could run throughout next year, after the season has gotten underway.

Singer Songwriters on Air: Simon Ward instigated this project, inviting singer songwriters to come in and strut their stuff live in Studio A. It operated as a Radio Project Day and might be considered as Trent Radio Open Stage monthly event.

I believe these projects may offer an opportunity for those who chose not to commit to regular programming to share in and contribute to the community of Trent Radio in a meaningful and enjoyable way.

Studio A Fall 2006

Peter Greenall offered Studio A training 3 times a week during the busy month of September and included evening and weekend training when necessary. He currently conducts 2 hour Studio A training sessions every Monday and Friday mornings with 1 hour refresher options which include phone and turntable training. This year we included a programmer test Sheet to ensure programming & technical operations ability. Studio A trainers may benefit from reviewing and re-training during the start of the Spring Season.

Studio B Fall 2006

Dahn Mirabelli provided weekly Studio B Training Thursdays and Fridays from noon –4pm. Along with full Studio B Training Dan aided in the production of Programmer Promo's and Programmer back-up shows. He has also facilitated pre-recorded programming with group projects such as the PCVS's ESL programming. Studio B continues to remain popular with daily bookings. Some programmers do not take readily to computers and need assistance throughout their learning.

Smooth Operator

Smooth Operator broadcasts 2 to 3 times daily during the week and has been host to dozens of touring and local artists, activists, politicians and other colourful characters. Smooth Op has provided first time programmers an opportunity to jump right into Studio A and shake off some stage fright, while practicing their broadcasting skills. The Smooth Operator binder is refreshed daily with incoming news received through our psa@trentradio.ca email, from posters brought into the station and from programmers, operators and the general public. Smooth Operator now features a regular running one hour time slot every Friday for in-depth interviews hosted by various programmers as they desire.

Student CO-OP Placements

This mutually beneficial program seems to work best within a structured environment. Smooth Operator continues to be an excellent focus for the student placements allowing them to learn broadcasting skills while contributing to the daily flow of Trent Radio. Our Fall Student co-op placement with Jordyn McKinley was discontinued due to her schedule changes in mid October. Spring Co-Op Placement with Holy Cross student Kyle Dorricott has been successful. He is keen to add to our collection of local interviews. It may be well to consider joining forces with other local orgs who participate in the co-op program, to give the students a broader understanding of the local environment Trent Radio swims in.

Fundraising 2006-07

Good 'n Country Marathon Dec. 15-16

Henry Holtmann's Knackwurst and Sauerkraut BBQ April 29th

Miriam Stucky has joined Al Kirkcaldy to attain new Sponsors

Max Price has offered to put on a Cabaret in Feb 2008. (2007 was dedicated to the New Theatre)

Levy 2006-07

The fall 2006 levy referendum was unsuccessful due to lack of voter turn out.

The spring 2007 levy referendum was a big surprise! Although we were unsuccessful in achieving a levy raise

I believe the various campaign strategies we employed should be continued as regular forms of outreach to students.

Mayoral and City Council Elections

Our previous co-op student Tom Donaghue returned to produce extensive programming covering the elections, as part of his independent studies with C.I.S. Each candidate was invited to participate in a 15 minute interview prior to the election. Coverage of debates hosted by the Peterborough Social Planning Council and The Peterborough Arts Coalition were also included in live broadcast.

Statement of Performance

Content Category	CRTC Required	TRadio Required	Spring 2005	Fall 2005	Spring 2006	Fall 2006	Spring 2007
Category1 - Spoken Word	Min 25% of all programming	Min 25% of all programming	41%	43%	55%	55%	54%
11 – News	no spec	no spec	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
12 – S/W Other	no spec	no spec	44.25hours	40 hours	52 hours	52.25 hours	55.5 hours
Category 2 - Popular Music	no spec	no spec	35.88% of all music programming	48.5% of all music	35 %of all music	25.75 % of all music	34% of all music
21 – Pop, Rock Dance	Max 40% of all music	Max 40% of all music	18.5 hours 29.3%of all music)	19hours 33%of all music	15 hours 22.%of all music	16 hours	19.5 hours
22 - Country & C'try Oriented	no spec	no spec	3 hours	5 hours	5.25 h	6.75hour	5.75 hours
23 – Acoustic	no spec	no spec	.75 hours	3.5 hours	4hours	3 hours	7.5 hours
24 – Easy Listening	no spec	no spec	0 hours	.75 hours	.5hours	0	0
Category 3 - Traditional & Special Interest	Minimum 5% of selections	Minimum 5% of selections	64.11% of all music programming	51.3% of all music	65 % of all music	44.35%	60%
31 – Concert	no spec	no spec	1.75 hours	0	0	2 hours	3.75 hours
32 – Folk & Folk Oriented	no spec	no spec	7hours	8.5	6	7 hours	6.25 hours
33 – World Beat & International	no spec	no spec	10.75hours	9 hours	20.7 hours	12 hours	15.5 hours
34 – Jazz and Blues	no spec	no spec	11hours	8 hours	12 hours	10.5	10 hours
35 – Religious	no spec	no spec	0	.5 hour	.5	0	0
36* – Audio Art	*not recognised	no spec	10.25hours	4 hours	4 hours	9.5 hours	14 hours
"Hits" Played	Max 10%	Max 5%	Below (TR) max	Below (TR) max	Below (TR) max	Below (TR) max	Below (TR) max
Station produced	Min 42 hours	Min 42 hours	108 hours	78 Hours	94 Hours	102 Hours	117 Hours
Advertising & Sponsorship	Max 504 min	Max 252 mins	Below (TR) max	Below (TR) max	Below (TR) max	Below (TR) max	Below (TR) max

Summary Numbers excluding "Radio Free Peterborough" broadcasting

Season	Fall 2005	Spr 2006	Fall 2006	Spr 2007
Total live broadcasting hours (weekly)	78	94	103	117
Number of Programmes	74	85	89	90
Number of Programmers	98	112	113	115

In my opinion Trent Radio has met or exceeded all standards or levels of performances which comprise its broadcast licence granted by the CRTC and its own internal policies. Laurel Paluck, Programme Director 20 April 2007

General Manager's Report for the Board of Director's Meeting 26 April 2007
Prepared by John K Muir

This report is intentionally brief to accommodate for other reports scheduled for this meeting.

01 Staffing

- a) The Programme Director is scheduled to finish her current contract on Fri, 25 May 2007. We have successfully negotiated a one-year renewal on the same terms. That forty-week contract starts on Monday, 20 Aug 2007.
- b) The Production Manager's contract as a 50/50 joint appointment with Sadleir House finishes on Fri, 15 June 2007. It is intended that she will return for forty weeks on a 70% of full-time basis commencing Tuesday, 04 Sep 2007.
- c) Jeff Stewart will be returning to Trent Radio on Monday, 17 September 2007

02 Summer Cash flow

About \$12,000 is calculated as owing from TrentU as student membership fees. It is expected that some short-term borrowing will be needed to maintain Trent Radio over the summer, and timely receipt of the money from TrentU would greatly reduce the amount to be borrowed.

03 CRTC Application

A note was sent to the CRTC pursuant to Trent Radio's application for renewal of its broadcast licence. (see attached)

A copy of all licensing documentation is at:
http://www.trentradio.ca/crtc/2007_app/



Submission completed - sent ~ 19:10
Thank you for submitting your intervention
Your reference number for this intervention is # 55944

Steps

Step 6 of 6

1 - Number

Is this information correct?

2 - Applicants

Observation ou commentaire / Intervention or comment

3 - Comments

Date Reçue / Date Arrived: 18/04/2007

Numéro de processus public / Public Process Number : pb2007-31

4 - Appearance

Demande(s) / Application(s) : 200614588

5 - Identification

Comparution à l'audience demandée/Request to appear at the hearing: Non/No

6 - Confirmation

Intervention-Observation/Intervention-Comment :

Further to Intervention Reference # 55941, Trent Radio has reconsidered application (# 2006-1458-8) and has determined that it is not associated with a post-secondary educational institution within the meaning of Public Notice CRTC 2000-12, and in consequence requests the Commission to renew its licence to operate CFFF-FM as a "Type B Community Radio station" on the understanding that Trent Radio will comply and abide by all particulars and regulatory elements set out in Public Notice CRTC 2000-13 for this class of broadcast licence. Yours truly, John K Muir VP & GM Trent Radio

Pièce jointe/Attachment(s): Non/No

Nom / Name: Mr. John K Muir

Titre / Title : VP & GM

Compagnie / Company : Trent Radio

Adresse courriel / E-mail address : jkmuir@trentradio.ca

Adresse postale / Postal address : 715 George Street North, Peterborough,
Ontario, CANADA

Code postal / Postal code : K9H3T2

Veuillez communiquer par / Please contact by: Email

Nous vous rappelons que toute information soumise avec ce formulaire sera disponible sur le site Internet du Conseil. / You are reminded that all information provided in this form will be posted on the Commission's web site.

Submit

Print

Date Modified: 2005-04-04

Powered by [Rapid-Systems Inc.](#)

CRTC88

[top](#)

[Comments about our site](#)

[Français](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Help](#) | [Search](#) | [Canada Site](#)

[Today's Releases](#) | [File, Register and Epass](#) | [Decisions, Notices & Orders](#) | [Home](#) | [CISC](#) | [Industries at a Glance](#) | [Reference Centre](#) | [Canadian Content](#) | [Public Proceedings](#) | [Statutes & Regulations](#)

1-877-249-CRTC (2782)

[Important Notices](#)

Trent Radio Comparative Balance Sheet

ASSETS	As At 07-03-31	As At 06-03-31	LIABILITIES	As At 07-03-31	As At 06-03-31
CURRENT ASSETS			CURRENT LIABILITIES		
Raffle & Bingo Acct	0.00	0.00	Accounts Payable	(2,483.75)	2,692.14
Boost & Freq Acct	5.93	5.93	Contract Obligation	44,788.64	30,008.18
General Funds Montreal	693.36	14,407.43	Deferred Income	845.00	645.00
ING Savings	194.35	4,161.80	Accrued Liabilities	0.00	0.00
Cash In Bank	893.64	18,575.16	Trillium StudioC	39,066.82	50,209.68
Petty Cash: Programming	0.00	0.00	CPP Payable	0.00	(0.00)
Petty Cash: Admin	(0.00)	(1.00)	UIC Payable	(0.00)	0.00
Petty Cash: Summer Admin.	0.00	0.00	Income Tax Withholdings	(0.00)	0.00
Term Deposits	0.00	0.00	Receiver General Net	(0.00)	0.00
Accounts Receivable	1,050.00	1,288.60	Health Benefit Payable	0.00	0.00
Employee Advances	0.00	75.37	Other Withholdings Net	0.00	0.00
Doubtful Accounts	0.00	0.00	TOTAL CURRENT LIABILITIES	<u>82,216.71</u>	<u>83,555.00</u>
Receivables Net	1,050.00	1,363.97			
Student Levy Receivable	11,950.27	0.00	LONG TERM LIABILITY		
Prepaid Expenses	721.94	662.73	Mbanx Demand Loan	(321.09)	0.00
TOTAL CURRENT ASSETS	<u>14,615.85</u>	<u>20,600.86</u>	Deferred Contribution	37,311.38	28,865.40
			TOT. LONG TERM LIABILITY	<u>36,990.29</u>	<u>28,865.40</u>
FIXED ASSETS			TOTAL LIABILITIES	<u>119,207.00</u>	<u>112,420.40</u>
Land	10,000.00	10,000.00			
Buildings	94,439.07	94,439.07	NON-SHARE EQUITY		
Office Equipment	20,774.21	20,774.21	Retained Surplus/(Deficit)	(6,398.87)	(1,391.29)
Technical Equipment	236,494.72	219,656.39	Previous Year-end Adjustments	0.00	0.00
Technical Renovations	9,913.00	24,431.00	Net Retained Surp/(Def)	(6,398.87)	(1,391.29)
Fixed Assets at Cost	371,621.00	369,300.67	Current Surplus/(Deficit)	35,245.38	34,232.81
Accumulated Depreciation	(238,183.34)	(244,639.61)	TOTAL NON-SHARE EQUITY	<u>28,846.51</u>	<u>32,841.52</u>
TOTAL FIXED ASSETS	<u>133,437.66</u>	<u>124,661.06</u>	LIABILITIES AND EQUITY	<u>148,053.51</u>	<u>145,261.92</u>
TOTAL ASSETS	<u>148,053.51</u>	<u>145,261.92</u>			

Trent Radio Comparative Statement of Revenue & Expense

REVENUE	06-09-01 to 07-03-31	05-09-01 to 06-03-31	EXPENSE	06-09-01 to 07-03-31	05-09-01 to 06-03-31
GOVERNMENT GRANTS			PERSONNEL		
Federal Grants	1,056.00	5,280.00	Programming Wage	15,284.50	14,999.25
Provincial Grants	0.00	826.95	Technical Wage	14,075.20	12,812.80
Municipal Grants	0.00	0.00	Publicity Wage	0.00	0.00
TOTAL GOVERNMENT GRANTS	1,056.00	6,106.95	Administrative Wage	22,498.65	21,945.42
			Benefits	0.00	0.00
FUND RAISING			CPP Expense	2,260.49	2,163.23
Corporations	75.00	0.00	EI Expense	1,337.58	1,335.94
Foundations	0.00	0.00	Total Wages & Benefits	55,456.42	53,256.64
Private	6,021.39	3,142.00	Programming Fees	0.00	8,915.45
Leadership	0.00	0.00	Technical Fees	0.00	0.00
Donations "In Kind"	0.00	0.00	Publicity Fees	250.00	250.00
Net Donations	6,096.39	3,142.00	Administrative Fees	870.00	1,423.00
Trent Student Memberships	92,000.00	93,456.96	Total Fees	1,120.00	10,588.45
Commercial & Non-profit	0.00	0.00	TOTAL PERSONNEL	56,576.42	63,845.09
Individual Memberships	670.00	300.00			
Discretionary M'ship Exp	0.00	0.00	SUPPLY & EXPENSE		
Net Memberships	92,670.00	93,756.96	Publicity & Promotions	0.00	85.00
Special Events	1,033.76	883.97	Equipment Rental	0.00	1,250.00
Special Events Expense	0.00	0.00	Line Rental	1,938.77	1,961.02
Net Special Events	1,033.76	883.97	Rental Other	0.00	150.00
Fundraising	204.68	234.25	Net Rentals	1,938.77	3,361.02
Fundraising Expense	0.00	0.00	Postage & Delivery	176.73	49.15
Net Fundraising	204.68	234.25	Office Supplies	257.70	583.82
TOTAL FUND RAISING	100,004.83	98,017.18	Telephone	827.11	880.31
			Utilities	2,891.47	2,908.77
EARNED REVENUE			Programming & Licence	5,178.41	1,720.91
ON AIR Sponsorship	5,558.28	7,075.00	Building R & M	974.76	781.51
ON AIR Sponsorship Expense	(590.00)	0.00	Building R & M Upper Apt	22.22	16.96
Net ON AIR Sponsorship	4,968.28	7,075.00	Technical R & M	7,113.82	5,285.91
Net "RADIO PAPER"	0.00	0.00	Net Repair & Maintenance	8,110.80	6,084.38
Net Other Sponsorship	0.00	0.00	Professional Fees	125.00	50.00
Tape Sales	0.00	0.00	Insurance	4,079.72	3,766.57
Tape Sales Expense	0.00	0.00	Travel	0.00	151.06
Net Tape Sales	0.00	0.00	Volunteer Expense	520.40	572.94
Rental Income	4,620.00	4,515.00	Bank Charges	82.00	151.03
Net Misc Sales & Services	8,069.54	4,204.19	Mbanx Loan Interest	1,898.85	1,329.20
TOTAL EARNED REVENUE	17,657.82	15,794.19	Net Interest	1,898.85	1,329.20
			Depreciation	0.00	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE			GST Paid	717.76	862.63
Interest Income	8.14	156.37	Bad Debts	0.00	0.00
Micellaneous Revenue	0.00	760.00	Miscellaneous	100.27	200.00
Amortisatn Dfrd Contribtbn	0.00	0.00	TOTAL SUPPLY & EXPENSE	26,904.99	22,756.79
TOTAL MISC REVENUE	8.14	916.37	TOTAL EXPENSE	83,481.41	86,601.88
TOTAL REVENUE	118,726.79	120,834.69	NET INCOME	35,245.38	34,232.81

Organisational Assessment Methods for Trent Radio

By Lily J. Mills

Date: Feb. 04, 2007

For ADMN

Supervising Professor: R. Dart

This original formatting of this document
has been amended for distribution.

Introduction

Marvin Everett Mundel defines improvement as “bringing into a more desirable state” (1). This definition implies that improvement is only possible when the current conditions of an entity leave something to be desired, and rightly so. At organizations like Trent Radio, a community radio facility, improvement is always possible.

The inability of Trent Radio to reach a state of perfection stems from its highly abstract and varied aims, which emphasize community-building and interaction; the inspiration of creativity; the maximization of diversity; encouragement of the use of radio; and fair and efficient operations. Despite the fact that there is no terminal and measurable point of completion for such objectives, Trent Radio seeks to improve, to bring itself into a more desirable state. It is for this purpose that an organizational assessment model is to be developed and implemented.

Organizational assessments in practice often focus on matters of productivity and performance (Van de Ven 1), such as number of vehicles made within a week or number of customers served in an hour. Unfortunately, such basic counting assessments will only serve very specific, although important, aspects of Trent Radio’s operations. For example, it would be excessively difficult to try to track how many times the facility brought about community-building and interaction. Even when such counts are relatively simple, such as how many community members felt encouraged and compelled to use the facility in a given season, the potential of these aims to be fulfilled will never conceivably be fulfilled and therefore will always be subject to improvement.

In order to improve, therefore, Trent Radio seeks to discover how current operations and internal culture are imperfect. This perceived desire to identify imperfections has inspired the conceptual framework of “Key Indicators of Failure.” The assessment seeks to quantify Trent Radio’s operations and intangible products in order to measure distance from perfection. This approach could be likened to a teacher delivering a report card showing only those grades below an A, so that the student concentrates on areas needing improvement rather than gloating in successes.

To state a desire to measure distance from perfection, there lies an assumption that perfection itself has a number or measurable level. At the same time, it has already been stated that perfection for Trent Radio is inconceivable and impossible. Therefore, it is not directly these aims which are to be measured in terms of failure, but those elements of Trent Radio which contribute towards their achievement. Such a deconstruction of the organization shall require a thorough analysis and discovery of these contributing factors, be they technical, cultural, political, financial, operational, logical, illogical or relating to anything else which adds to the composition of Trent Radio. Subsequently, perfection levels for these manageable elements will be defined (rather than goals, which provide motivation only to the “satisfactory” point) and their current level within the facility assessed. Two texts, *Measuring and Assessing Organizations* by Andrew H. Van de Ven and *Measuring and Enhancing the Productivity of Service and Government Organizations* by Marvin Everett Mundel, provide particular guidance in the development and implementation of organizational assessment models, no matter what their conceptual framework.

General Considerations

Van de Ven outlines general considerations which can actually be applied when working with either assessment process, or a combination of the two. This author was involved in the Organization Assessment Research Program, which “aimed to develop a framework, a set of measurement instruments, and a process that are scientifically valid and practically useful to assess on an ongoing basis” (4). He emphasizes the usefulness of organizational assessment as a tool to be used on a continuing basis. Regular assessment can illuminate trends and the effects of changes which take place between assessments, literally highlighting cause-and-effect relationships. Of course, this use would also require that organizational changes are documented and included in assessment analysis.

Van de Ven also identifies four levels of organizational assessment: the overall organization, organizational units, individual jobs/positions, and the relations within and between these various elements. For Trent Radio, organizational units will likely not be considered as the facility is decidedly small by business standards and does not have identified units. This level of consideration would apply to larger organizations and franchises.

At the time of writing the text, Van de Ven was not at a stage in research development where he could offer a standardized process, but the following three main considerations were offered:

- Who decides measures for criteria?;
- Whose conceptual model should be used?; and,
- How to facilitate learning and use of results? (22).

He later goes on to outline the pros and cons of assessment design and administration as executed by either internal or external personnel. For example, internal personnel are more informed, but may find more difficulty in maintaining objectivity, while external personnel can see those organizational elements which are taken for granted, but can be less sensitive to the effects of the evaluation process on the staff. To alleviate the problems associated with each option, Van de Ven suggests a close collaboration between internal and external personnel. Each can bring their own advantages to the table while at the same time keep the disadvantages of the other in check. It is in this way that the questions listed above will be answered for the Trent Radio organizational assessment.

The measures for criteria will be developed primarily by the student, the party external to the organization; however, this development will be through consultation with Trent Radio board, staff, volunteers, and a representative sample of programmers. The conceptual model is prescribed, being the failure-focus model discussed in the introduction. This model was conceptualised internally (by General Manager John K. Muir), but the practical design will be executed by the student, which will require a refinement of the model. The task of facilitation of learning and use of results for the primary user (the General Manager) is that of the student, while extension of this learning and use to others involved at Trent Radio is that of the internal party. It is especially important that the external developer maintains a concern of the relevance of the study for its users (Van de Ven 30).

Keeping these general considerations in mind, the detailed process models can be explored.

Models of Process

Van de Ven presents a six-step process to organizational analysis:

1. Evaluation Prerequisites;
2. Goals Exploration;
3. Criteria Development;
4. Evaluation Design;
5. Evaluation Implementation; and,
6. Data Analysis, Feedback, and Evaluation (31).

While the list may seem condensed and concise, each process element is broad and this framework allows for use towards a variety of assessment models and methods (including failure-focused assessment).

Mundel provides a process model with more than twice as many steps as Van de Ven's. This model includes more specific components which could possibly be reworked to apply to Trent Radio (specifically those related to the measurement, budgeting and management of what he calls "manpower"), but these were considered much too detailed and extraneous for a small community NFP organization. Likewise, Mundel's Step 8 (Reduce Data to Standards) has been left without consideration. The Failure model looks at unachievable perfection rather than standards in order to perpetuate motivation. Six of Mundel's steps have been selected for integration into the process model for this project:

- Step 1 – General Reconnaissance;
- Step 2 – Work-Unit Structure;
- Step 3 – Select Measurement Methods;
- Step 6 – Familiarize those Affected with Approach;
- Step 7 – Apply Measurements; and,
- Step 13 – Provide Follow-Up Assistance (59).

These steps will be integrated into Van de Ven's model to form the following comprehensive organizational assessment process model for use in the development and implementation of the "Key Indicators of Failure" assessment:

1. General Reconnaissance;
2. Evaluation Prerequisites;
3. Goals Exploration;
4. Work-Unit Structure;
5. Criteria Development / Selecting Work Measurement Methods;
6. Evaluation Design;
7. Evaluation Implementation / Applying Work Measurements;
8. Data Analysis, Feedback & Evaluation;
9. Providing Follow-Up.

The task of "Familiarizing Those to be Affected" will not be included in this step-by-step process because it is to be considered an ongoing element independent of the stage of advancement of the process itself.

Process Elements

1. General Reconnaissance: The General Reconnaissance, as Mundel instructs, is meant to be a quick exam of the nature of the work, the organization, and the personnel (60). The student will gain a sense of the operations and organizational culture, assess the attitude of the staff towards the project, become familiar with any previous evaluations, appreciate current problems, and identify those individuals “in-the-know” (61). The rapport developed at this stage should be maintained throughout the project. Mundel suggests engaging in individual discussions rather than group meetings for this step.

2. Evaluation Prerequisites: In this stage, the evaluation project is defined. A working contract is developed to clarify the roles of those involved, and resources are identified. A budget of time and finances may also be set/presented.

3. Goals Exploration: At this point, the assessment developer should conduct a series of meetings in order to assess what goals Trent Radio’s stakeholders have for the organization. Primary stakeholders include Board members, staff, volunteers and programmers. The Trent student body should also likely be included as stakeholders, given their position as funders, but a representative survey of this group may be extensive given the time constraints of this project at this time. Such a survey could be considered for future assessments. Even with the group of stakeholders mentioned above, the interviews should reflect multiple, possibly conflicting, expectations for Trent Radio.

Van de Ven states that judgments of performance are also concurrently value judgments (14). These performance judgments and goals also represent the desired outputs for the organization. The next step for the developer is to connect actual operations to real or desired outputs.

4. Work-Unit Structure: The work-unit structure outlines the input-output flow for the organization. It is through this deconstruction that the developer will analyse the workings of Trent Radio and discover how these operations produce the real and/or desired outputs. This analysis will also reveal those elements of operations which offer feasible measurements for quantitative evaluation. Mundel defines 8 levels of the work-unit structure: motion, element, task, intermediate product, end product, program, gross output and results (30). This framework seems reminiscent of Taylor’s Scientific Management, and Trent Radio’s creative and intangible operative style would not allow the imposition of such prescriptive measures; however, the general concept can still be followed.

5. Criteria Development / Selecting Work Measurement Methods: Mundel boldly states that “all work can be subjected to measurement” (68). Once the work-unit structure is understood, measurable operations which lead directly to desired outputs can then be identified. Van de Ven suggests that criteria be variable (and therefore useful), reliable, and low cost (36). Both authors point out that criteria should be as broad as possible, taking into account multiple detailed elements, rather than assessing each smaller element. Further, it should be ensured that the measurement criteria actually support the future acceptability of the end report (this direct relation should be illustrated through the work-unit structure).

6. Evaluation Design: At this point, the developer will design all aspects of the evaluation, including forms, data storage, implementation methods, timeframe, and reports to be generated. Criterion diction should reflect organizational jargon. The limitations of the evaluation should be discussed with the users (the General Manager, for the case of Trent Radio), and these limitations must be agreed upon by the user(s) before the evaluation is implemented.

7. Evaluation Implementation / Applying Work Measurements: Once the terms of the evaluation design have been agreed upon and those affected have been notified and

consulted and no logistic or political issues remain, the steps outlined by this design should be implemented. Concerns during this stage include:

- Maintaining integrity and controls on uniformity of data collection;
- Tracking responses;
- Recording unanticipated events which may affect results; and,
- Responding to feelings of threat and sensitivities of respondents and users (40).

Mundel suggests using preliminary data to test the effectiveness of the use of the data while it is being collected, in order to make necessary changes in a timely manner. Those changes which are not made during this evaluation period can also be implemented during the next round, but need to be recorded and integrated into the design (78).

8. Data Analysis, Feedback & Evaluation: In this stage, the data collected is entered into the data information system developed in the evaluation design, likely a computerized system. The analysis procedure outlined in the design is then executed and reports are generated. Users should be met with in order to analyse, interpret and learn from the results. This meeting should begin with a review of the purposes, goals, criteria, design and conduct of the evaluation. Van de Ven states that the user group will naturally engage in questions and discussion as results are brought forward. Internal strengths and weaknesses will be revealed and debates about organizational conditions may occur, which optimally will lead to positive change. Other goals which have not been assessed will also become apparent, and these can be integrated into the design for the following period's analysis.

9. Providing Follow-Up: At this point, the external evaluation producer will ensure that the users and future evaluation administrators understand and will be able to carry on the process in future periods, given that organizational assessment is more effective when completed on an ongoing basis. Process documentation will be completed, new sub-systems will be added if required, inefficiencies can be identified and redesigned, result implementation can begin, and management can be trained in data collection practices. The student should leave the assessment process in a fully operational state and see that improvements are under way.

Conclusion

This outline details a comprehensive process, so in reality, these steps may not be fulfilled as completely as would be optimal. The assessment would however get its conceptual feet off the ground and expand, grow, and improve along with Trent Radio, given that commitment is given towards this improvement.

The process is ultimately a participatory one. While the student will take the responsible role of fulfilling the planning and administration, the assessment should be on the terms of the stakeholders. Failure is of course relative, depending on the aforementioned value judgments. This whole exercise, however, is a study of relativity and perspective. In reference to Douglas Adams' *The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy*, what General Manager John K. Muir seeks is the "You Are Here" arrow pointing to a microscopic dot on a microscopic dot in relation to the infinity of the universe.

Works Cited

- Mundel, Marvin Everett. *Measuring and Enhancing the Productivity of Service and Government Organizations*. Tokyo: Asian Productivity Organization, 1975.
- Van de Ven, Andrew H. *Measuring and Assessing Organizations*. New York: Wiley, 1980.

This original formatting of this document
has been amended for distribution.

**Trent Radio Indicators of Failure
Report of the Results
By Lily J. Mills
For: John K. Muir, Trent Radio
And Professor R. Dart, Trent University
April 9, 2007**

Overview

The following report gives an interpretation of the results of the Indicators of Failure evaluation process implemented within Trent Radio for the 2006-2007 season. The following aspects of the evaluation are discussed:

- Methodology of Evaluation;
- Incomplete Aspects of Evaluation;
- Failures of Note: Radio Facility Failure;
- Failures of Note: Community Service Role Failure;
- Failures of Note: Business/Operational Failure;
- A General Suggestion;
- General Observations of the Evaluation Process;
- Conclusion;
- Appendices.

The interpretations herein provided are merely a stepping stone towards positive change away from failure at Trent Radio. Further questioning should be completed for full understanding of the hard data results of the surveys in order to identify specific reasons behind failures. Consequently, core problems can be identified and plans for change implemented.

Methodology of Evaluation

The information which comprises the various identified indicators stemmed from a number of sources, including reports from Annual General Meetings and the direct questioning of Trent Radio staff. A majority of the indicators have been yielded through a comprehensive survey process which sought the feedback of Programmers, Volunteers, Staff and Board members.

Survey questions generally took on one of three forms. Those requiring Yes/No answers were typically phrased such that a "Yes" response would be positive and therefore a "No" response would result in a Failure Point for Trent Radio. Some responses required a quantity (i.e., "How many times...") and were phrased such that the optimal answer would be zero, and thus any response of 1 or more resulted in Failure Points.

The third and most common type of survey question involved opinion-based rating. Respondents were asked to rate a particular service or experience at Trent Radio on a scale of 1-5, 1 generally being equivalent to "very bad" and 5 being equivalent to "excellent." In the calculation of Failure Points for such questions, the results were tabulated on an Excel page, their average for each question calculated, and the difference between the positive average and 5 (that being considered perfection) calculated. This difference represented the Failure Points for the issue concerned. Generally for these reverse-average Failure Point calculations, results were under "2." The failures noted herein are for the exceptionalities, those questions which received reverse averages of 2 or greater.

Part I of the evaluation, Radio Facility Failure, some Failure Points were calculated from the responses of both surveys given to Programmers and Volunteers/Staff (the two groups received different surveys reflected the different concerns for each). At times, concerns spanned both groups, such as level of comfort in the Trent Radio facility. In these instances, the reverse averages from each group of

respondents was found, and the average between these reverse averages was calculated, constituting the combined Failure Point level for the issue (again most often being below the count of "2").

It should be noted that the surveys were conducted on paper or in MSWord format (respondents were given both options, although e-response did not ensure anonymity). This form of survey allowed respondents greater flexibility in their answers, which was often harnessed. Some answers were given in half points (i.e., 3.5), some answers received worded responses ("maybe" or "don't know"), and some received extra punctuation ("5!" or "☺"). For rating systems, respondents either gave numbers or "don't know" responses, but with Yes/No questions, if a respondent answered "maybe" or "sometimes," then the response was considered to carry a 0.5 Failure Point. It would be encouraged that Trent Radio maintain the flexible response survey style in order to glean the most informative responses from respondents, even if those responses cannot at all times be translated into calculable Failure Points.

Incomplete Calculations

A number of Failure Point measures were not calculated for this term, largely due to the fact that this framework has only recently been developed. The following measures require that tracking be done throughout the regular operating year and would be implemented for the first time in the coming year, 2007-2008:

Radio Facility Failure

- 1. How often in this period have scheduling problems remained unresolved? (*Reference: Report RF5*);
- 10. How often in this period have Trent Radio employees, volunteers, and programmers suffered a loss of physical or digital files due to improper or insecure storage? (*Reference: Report RF1*);
- 13. How many complaints have been made against Trent Radio from the upstairs tenant, facility neighbours and the general Peterborough public? (*Reference: Report RF2*);
- 32. How often has Trent Radio equipment failed within the period? (*Reference: Report RF3*);
- 33. How often have equipment failures resulted in over 10 minutes of dead air over both the radio broadcast and online stream? (*Reference: Report RF3*);
- 39. How many times has the streaming technology failed in the past period? (*Reference: Report R4*).

Community Service Role Failure

- 39. How poorly does Trent Radio handle internal conflicts? (*Reference: Report CSR 1. [5 – Avg.]*).

Business Failure

Measurements which were not able to be taken for this period under the Business/Operational Failure component of the evaluation were those requiring response from Board members (Questions 7 through 30) as well as those requiring budgeted figures (Questions 58 and 59). Given the Governing (i.e., non-working) nature of the Board, it was difficult to obtain Board responses via paper surveys. MSWord document surveys were proliferated to Board members, but only was completed survey was returned. One member's opinion is not sufficient to truly represent the opinions of the Board members in general, and therefore these measurements have been negated for this term. The Questions dealing with budget figures cannot be answered because Trent Radio does not establish a [**no unified budget for YE06*] budget for itself; however,

these questions will remain in the evaluation format in case Trent Radio ever decides to do so.

Failures of Note: Radio Facility Failure	Failure Points
Accessibility	10.8
Physical Plant	16.2
Resources	39.8
Standards	0.0
Equipment	7.7
Total Failure Points:	74.5

****Note:** Separate aspects of each failure type (i.e., Accessibility, Physical Plant, etc.) can not be inter-compared. Levels of Failure Points for each are not relative.

- Question 5 – Adequate Training and Support: Programmers collectively claimed 14.5 incidents of not having received proper training with Trent Radio equipment. This inadequate training may apply to any aspect of the Trent Radio equipment.
- Question 5 (accidentally duplicated) – Adequacy of Working Spaces: Input for this assessment was gathered from Programmers, Staff, and Volunteers. Although the combined reverse average was less than 2, it should be noted that three respondents noted that the environment tends to be cold/chilly.
- Questions 6 and 8 – Physical Storage Space Provisions: 5 Programmers and 3 Staff/Volunteers expressed dissatisfaction with storage provisions.
- Question 11 – Physical Barriers: Three respondents experienced the physical barrier of being locked out of the building. One respondent gave the following note:

My vision isn't great, and the [labeling] of electronics is generally horrible. It would be great to consider interfaces when purchasing new equipment. And it's too cold. And the benches are too hard.
- Question 17 – Digital Music Archive Usability: Trent Radio received a reverse average rating of 2.3 for the user-friendliness of its digital music archive retrieval system.
- Question 19 – Current Status of Music Archive: Although this rating was under 2 (standing at 1.9), it should be mentioned that one respondent asked, “Why no earshot charts?”
- Question 20 – Underrepresented Aspects of Music Archive: 8 genres/groups/time frames were identified as being ignored in the music archive.
 - Loud rock;
 - Electronic music;
 - Canadian comedy;
 - Blues (“the jazz collection is mostly crap fusion and any album that has a black guy on the cover and is not rap is considered jazz”);
 - Industrial electronica ebm eurodance;
 - Weird AI;
 - Conservatives (?); and,
 - Slam Poetry.
 - Also mentioned was the date “February 22, 1963” was also listed; however, this response is most likely poking fun at the reference to a neglected “time frame” in the original survey question. (The only significance of this date seems to be Vijay Singh’s birthday.)
- Question 22 – Music Archive Browsability: Trent Radio received a 2.6 reverse average rating for the “browsability” of the music archive.

- Question 24 – Spoken Word Archive: 13 Programmers feel that Trent Radio should expand its spoken word archive.
- Question 36 – Equipment Barriers: 4 Programmers stated that Trent Radio’s current equipment presents barriers to their ability to create the programs they envisioned, with the following 5 reasons:
 - Absence of CD mixer;
 - Absence of 2 tape recorders;
 - Needles in record players not always functional;
 - Need for better headphones (Respondent suggestion: Maybe have a sign-up sheet to guarantee safety?); and,
 - Mic stands are rickety.
 - Also mentioned was the inability for full bands to play live sets (“...which is extremely lame”); however, this inadequacy was not counted for a Failure Point as it could not be alleviated through more advanced and readily available technologies. This capacity may more likely represent a long-term goal if deemed integral.

Failures of Note: Community Service Role Failure	Failure Points
Concerning Programming...	13.0
How Programmers See Trent Radio...	57.1
Concerning Employee/Volunteer Satisfaction...	4.7
Total Failure Points:	74.8

- Question 2 – Non-Returning Programmers: 9 Programmers from the 2005-2006 season did not return to Trent Radio for this season for reasons other than having moved out of town.
- Question 9 – Appeals for Input: 5 Programmers stated that they had not before been asked for their input concerning Trent Radio’s operations (this failure may in fact be remedied through these very surveys, of course).
- Question 14 – Programme Director Feedback: 10 Programmers state that they would like to receive the Programme Director’s feedback more often; however, two did note that they understand the constraints which may not make this possible.
- Question 18 – Extension in Participation: A non-calculated sub-question (under Question 12 of Form U2) showed that 4 individuals at Trent Radio would be interested in a greater level of participation (i.e., through participation with the Board, volunteering, etc.).
- Question 19 – Website User-Friendliness: Trent Radio’s website received a reverse average rating of 2.4 for the user-friendliness of its website.
- Question 20 – Website Usefulness: Trent Radio’s website received a reverse average rating of 2 for the usefulness of its website.
- Question 24 – Fostering the Trent Radio Community: 6.5 Programmers feel that Trent Radios does not do enough in terms of fostering its own community (a half count results from the response “sort of.”). One Programmer suggested that Trent Radio hold a Programmer Meet and Greet.
- Question 29 – New Programmers and Staff: 4.5 new Programmers state that they are not familiar with all of the Trent Radio Staff (a half count results from the response “most”).

Failures of Note: Business/Operational Failure	Failure Points
Concerning the Board...	5.0
Concerning Programmers...	3.2
Concerning Volunteers and Staff...	21.5
Concerning Reports of the AGM – General	3.0
Concerning Reports of the AGM – Financial	~
Total Failure Points:	32.7

- Question 33 – Programme Proposal Process: Given that the evaluation is meant to focus on failures, this note is the only one which will address a success. Because of exceptional ratings in general, plus one rating of 8 (on a scale of 1-5), Trent Radio received a reverse average rating of -0.1 for the ease of its programme proposal process!
- Questions 34 and 39 – Pre-Season Preparation: While 2 Programmers felt that Trent Radio takes too much time at the beginning of the season to get things up and running, 3 Staff/Volunteers felt that they did not have enough time (one noting, “Is there such a thing?”). This issue would hence have to be one of compromise in order to address the needs of both parties, whose interests appear contradictory in this case.
- Question 38 – Volunteer/Staff Stress Levels: Volunteers and Staff expressed reverse average rating of 2.9 for their level of stress due to what they perceive to be faulty, inefficient and/or nonsensical operations at Trent Radio.
- Question 41 – Neglected Duties: Altogether, Volunteers and Staff feel that they are unable to address 12 of their consummate duties adequately due to needs in other areas of their portfolios.
- Question 50 – Corporate Donations: Trent Radio secured 100% less in Corporate Donations for the 2006 fiscal year compared to the 2005 fiscal year.
- Question 51 – Private Donations: Trent Radio secured 45% less in Private Donations for the 2006 fiscal year compared to the 2005 fiscal year.
- Question 53 – Special Events Fundraising: Trent Radio secured 56% less through Special Events Fundraising in the 2006 fiscal year compared to the 2005 fiscal year.
- Question 57 – The Levy Question: 9.1% of full-time undergrad Trent students expressed opposition to the levy increase.

A General Suggestion

The following concerns were forwarded to the evaluation facilitator:
 If you are looking for suggestions to help [Trent Radio] I think having the website overhauled, like having Indie Charts. I know starting our own charts won't be easy, but they seem to garner a lot of interest on other stations such as LU Radio and CIUT, as well as possibly a digital signal I think that's what it's called;) Oh and maybe a promotional campaign - massive postering and getting some spots in local newspapers might help, as well as making [Trent Radio] nights such as the Monday nights at Sadlier house more public by postering the event in the city.

General Observations of the Evaluation Process

- Question 3 of Form U1 (After your initial training, how adequate was continued support and guidance in the use of equipment?) issued one response of “Fuck you.” This defensiveness may indicate a sense of pride about Trent Radio, one which even extends to the Programmers (as Form U1 was one completed by Programmers), which has both benefits and shortcomings.

- It seemed that some Programmers had trouble answering Questions 11-18 of Form U1:
 - Question 11: How user-friendly is Trent Radio's music archive online search portal?
 - Question 12: How user-friendly and easily accessible is Trent Radio's vinyl collection?
 - Question 13: How user-friendly is Trent Radio's digital music archive retrieval system?
 - Question 14: How would you rate the breadth and variety of the Trent Radio music archive (including vinyl and digital resources)?
 - Question 15: How well does Trent Radio keep its music archive up-to-date and current?
 - Question 16: Do you feel that any particular group, genre, or time frame has been ignored in the Trent Radio music archive?
 - Question 17: How many times has Trent Radio failed to follow-up on a suggestion for either an audio or informational resource in the period?
 - Question 18: How would you rate the "browsability" of the Trent Radio music archive?

All of these questions deal with the Trent Radio music archive (except Question 17, which should thus perhaps be moved to exchange survey positioning with Question 18). About one-third of responses to these questions expressed confusion or non-applicability to the respondents (i.e. "I don't know" or "I don't use this"). At the same time, many Programmers did respond to the questions with numerical levels. Thus, while these questions should in fact remain part of the evaluation, it should be expected that not all Programmers will be able to respond, as they do not all use the music archive.

Of particular note was Question 15, which showed an increase of non-committal responses. As such, Question 15 may be removed, as Question 25 of Part I – Radio Facility Failure addresses the success/failure of Trent Radio's ability to keep its archive/collection up-to-date.

Question 17 may have been confusing because it did not refer specifically to suggestions made by the respondent and should be restated as "How many times has Trent Radio failed to follow-up on a suggestion you have made for either an audio or informational resource in the period? (*N/A if no such suggestions have been made*)"

- Question 3 of Form U2 ("Has Trent Radio ever asked for your input concerning their operations?") would be redundant as the surveys are themselves in fact asking for the Programmer's input. This question will likely be removed.
- One respondent was confused about to whom Question 7 of Form U2 ("How satisfied are you with the feedback you receive from the Programme Director?") was referring. Laurel's name will be added to the survey and changed as necessary.
- To Question 10 of Form U2 (Are you made to feel that the Trent Radio staff are truly there for you (the programmers)?), one respondent stated "weird question." This question could be restated to perhaps make more sense: "Are you made to feel that the Trent Radio staff are truly there to serve your interests rather than their own ideas?"
- There seemed to be some confusion over the juxtaposition of Questions 4 and 5 in Form U3 ("Do you think that Trent Radio takes too much time to get up and running in their regular season after the school year starts?" and "Do you think that Trent Radio takes enough time to get up and running in their regular season after the school year starts?") Perhaps these questions should be amalgamated to ask both questions simultaneously.
- It seems that Question 8 of Form E3 ("Do you feel that you are adequately compensated for the work you do (taking into consideration Trent Radio's financial constraints)?") may be too sensitive an issue. 3 respondents answered

“Yes” while 2 left the response blank. This question may be removed from the form.

- The equations provided for the calculation of Failure Points in dealing with Financial Reports at the AGM are flawed. Rather than dividing the current figure by the previous figure, the difference between the two (assuming the current figure is lower) should be the amount which is divided by the figure from the previous fiscal year (and subsequently multiplied by 10).
- The Radio Facility Failure Assessment form has two questions labelled as Question 5. Number throughout will have to be adjusted.
- Upon actually doing the tabulations, it was discovered that it would facilitate the process if boxes were framing the spaces where sub-totals are calculated, as has been done in pencil on the current assessment forms.

Conclusion

Through the creation and implementation of this evaluation process, I have hoped to help Trent Radio identify its failures. Finding these failures is only half the battle, however. There are reasons behind these failures, reasons which have not necessarily been identified through this process. Furthermore, priorities and possibilities must be set. The Indicators of Failure do just that – merely indicate. It is the initial development towards change, as well as a useful and standardized instrument to show Volunteers, Staff, and Programmers that their opinions matter and that they can inspire change.

Appendices

- Tabulations of responses for Forms U1, U2, U3, E1, E2, and E3. *(Questions are not included, thus cross-referencing of questions will be required with original forms when reading tabulations.)*

This original formatting of this document
has been amended for distribution.

An Experience of Failure

By Lily J. Mills

0165927

For: Professor R. Dart, ADMN 491H

April 18, 2007

Introduction

Although it might seem too obvious, students do not often think about their classes as “learning experiences.” The term is more often applied to real-life situations, such that classes are considered to offer “simulations” or merely think-tanks for the “real world.” The Trent Centre for Community-Based Education (TCCBE), however, provides opportunities for learning experiences which are practical, applied and integrated into this “real world.” By coordinating with organizations in Peterborough and the surrounding area, the Centre allows students to explore credit-earning options outside of the classroom.

This document is to exist as my own personal reflection of my learning experience which was made possible through the TCCBE. The following phases have been identified in the process:

- Project Discovery;
- Understanding of Project;
- Curriculum Development;
- Research;
- Brainstorming;
- The Images of Organization Survey;
- Survey Development;
- Survey Execution;
- Reporting;
- Interpretation; and,
- Model Evaluation.

These phases should be seen as only loosely chronological. In reality, each phase overlapped with the phase immediately preceding and immediately following it to some extent. While this reflection process is also yet another important and integral phase of the learning experience, discussion concerning it has not been herein included, in order to avoid redundancy!

Project Discovery

I began the project discovery process late into last summer, as I had been on the waiting list for two other business half-credits all summer and suspected that I would not be getting into them. My first order of business was to browse the projects listed on the TCCBE website (www.trentu.ca/tccbe). I was looking for something both applicable to business as well as related to my chosen field of arts and culture (I am actually a Cultural Studies major, taking a minor in Business Administration).

Projects which looked interesting to me included an audience survey for Peterborough New Dance, the development of a self-evaluation model for OPIRG, a “listenership” survey and Indicators of Failure evaluation model (the former two to be completed for Trent Radio, each constituting a separate project). Further research into what each project would entail was sought through Barb Woolner, Projects Coordinator with the Centre, who sent me a 2-3 page long synopsis of each project.

Further support in the quest for the perfect project was sought through the supervising professor, Professor Ray Dart. Prof. Dart graciously agreed to supervise the project in August. I had chosen to approach this particular professor because I had enjoyed taking a first-year business class with him and remembered that he had done quite a bit of work with not-for-profits. He guided me through the project decision process

by encouraging me to find something that really interested me and would be applicable to my future endeavours.

Throughout this process, I also decided that I would complete this Community-Based Education project for half-credit only in the winter semester. The planning process was taking too long for me to be comfortable with taking on the project in September, and this ended up being acceptable as my selected project suited a semester's worth of work.

After reviewing the project profiles, I decided to have meetings with OPIRG and Trent Radio to get a better sense of the projects and the people with whom I would be working. OPIRG's project seemed fairly straightforward and logical. When I met with John K. Muir, General Manager of Trent Radio, however, I found that the project he was envisioning (for the Indicators of Failure model) was much more abstract and conceptual. I felt that this project was more challenging to grasp and therefore would make for a more fulfilling and interesting learning experience.

Understanding of Project

Coming to fully understand what John was looking for took more than one meeting. Thinking in terms of failure rather than success is a bit unorthodox for most evaluation models. John's logic was that Trent Radio already knew where it was doing well and that finding the failures would provide opportunities for learning and growth for the organization. John showed me around the Trent Radio facility twice, suggested some reading to me (sections from *Resistance Through Rituals*, edited by Stuart Hall and Tony Jefferson), and met with me about four times before I truly understood what he was going for. At one point, John explained that he wasn't interested in creating standards, because standards create a level of "acceptable" failure and do not necessarily encourage growth once they have been successfully met. For quite a while, I had been under the impression that creating standards was exactly what I would be doing. On the contrary, John was looking for a conceptualisation of perfection, and then seeing how far away Trent Radio was from it. Rather than the great mark of 80% on the report card, John wanted to focus on the 20% deficiency. My ability to understand John's thinking was facilitated not only through the reading he suggested, but also through a section of the radio recording of *The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy* by Douglas Adams. Once I had tapped into John's thinking, the development of the project became one hundred percent easier.

Curriculum Development

Of course, for this project to be legitimated as a fourth-year university course, a curriculum for student evaluation had to be developed between myself and Professor Dart. Although the project which Trent Radio sought would obviously be one deliverable, it would not be the only one. The project outline process and creation intended to identify the purpose of the project, the key research questions, the project methodology, the project timeline, resources which would be required of Trent Radio, the deliverables to Professor Dart (as well as their respective weights in relation to the final evaluation of the student), and the responsibilities of each party (the student, the supervising professor, the host organization, and the TCCBE).

The development of this document took place over a few weeks towards the end of the semester preceding the project and a couple weeks into the project semester. Its development occurred largely through brainstorming between me and Professor Dart, through meetings and e-mail correspondence. I searched the library catalogue to find research readings which would be appropriate for background reading dealing with surveys, organizational analysis, and radio. The resultant outline was reviewed and signed by all parties. For the most part, the guidelines set out in the curriculum were subsequently followed.

Research

Doing the background research was a hurried process as it seemed logical that one would need to complete this step before moving into the meat-and-potatoes of the project. I did, however, identify which chapters and sections could be read while completing other parts of the project. For example, the chapters in Elizabeth G. Baldwin's Master's Thesis entitled *Community Radio: The Development of a Voluntary Organization* which dealt with business aspects could be read later while I worked on the Radio Facility and Community Service Role sections of the project.

Each reading brought something new to my understanding of the project and each I found to be more or less relevant than the others. The De Bono text (*Six Thinking Hats*) was useful for taking a critical approach, but seemed more applicable to idea generation rather than organizational analysis. *Measuring and Enhancing The Productivity of Service and Government Organizations* by Marvin E. Mundel, Ph. D. was extremely comprehensive and convoluted. The processes described in the book did not have exact applicability to Trent Radio as measuring output is so abstract, and output was the primary focus of the text. *Measuring and Assessing Organizations*, by Andrew H. Van de Ven, however, gave a more general focus to evaluating organizations, noting some varied models which could be applied (none of which focused on measuring failure). The *Organizational Surveys* text by Allen I. Kraut was extremely helpful in terms of outlining the processes and pitfalls of initiating organizational surveys. During the actual survey process, I actually came across all of the points of theory mentioned by Kraut in the text. *Resistance Through Rituals* (Hall and Jefferson) provided an aspect of political and cultural thought into the project, allowing me to see the various ways in which Trent Radio might be considered unsuccessful within its contexts. The last chapter of *The Politics of Canadian Broadcasting* by Frank W. Peers (Chapter 17: "Interpretations") provided a convenient overview of the logic behind the different types of radio organizations – public, private/commercial, and community.

A total of 22.5 hours was spent reading for this course.

Brainstorming

The development and execution of the project was largely completed on Tuesdays at the Trent Radio facility. This *in situ* work allowed me to observe the goings-on at the site and understand what exactly might need to be evaluated. I saw people prepare (or not prepare) for shows, saw them interact with John, and listened to them actually on the radio. This presence also allowed me to interrupt John whenever I needed an answer to a question and look up records/files as needed. Although I did not see the entire year-long process, and was never able to attend a meeting of the Board, I gained an understanding of the meat-and-potatoes of Trent Radio. Other work was completed at home as necessary.

The brainstorming process was largely informed by my conversations with John Muir. Over the four formal and various impromptu meetings, I quite possibly learned more about Trent Radio than many of the programmers. It was through those meetings that I was able to develop the initial general outline (Radio Facility, Community Service Role, and Business/Operational Failures) and later elaborate upon what each of these Failures would entail. Brainstorming yielded the areas for analysis, but not the analysis itself.

The Images of Organization Survey

Inspiration for this survey sprouted from learning about Moore's Images of Organizations in my Social Organizations class. The questions in this survey were forwarded to Trent Radio Programmers, Volunteers, and Staff members:

- If Trent Radio was a machine, what would it make or do?

- If Trent Radio was an organism, where would it fit in its food chain? How does it survive (cow eats grass) and what does it in turn help to survive (cow feeds calf)?
- Remember in cartoons those shots of looking into someone's brain and seeing monkeys or a spider web or nothing at all? If you could look into Trent Radio's brain (or the brain that is Trent Radio) what would be going on?
- If Trent Radio was a culture, what values and beliefs would it be known for (like the rumour that Canadians are exceptionally polite)?
- If Trent Radio was a political system, what would it be (for example, anarchy, democracy, tyranny, etc.)? For a full list of political systems, see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_forms_of_government.
- 6. If Trent Radio was a brainwasher, what would its subliminal messages tell you?

The original intention of this survey was to uncover what kinds of questions I should be asking in the surveys, but in reality they provided another, more qualitative, opportunity for finding Trent Radio's failures. The answers received were aggregated, alphabetised for anonymity, and shared with John Muir as well as Laurel Paluck, Programme Director, and Jill Staveley, Production Manager. The answers were informally compared to what John had told me about the organization. In some cases responses seemed congruent, in others, they radically differed. Furthermore, it introduced the various parties involved at Trent Radio to myself, my project and the survey process. Because of the wide proliferation of this survey, and the number of informative responses, personal interviews never did take place. I felt that personal interviews would have given a more micro-organizational view, while the project was meant to be more focused on macro-organizational concerns. I have advised that the survey be extended every year in order to compliment the quantitative survey process with a more qualitative aspect.

Survey Development

The greatest challenge in survey development was finding the calculable key to each aspect of a failure set. For example, how would one find out a measurable quantity of by how much Trent Radio fails to provide user-friendly equipment? The answer was often to be found in (levels*), which were used in Programmer and Staff/Volunteer surveys. This system provided a numerical measurement with a conceivable level of perfection (5). For every survey question, it was necessary to include a corresponding question on the master evaluation form for the failure type. The surveys were geared for each of the three failure types to be presented separately. Other survey questions required Yes/No answers or quantities (i.e., How many times...?).

I perhaps did not take my use of language into account as much as I should have. Although the radio programmers, specifically those associated with Trent Radio, are well educated/well-read, my language at times can be convoluted, and I received a few confused comments about my questions at times.

The evaluation model did not always necessarily correspond with survey questions. Some questions were also based on pre-fabricated and newly required records/files to provide measurements of failure, often in comparison with the previous year or in frequency of negative occurrences (to be recorded during the year as they occur).

Survey Execution

Many cues in the survey execution process were taken from the *Organizational Surveys* text. Participants were given a choice of response forms in order to appeal to different preferences – MSWord file or paper copy. Unfortunately, response via MSWord and subsequent e-mail did not ensure anonymity; however, I was likely considered a neutral intermediary given my lack of personal involvement with Trent Radio (in some

instances it was obvious that I was considered an outsider, given the sometimes disrespectful responses). Paper copies were made available in the Trent Radio sitting area. Each of these formats enabled respondents to include digressions beyond the requested yes/no or 1-5 scale* answer, which allowed for a greater comprehension of how the surveyed participants felt about what they were being asked.

Signs were posted (and noted as being from John) indicating that these surveys were available and that the e-mail should be noted. An introductory e-mail was also sent out to let potential respondents know about the project and the upcoming surveys. It outlined the survey schedule, which showed when surveys would be available and their optimal return time. Although I did not need the surveys back until much later necessarily, it was advisable to give a psychological “due date” in order to increase responses (as otherwise, surveys may be marginalized and then forgotten). Even after the due dates, they were issued a second time to remind and encourage those who had not yet completed it. In only a couple instances did programmers complain that they considered this process to be “spam.” Paper copies were anonymously delivered to the Trent Radio mailbox.

The survey execution process went very smoothly overall. Operators (one of which is present during all live broadcasting hours) were instructed to encourage individual Programmers to fill out the surveys, as well as partake in the process themselves. Very few questions were asked, although that does not necessarily mean that questions did not exist. While I did receive a few e-mails of thanks and encouragement from Programmers, my contact with them was highly impersonal, unfortunately. If I had more time, I could have visited the facility every day of the week and met all of the Programmers, Staff and Volunteers. Many questions were generally included on the forms after they were turned in, when they did occur. As would be expected, the number of surveys returned declined with each round as survey fatigue and disinterest set in; however, I believe that this three-step process was more effective than presenting all of the questions at one time.

Reporting

Reporting of the results involved the tabulation of the survey responses. Once all responses for the same question were aggregated (using Microsoft Excel), failure points were calculated, either through quantity-summary or through reverse-averaging. The reverse-averaging process involves tabulating results, finding the average and then subtracting that average from the perfection level of 5. In this way, the distance between the average answer and perfection was calculated. This reverse-averaging process was completed for most ** questions, whereas 1 was the most negative response and 5 the most positive. (Instructions for the completion of each failure point calculation are included in the master evaluation forms.)

Also included in the Excel spreadsheets were qualitative comments included in the surveys. Lists (such as which audio genres are seen by Programmers to be lacking) were also tabulated and included.

Interpretation

After failure points were tabulated, the hard results had to be interpreted so the numbers could provide meaning. Trends (such as three comments about the facility being uncomfortably “chilly”) were noted and lists of worded suggestions were included. With regards to the reverse-averages in the master evaluation, it was found that these differences were generally under the level 2. Thus, any exceptions (i.e. those reverse-averages of 2 or higher) were noted in the interpretation. Not every failure point was included in the interpretation. The focus was placed on analysis points which yielded relatively higher levels of failure points.

The interpretation document merely notes the failures; however, due to the quantitative nature of the evaluation, pure problems at the root of these failures, as well

as their solutions, are not assessed and provided. The next step in this process would be to investigate the reasons behind the results (although very often they may be seemingly obvious) and then remedy these problems. Priorities would also have to be set (although a partial prioritisation has taken place through my decision to note only those failures which seem relatively high, while some seemingly smaller problems may in fact be of more consequence).

Model Evaluation

I simultaneously undertook a micro-evaluation of my own evaluation. Subject to this analysis were typos, numerical errors, errors in calculation instructions, issues of confusion and concern in survey questions (such as questions which may be considered too uncomfortable for respondents), and suggestions in diction. These edits will be applied to the digital files before they are handed over to Trent Radio.

An evaluation of the model with a broader focus, such as the ability or inability of the surveys and questions to truly uncover Trent Radio's failures, will need to be completed on a continuous process. The evaluation documents and process should be reviewed at least annually in order to keep congruent with changes with in the organization and its environment. For example, questions concerning certain pieces of equipment or organizational positions will likely become antiquated over time, assuming changes do in fact take place.

Conclusion

I found that the bulk of the learning in the process took place, for me, during the survey planning and development stages. This provided a strong grounding for me if ever again I partake in developing an organizational analysis or any survey process for that matter. I feel that the failure-focused approach was unorthodox and may be a unique perspective which I would be able to any evaluation process.

It was also highly informative to discover how Trent Radio itself works, as well as learning to understand the mind of General Manager John K. Muir. Learning about community radio was what I found to be most interesting about the project. I enjoy learning about organizations and communities, but I prefer even better to be involved. This project, I felt, restricted me to the position of an outside consultant and observer. I would much more have preferred to learn and observe from within; however, each perspective has its own advantages and disadvantages for evaluation. For example, the viewpoint of an outsider may be considered more objective, but the viewpoint of an insider may see the more subtle aspects of an organization which might not be captured by an outsider. At the same time, becoming an insider while assuming the mindset of an outside evaluator might be possible, such as with a secret shopper. A search for failures could also be done by assigning a student to actually participate in the programming and volunteering processes. Hopefully I will be able to achieve a more involved and personal experience of radio through my production internship with CBC Radio.