

CALGARY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees (the "Board") held in the Multipurpose Room, Education Centre, 1221 – 8th Street SW, Calgary, Alberta on Tuesday, May 1, 2012 at 3:00 p.m.

MEETING ATTENDANCE

Board of Trustees:

Trustee P. Cochrane, Chair
Trustee C. Bazinet
Trustee J. Bowen-Eyre
Trustee L. Ferguson
Trustee P. King
Trustee G. Lane
Trustee S. Taylor

Administration:

Ms. N. Johnson, Chief Superintendent of Schools
Mr. D. Stevenson, Deputy Chief Superintendent of Schools
Mr. F. Coppinger, Superintendent, Facilities and Environmental Services
Ms. C. Faber, Superintendent, Learning Innovation
Ms. D. Lewis, Superintendent, Learning Services
Ms. D. Meyers, Superintendent, Finance and Supply Chain Services
Mr. K. Peterson, Acting Superintendent, Human Resources
Mr. R. Peter, Chief Communications Officer
Ms. L. Safran, Acting General Counsel and Corporate Secretary
Ms. J. Barkway, Office of the Corporate Secretary
Ms. A. McNaught, Recording Secretary

Stakeholder Representatives:

Mr. B. Anderson, Canadian Union of Public Employees, Local 40
Mr. M. Johnson, Calgary Board of Education Staff Association
Ms. J. Regal, Alberta Teachers' Association, Local 38
Mr. R. Hurdman, Calgary Association of Parents and School Councils (CAPSC)
Ms. S. Anderson, Elementary School Principals' Association
Ms. S. Trumper, Elementary School Principals' Association
Ms. M. Wheatcroft, Principals' Association for Adolescent Learners (PAAL)
Ms. L. Robertson, Principals' Association for Adolescent Learners (PAAL)

1| **CALL TO ORDER, NATIONAL ANTHEM AND WELCOME**

Chair Cochrane called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and the singing of the national anthem was led by the Grade 4 singers from Citadel Park School.

Chair Cochrane acknowledged and welcomed representatives from the aforementioned organizations.

2| **CONSIDERATION/APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Ms. Barkway noted that Agenda Item 3.1, Excellence in Teaching Awards had a set time of 5:00 p.m. She advised that under Item 6, Public Comment, there were two proposed additions.

Motion Arising

MOVED by Trustee Taylor:

THAT a new Item 7.3 be added to the Agenda to accommodate Board consideration of a motion regarding preparation of information related to transportation and fees.

The motion was
CARRIED.

In Favour: Trustee Bazinet
Trustee Bowen-Eyre
Trustee King
Trustee Taylor
Opposed: Trustee Cochrane
Trustee Ferguson
Trustee Lane

MOVED by Trustee King:

THAT the Agenda for the Regular Meeting of May 1, 2012, be approved as submitted, subject to the amendments noted above.

The motion was
CARRIED.

In Favour: Trustee Bazinet
Trustee Bowen-Eyre
Trustee King
Trustee Lane
Trustee Taylor
Opposed: Trustee Cochrane
Trustee Ferguson

3| **AWARDS AND RECOGNITIONS**

3.1 **Excellence in Teaching Awards – at 5:00 p.m.**

The recognition and presentation Agenda item took place at 5:00 p.m. but is recorded at this point in the minutes to provide continuity to the minutes.

Chair Cochrane provided preliminary comments about the origin of the Excellence in Teaching Awards, which are presented and sponsored by Alberta Education. The 2012 awards recognized nine creative and innovative CBE teachers as semi-finalists for their exceptional work in Alberta's Kindergarten to Grade 12 classrooms.

Trustees read the nominator quotes related to the semi-finalists from their respective Wards and presented the following teachers with certificates of recognition and tokens of appreciation:

- Ms. L. Pierzchalski, F.E. Osbourne School
- Ms. E. Tamblyn, W.O. Mitchell School
- Ms. P. Bates, Saddleridge School
- Mr. M. Hoblak, Sir John A. Macdonald School
- Ms. J. Turner, Sir John A. Macdonald School
- Ms. N. Baines, Captain John Palliser School
- Mr. D. Wensley, Jennie Elliott School
- Mr. P. Brown, Dr. E.P. Scarlett High School
- Mr. A. Fotopoulos, Dr. E.P. Scarlett High School

Chair Cochrane noted that a short recess would be taken to enjoy refreshments on the link.

4| **RESULTS FOCUS**

4.1 **School Presentation – Arbour Lake School and Bowness High School**

Ms. J. Everett, Director of Area I, began the presentation profiling the Mega Result. She informed that Arbour Lake School is a middle school with over 800 students and Bowness High School is a high school with over 1,300 students. Ms. Everett shared that although the Mega Result speaks to completing high school and continued learning, the foundation from Kindergarten through to Grade 12 ensures that students achieve the Mega Result. She stated that following the student presentations it would be apparent that these schools support each student in keeping with his or her own individual abilities and gifts to complete high school with a foundation of learning necessary to thrive in life, work and continued learning.

Three students from Arbour Lake School, Matthew, Rebecca and Taylor, and two students from Bowness High School, Sydney and Hellen, shared personal learning experiences reflecting on their learning today and their ongoing efforts to successfully meet the Mega Result in the future.

Ms. C. Meaden, Principal of new Northwest High School scheduled to open in September 2013, closed the presentation. She thanked the student presenters for the reminder that learning is different for everyone; that individual experiences and the ability to take supported risks build understanding; and that significant people in families, schools and communities are critical to each person's journey.

Trustee Bowen-Eyre, as Ward Trustee, thanked the Grade 4 singers from Citadel Park School for leading the assembly in the national anthem, as well as Ms. H. Wallace, Principal, and Ms. C. Jackson, music teacher, for their efforts in organizing the performance. She also thanked the five student Mega Result presenters for their participation at the meeting, together with Ms. C. Meaden, Ms. K. Barry, Principal, and Mr. R. O'Shaughnessy, Assistant Principal, of Arbour Lake School, and Ms. C. Shellenberg, Assistant Principal of Bowness High School.

5| **OPERATIONAL EXPECTATIONS**

5.1 **Operational Expectations 11: Learning Environment/Treatment of Students – Reasonable Interpretation**

Superintendent Lewis introduced the report stating that the Chief Superintendent has interpreted the Board of Trustees' value that education environments effectively support student learning to mean that students are provided for intellectually, socially, emotionally and physically. She discussed indicators of compliance that are linked directly to the results of Alberta Education's Accountability Pillar Survey (the "Survey"), particularly the safe and caring questions asked of teachers, parents and students regarding student safety at school, student learning about the importance of caring for others and student treatment in school.

Chair Cochrane reminded the Board that the criteria against which the Board is to judge this report is whether the Board is satisfied that the Chief Superintendent has conveyed that she reasonably understands the values underlying this Board policy. She pointed out that any decision or comment of the Board of Trustees around non-approval of the reasonable interpretation, including the indicators, is in no way intended to be a vote of non-confidence for the Chief Superintendent.

Trustees posed questions, which were addressed by Administration. The discussion is summarized as follows:

- The indicator of compliance of 81% referenced under 11.2(4) and 11.3 on page 5-5 indicate the intermediate level (81% - 84.5%) from the Survey. This percentile gives a strong baseline to understand the CBE's performance in relation to other school Boards across the province and provides a medium to high expectation for results.
- The province creates a baseline based on a three year average of data collected from the Survey across all school jurisdictions in Alberta. The percentile is based on calculating the 5th, 25th, 75th and 95th percentiles that exist in the data sets that are provided.
- The fourth indicator of compliance under 11.2 (concerning safe learning environment) is the same as the indicator of compliance under 11.3 (concerning high student achievement). Different sections of Survey questions are tailored to safe environment and achievement. The questions guide the responses very specifically in those separate areas. Responses related to safe environment would be used to report on 11.2 and responses related to achievement would be used to report on 11.3. Alberta Education rolls the information up into one piece and that is how Administration proposed to present it as well.
- In response to a question about whether the individual questions and responses could be broken out for review, Alberta Education reinforces that the exact percentage in the raw score of an individual question has not gone through any of the statistical comparative work that would establish whether or not it was a good result. It is the rolled up measure that indicates whether or not it is a good result. Looking at the data question by question would result in a review of the data for the CBE only and not in comparison to others.

- Under 11.6 on page 5-7, whenever there are individuals other than teachers or CBE support staff working in schools or classrooms, including contractors and vendors, prerequisite precautionary actions are taken to ensure that those individuals are appropriate to be there. These include screening, volunteer screening, police background checks, etc.
- Each year principals complete an Action Manager Survey, which is a tool Administration uses to ask specific questions and gather information which can be used to measure indicators of compliance. If a school is not in compliance in an area, that would be investigated.
- Alberta Education indicates the number of minutes and instructional hours required in schools, 950 for elementary and junior high and 1000 for high school. Under 11.1 on page 5-4, the first indicator of compliance is set at 100% because that is what is strived for. A teacher's professional judgment is used regarding fun activities and many are able to make connections and tie various events and activities to the program of study.
- Under 11.4, the CBE has a Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP) Coordinator who receives and responds to complaints related to incorrect or improper use of private information. The FOIP Coordinator reports to the General Counsel who reports any consequential complaints to the Superintendents' team.
- Under 11.4, indicator 1 on page 5-6, the CBE's Administrative Regulations must comply with statutory requirements. Reporting on that would be a simple yes or no answer. Currently the Administrative Regulation regarding student records does align with legal requirements.
- Parents and guardians are the only people entitled to their student's information. Independent students have control over their own personal information. How confidential information is managed will be covered under Operational Expectation 3: Treatment of Owners.
- In response to questions about how the Board will be informed of privacy issues that arise, Administration advised that Operational Expectation OE-3: Treatment of Owners deals with managing confidential information and handling complaints, and issues will be reported there.

MOVED by Trustee Bowen-Eyre:

THAT the Board of Trustees approves that the Chief Superintendent has reasonably interpreted the provisions of Operational Expectation OE-11: Learning Environment/Treatment of Students, including but not limited to the indicators provided in the report.

MOVED by Trustee Taylor:

THAT the motion be amended by the addition of "with the exception of interpretation 11.4."

(For clarification, Operational Expectations Policy OE-11.4 states “The Chief Superintendent will ensure that all confidential student information is lawfully collected, used and protected.”)

Trustees entered into debate on the amendment to the motion. Comments in support of the amendment are summarized as follows:

- A Trustee noted her belief that there is a gap around the Board receiving information when there are issues related to compliance with the indicators. She reminded that the Board has not yet accepted the Reasonable Interpretation OE-3.
- A Trustee expressed the belief that when OE-11 comes before the Board for monitoring, that is the time the Board should hear about breaches in terms of confidential student information and assess compliance in that area.
- Breaches can happen even if there is a correct practice in place. A fifth Indicator around reporting incidents and complaints that have happened during the year in the OE that is being monitored at the time would be valuable.
- A Trustee noted a concern that the monitoring report might only state the system is in compliance with the Indicator but not provide any data to back that up.
- Policies are monitored one at a time. When an OE comes before the Board for monitoring, Trustees need to be able to vote on whether or not they think this policy is in compliance at that time, not based on what has happened or will happen with another OE.
- The privacy and safety of student records is of such importance to the Board that it is stated in OE-3 and in OE-11. It should be reported at the time each of those policies are reviewed.

Comments in opposition to the amendment to the motion included:

- Under Coherent Governance there is an interrelationship between the various policies. They are each in their own way understandable but they are interdependent. OE-3 deals with the area of managing information effectively, handling complaints and organizational culture.
- Under 11.4, indicator 2, principals must report on their practices and if there is non-compliance with an Administrative Regulation or an infraction regarding the release of information that would come out in the reporting.
- A Trustee reminded that the test is reasonableness. The Chief Superintendent’s interpretation of “collected, used and protected” in relation to student records is very clear, the Administrative Regulations will reflect that, principals will have training and understanding of what that means at their school, and records will be managed at the central level in a way that complies with the law and the intent of this policy. The indicators set out in OE-11 are an effective way of reporting back on whether or not the individual school and the system understand and are protecting student records appropriately.

Chair Cochrane called for the vote on the amendment.

The motion was
DEFEATED.

In Favour: Trustee Bazinet
Trustee Taylor
Opposed: Trustee Bowen-Eyre
Trustee Cochrane
Trustee Ferguson
Trustee King
Trustee Lane

Trustees entered into debate on the main motion and comments are summarized as follows:

- The interpretation is thorough and reasonable, and reflects what the Board was looking for relative to the learning environment for students. Key words are well defined and provide clear understanding.
- A Trustee expressed concern that the indicator of compliance under 11.3 on page 5-5 appeared to be low at 81%. Another Trustee felt the range was acceptable considering that if someone answers "I don't know" to a question on the Accountability Pillar Survey that would reflect negatively and make the likelihood of achieving 100% remote.
- It was appreciated that indicators were now more results-oriented than process-oriented.
- A Trustee reinforced that this is an incredibly important OE as it is about what the CBE does as a school system. The interpretations and the indicators indicate a clear statement from the Chief Superintendent and Administration that of utmost importance is the teaching and learning that happens, that learning environments are safe and supportive for students to be successful, and that we have to have ways of measuring it.

Chair Cochrane called for the vote on the motion.

The motion was
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Cochrane advised that the recommendation to determine an appropriate date for the monitoring report to come forward will be referred to Agenda Planning as that is where the calendar of when monitoring reports come forward is being built.

6| **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. R. Kingkade, Parent

Mr. Kingkade introduced himself as a Calgarian and father of two children who currently attend a CBE French immersion program. He shared the reasons why his family chose the French immersion program and discussed the tremendous impact the new CBE fee structure would have on his family. Mr. Kingkade advised there is no community school within walking distance of his home and, regardless of where his children were registered, they would have to ride the school bus and stay for lunch. Mr. Kingkade questioned how a full bus of students riding to a closer school (in his circumstance the

Alternative Program school is closer than the designated Regular Program school) results in transportation costs twice as much as the Regular Program. Mr. Kingkade also discussed the available waiver system stating his belief that the maximum family income threshold is extremely low with a maximum yearly family income at \$34,346 for a family of two parents and two children. Mr. Kingkade calculated that a family of two parents and two children with an annual income of \$35,000 would not qualify for the waivers and would pay, by 2014, \$1,380 in school fees to take the bus to an elementary Alternative Program, stay for lunch and receive instructional resources. He concluded by saying he understands there are budgetary concerns but urged that creating a two-tiered system is not the way to solve the issue.

Scott Chaulk, Parent

Mr. Chaulk introduced himself as a parent and declared he is not an enemy but a supporter of the CBE. He stated that of the options available, he chose the CBE as it has the best vehicles and programs for his child's education. Mr. Chaulk advised he was in attendance that evening because he does not understand the fee structure on transportation and would like to see quantifiable data - numbers, formulas and calculations - that support the end dollar figures. He shared that he cannot understand how one bussing system costs twice as much as another.

7| **MATTERS RESERVED FOR BOARD ACTION**

7.1 **Office of the Board of Trustees 2012-13 Operating Budget**

Chair Cochrane prefaced the presentation of this report by stating that although the information in the report came from Superintendent Meyers and Finance and Supply Chain Services, it is the Board of Trustees who crafted this budget.

Trustee Taylor left the meeting at 4:39 p.m.

Chair Cochrane explained that the Office of the Board of Trustees 2012-13 Operating Budget was coming before the Board now, when it has not in the past, because under Operational Expectations Policy OE-5.7 the Board is required to determine that the budget is sufficient for the Board to perform its governing responsibilities.

Chair Cochrane provided a brief overview of each of the budget descriptors.

Trustee Taylor returned to the meeting at 4:42 p.m.

Trustee Bazinet left the meeting at 4:43 p.m.

- The budget underspend has varied, in 2009-10 it was over \$300,000; this year the forecasted underspend is \$160,000. Any underspend falls through to the bottom line and is applied as part of the unrestricted net surplus.
- The largest variance has been the P&T General consulting line.
- If the budget for the Office of the Board of Trustees was reduced those funds would most likely be directed to help correct the structural deficit since schools have already been focussed on in the projected budget for 2012-13.

- As the Board has recently adapted new governance policies, and is contemplating a change to the way they do community engagement, no reductions to the budget were proposed this year.

Motion Arising

Moved by Trustee Taylor:

THAT the Board of Trustees refers the 2012-13 budget for the Office of the Board of Trustees to a Working Group of Trustees for further review, and for Board consideration at the May 15, 2012 public Board meeting.

Trustees entered into debate on the motion. Comments in support of the motion were:

- A Trustee shared the belief that the Office of the Board of Trustees has been too significantly under budget for too long a time. She felt it would be realistic, within the next two weeks, to look at the areas of the budget where the considerable underspend is occurring.

Trustee comments in opposition to the motion are summarized as follows:

- A Trustee suggested maintaining the budget as the Board has just adopted a different governance system. The Board is also looking at plans to engage with the community in more strategic dialogues, the costs of which are not currently known.
- The May 15th public meeting is the presentation of the overall budget, of which the budget of the Office of the Board of Trustees forms a part. Putting together a Working Group to do a review at this time is not feasible.
- A report will be presented later during this meeting that recommends undertaking a major review of the remuneration and benefits for Trustees, which has not occurred for five years. Professionals will need to be consulted and the cost may be considerable. There are also outstanding issues around technology for Trustees that need to be addressed, and there may be changes to the Ward boundaries for the next election.
- A concern was shared that a two week turnaround was not appropriate timing, and a Working Group of three Trustees may not be the appropriate group to do a review of the budget. A proper review would entail additional expertise, support and guidance, including from Administration, in terms of what has been done in the past and what will be required in the future.

Chair Cochrane called for the vote on motion.

The motion was
DEFEATED.

In Favour:	Trustee Taylor
Opposed:	Trustee Bowen-Eyre
	Trustee Cochrane
	Trustee Ferguson
	Trustee King
	Trustee Lane
Absent:	Trustee Bazinet

MOVED by Trustee Ferguson:

THAT the Board of Trustees approves Attachment I of the report, reflecting the Office of the Board of Trustees operating expense budget allocation for the 2012-13 year.

Chair Cochrane called for the vote on the main motion.

The motion was
CARRIED.

In Favour:	Trustee Bowen-Eyre Trustee Cochrane Trustee Ferguson Trustee King Trustee Lane
Opposed:	Trustee Taylor
Absent:	Trustee Bazinet

At this point in the meeting Agenda Item 3.1, Excellence in Teaching Awards occurred. The recognition and presentation is recorded earlier in the minutes to provide continuity with the Agenda.

Trustee Bazinet returned to the meeting at 5:04 p.m.

Recessed: 5:31 p.m.

Reconvened: 5:52 p.m.

7.2 Review of Governance Policy GP-12E: Trustee Remuneration

Trustee Lane began his presentation of the report by thanking the members of the Trustee Remuneration Committee. He then highlighted three main recommendations of the Committee, namely: an increase to the transportation allowance; a major review of Trustee remuneration next year as there is an election in October 2013 and the last major review was done in 2007; and addressing the issue of technology for Trustees.

Trustee posed questions, the responses are summarized as follows:

- One of the reasons the Committee believes it would be beneficial to engage a professional consultant for the review process is for credibility. It is a difficult position for a public organization to determine its own remuneration.

Chair Cochrane received the consent of the Board to continue to the end of the agenda.

- Having additional public members on the Committee has been discussed in the past as, at times, it has been difficult to convene meetings with all members present. The idea has also been discussed, though not with the Committee, of not having Trustees on the Remuneration Committee at all, though the Board would still approve the budget. A change in the terms of reference would also be required.
- The parameters of what would be expected from the consultant, as well as the budget, have not yet been set. It is reasonable to expect that once there is further

- investigation around the cost and scope of the consultant's engagement, that information can come back to the Board.
- The range of comparators has not been decided yet. It was acknowledged there might be other groups than just city council and the four metro school boards that may be good comparators.
 - Comparisons with other Boards is sometimes unfair, as many Boards receive one-third of their remuneration tax-free.

MOVED by Trustee Lane:

THAT the Board of Trustees consult with the Aspen Group regarding the most appropriate placement of Trustee Remuneration information in the governance framework.

Trustee Lane noted that Governance Policy GP-12E was left over from the previous policy model and had not been integrated into the Coherent Governance the Board has since adopted.

Chair Cochrane called for the vote on the motion.

The motion was
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOVED by Trustee Lane:

THAT the annual taxable transportation allowance for each Trustee be increased by \$500, to \$4,100, effective September 1, 2012.

Trustees agreed to friendly amendments to the motion, which are included in the motion set out above.

Trustee Lane provided rationale for the motion stating that the Remuneration Committee felt that the current transportation allowance was considerably below what is normal for non-profit organizations. The proposed increase is in the middle of what the current allowance is and what the average allowance is in the non-profit sector.

Chair Cochrane called for the vote on the motion.

The motion was
CARRIED.

In Favour:	Trustee Bazinet Trustee Bowen-Eyre Trustee Cochrane Trustee King Trustee Lane Trustee Taylor
Opposed:	Trustee Ferguson

MOVED by Trustee Lane:

THAT the issue of technology for Trustees be addressed by a Working Group of the Board of Trustees as it is not solely an allowance or compensation issue and has components of IT policy, ownership, security and working remotely that need to be addressed. The Working Group to report back to the Board of Trustees by September 15, 2012.

Trustees agreed to friendly amendments to the motion, which are included in the motion set out above.

Trustee comments in support of the motion included:

- There were too many factors entwined with the issue of technology for Trustees for the Remuneration Committee to make a decision on its own.
- This is not a compensation issue but a “how you do your job issue.” Office supplies needed to perform one’s job are not typically a compensation issue.
- This has been an ongoing conversation for many years. It would be good to have a decision made about this.

Chair Cochrane called for the vote on the motion.

The motion was
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOVED by Trustee Lane:

THAT the Remuneration Committee makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees by October 31, 2012 regarding an in-depth comparative review to be done in the 2012-13 year. Such review will include but not be limited to the four metro boards and the City of Calgary Councillor comparators.

Trustees agreed to friendly amendments to the motion, which are included in the motion set out above.

Chair Cochrane called for the vote on the motion.

The motion was
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

7.3 Trustee Motion – Report on Fees

MOVED by Trustee Taylor:

***Be it resolved* THAT the Board of Trustees directs Administration to prepare a report by May 31, 2012 that contains the following information with respect to Transportation fees for actual forecasted 2011-12 and proposed for 2012-13:**

- 1. Revenues and expenses for charter transportation broken down by each school and each program shown as a total dollar amount and an average dollar per student; and**
- 2. Revenues and expenses for special needs transportation as total dollar amount and as an average dollar per student.**

Trustees posed questions which were answered by Trustee Taylor and Administration, and are summarized as follows:

- Chief Superintendent Johnson advised that the proposed report would require an analysis of every program and every student's transportation routines (walking, riding a bus or handi-bus, taking a taxi) and any supports that are required (such as an attendant on the handi-bus). Currently the information requested is not collected in that particular way. New processes would have to be put in place to do that.
- In response to Trustee Taylor's comments clarifying that she was not looking for information on each individual student but the average cost of transportation based on the number of students in a program, Administration advised that the calculations requested are more complex than just catch/divide. If a student is on a bus to any Alternative Program but their designated school is within walking distance, that student is not funded. Funding is received based on eligible riders. Each individual student's transportation information would have to be reviewed to determine what the incremental cost is.
- Relative to Special Education Programs, taking the number of students and averaging the cost of their transportation would not be very meaningful because of the difference in how they travel and the varying costs for each student. Some are capable of riding a city bus, which does not cost the CBE anything, and others are on a handi-bus, sometimes with an attendant or a Licensed Practical Nurse (LPN), which can be very costly.
- Administration could inform about how many buses are required to get each student to any specific program. The number of buses could be divided by the number of students on the buses. That would provide the cost of transporting those students to school but not the incremental cost, what the CBE is getting funding for and who would not otherwise be on the bus.
- The decision to divide students into two groups and charge a different fee for programs based on choice was made based on parental feedback received from the recent significant public engagement. Parents wanted some concept of user pay. The CBE has gone from having the entire population of bussed students paying the costs of all bussing to now having students who have chosen Alternative Programs to share the cost of their bussing. Administration was able to divide the total cost of charter buses between the routes that go to Regular Programs and routes that go to Alternative Programs, and estimate the number of riders in total for those groups.
- If the Board wishes Administration to provide the information it can be done but not by May 31, 2012. Administration does not have the resources or processes in place to meet that timeline. In response to a question about what the cost of providing the information would be, Administration advised that at this time the cost cannot be provided. The implication of this is a nearly individual analysis of 104,000 students.

Trustees entered into debate on the motion. Comments in support of the motion included:

- A Trustee shared her belief that although parents can understand the fees principles that came out of the engagement process they are asking for more information. Acknowledging that this would require a lot of work, she stated that providing this information to the community should be a high priority, otherwise there will be constant questions and confidence in the system may be shaken.
- It was stated that if you have a user pay system you have to tell people what the cost of the service is.
- Though it is a busy time of year, this is an important issue that has arisen and efforts should be redirected to deal with it. A Trustee stated her opinion that this is not a communications issue but a transparency issue around what has been communicated to the public. Parents do not need this explained again they need more information than has been provided.

Trustee comments in opposition to the motion are summarized as follows:

- The Board of Trustees delegated the decision and process for setting fees to Administration. Administration undertook an engagement process and survey to gain public input about the principles which guide the new fee structure.
- The Board has already received two reports outlining the community engagement process and its findings, as well as another report identifying how the fee structure was set. Administration has committed to a comprehensive plan to communicate to the public how fees are set, which services are funded, and what the options for payment are. It is not clear why the Board would require this information in a formal Board report, and it is not prudent to utilize additional administrative time and resources to produce such a report.
- The CBE is in the midst of an ongoing, organized process to engage more fully with parents, and that process should be allowed to continue. There are at least seven information sessions scheduled for this month which parents can attend. Attendance at an information session would have a greater and more immediate benefit to parents than the proposed report.
- One Trustee shared that she has heard from parents that they do not want more resources expended on administration. The proposed report would mean hiring more staff, and utilizing more time and resources to provide a level of detail that may not lead to the conversations that need to occur about the values around the structure of fees. She agreed it would be more beneficial to engage in the scheduled information sessions.
- A Trustee shared that parents are looking for a simple answer to a complex issue with a lot of different dynamics. She would like to see a clearer process for explaining decisions to parents but that is not possible in the next 31 days. Pushing out the details about the upcoming information sessions to parents is important to help them understand the complexities of the decisions.
- A Trustee has heard from parents who are upset they have to pay more, but has also heard from parents who are upset because they believe they have been subsidizing other students for years. The issue is a communications issue. The Trustee

- supported clarity and more detailed information but does not support redirecting the system in such a large way at this time of year to a focus that the CBE is already in the process of improving.
- Transportation Services needs to be focused on planning routes and contracts for the next school year. A huge body of parents out there who are not currently affected by this will be affected if all time and attention is diverted to this proposal.
 - A Trustee stated she was not willing to support a motion where the human and financial costs were not known, especially for a school system already under strain financially.
 - A Trustee shared her belief that the Alberta Child Health Benefit threshold is extremely low and questioned whether there is anything stopping the CBE from setting its own threshold.

Chair Cochrane called for the vote on the motion.

The motion was
DEFEATED.

In Favour:	Trustee Taylor
Opposed:	Trustee Bazinet
	Trustee Bowen-Eyre
	Trustee Cochrane
	Trustee Ferguson
	Trustee King
	Trustee Lane

8| **BOARD CONSENT AGENDA**

Chair Cochrane declared the following items to be adopted as submitted.

8.1 **Correspondence**

THAT the Board of Trustees receives the following correspondence for information and for the record, in the form as submitted:

- Letter dated April 24, 2012 from Board Chair, Pat Cochrane, to the Honourable Alison Redford, Premier of Alberta, offering congratulations to her for her successful campaign and election.

9| **CHIEF SUPERINTENDENT CONSENT AGENDA**

9.1 **Chief Superintendent Update**

THAT THE Board of Trustees receives the report for information.

Recessed: 7:21 p.m.

Reconvened: 7:34 p.m.

10| **IN-CAMERA ISSUES**

In attendance for this portion of the Agenda were: all Trustees, Acting Superintendent K. Peterson, Acting General Counsel and Corporate Secretary L. Safran, and Ms. J. Barkway.

10.1 **Motion to Move In Camera**

MOVED by Trustee Lane:

Whereas the Board of Trustees is of the opinion that it is in the public interest that matters on the Private Agenda for the Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees, May 1, 2012 be considered at an in camera session; therefore be it

Resolved, THAT the Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees moves in camera.

The motion was
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

During the in-camera session Trustee Bazinet left the meeting at 8:19 p.m.

10.2 **Motion to Revert to Public Meeting**

MOVED by Trustee King:

THAT the Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees moves out of in camera.

The motion was
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Absent: Trustee Bazinet

MOTIONS TO ACTION IN CAMERA RECOMMENDATIONS

MOVED by Trustee Ferguson:

THAT the Board of Trustees refers the employment matter, as discussed in camera, and requests a report to the Board of Trustees for the May 22, 2012 Board Meeting.

The motion was
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Absent: Trustee Bazinet

11| **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Cochrane declared the meeting adjourned at 8:28 p.m.