

February 10, 2014 Education Centre, Board Room

MINUTES

Present: J. Angus, Committee Chair, R. Collver, D. Dean, E. Dixon, B. Doyle, A. Everets, C. Lefebvre, M. Macdonald, C. A. Sloat, T. Waldschmidt, D. Werden, K. Amy (Student Trustee),

Administration: Director — J. Forbeck; Superintendents – D. Abbey, W. Baker, J. Gunn, M. McDonald, A. Nesbitt; Recording Secretary — D. Fletcher

Regrets:

Trustees: K. Manning (Student Trustee) Administration: B. Blancher, S. Sincerbox

A - 1 Opening

(a) Roll Call

The meeting was called to order by Committee Chair, J. Angus at 6:30 p.m. for the purposes of conducting the In Camera Session.

(b) Declaration of Conflict of Interest

J. Angus, D. Dean and M. Macdonald declared a conflict of interest regarding In Camera Legal matters.

(c) In Camera Session

Moved by: C.A. Sloat

Seconded by: T. Waldschmidt

THAT the Board move into In Camera Session to discuss Legal Matters at 6:30 p.m.

Carried

(d) Welcome to Open Session

The Public Session meeting was called to order by Committee Chair, J. Angus, at 7:20 p.m.



February 10, 2014 Education Centre, Board Room

(e) Agenda Additions/Deletions/Approval

Moved by: C.A. Sloat Seconded by: D. Werden

THAT the agenda be approved as printed.

Carried

(f) In Camera Report

Moved by: D. Werden Seconded by: T. Waldschmidt THAT Item B-1-b be approved.

Carried

B-1 Business Arising from Minutes and/or Previous Meetings

(a) Kiwanis Field of Dreams – Design Phase (from May 13, 2013)

J. Gunn reviewed background and recent developments.

The next step is to proceed to design work with a full cost analysis to determine the scope of project and budget. The City of Brantford has committed to fund one half of the estimate of \$200,000. The risk could be to go ahead with design and learn that it is not feasible.

In response to R. Collver, RFP responses will be received prior to engaging in an architect.

Discussion has been initiated with the Brantford City staff on joint use agreements and others.

In response to C.A. Sloat, D. Dean explained that the next step is the design project phase to determine the priorities of where the money will be spent.

A. Everets voiced a concern about a legal agreement if this initiative falls through. J. Gunn indicated that an agreement would be in place prior to signing an RFP with the designer and that the city has agreed to pay half of those fees.

HALL DISTRICT SCHOOL PER

Committee of the Whole Board No.2

February 10, 2014 Education Centre, Board Room

In response to R. Collver, J. Gunn stated discussed how we have only engaged in conversations with the City of Brantford to discover what the scope of the project is. Kiwanis is considered an external donor rather than a direct user.

Moved by: C. A. Sloat Seconded by: B. Doyle

THAT the Grand Erie District School Board approve the preparation and release of an RFP for Detailed Project Design and Cost Analysis services for the Kiwanis Field of Dreams project.

Carried

C – 1 Director's Report

The Director highlighted:

- Valentine's Day Auction to be held Feb 12, 2014 at the Education Centre with proceeds to the Stedman Hospice
- Grade 10 parent night to be held at North Park CVS
- GELA Personal Support Worker graduation to be held on Feb 13, 2014 at 12:00 p.m.
- Olympic fun events are happening throughout the board
- Adult Day School begins GELA in Simcoe this week

Moved by: B. Doyle Seconded by: C.A. Sloat

THAT the Grand Erie District School Board receive the Director's Report of February 10, 2014 as information.

Carried

D – 1 New Business – Action/Decision Items

(a) Grand Erie Learning Alternatives (GELA) Review Report

A. Nesbitt invited Lindsay Williams, Principal at GELA to co-present.

He Introduced members of the steering and/or sub committees: Cheryl Stewart, Sandy Doyle, Paul Kostelny, Ed Dipelino, Jason Hall, Shannon Jennings, Jane Angus, Dave Dean, and Carol Ann Sloat.



February 10, 2014 Education Centre, Board Room

The report included purpose of Alternative Education, rationale for GELA review, history of GELA, GELA review sub-committee process and template.

A. Nesbitt reviewed the background of the report and how back in 2012, the Student Success Team committed to reviewing the programs and organization of GELA in the Board Improvement Plan for Student Achievement. GELA supports the Board improvement Plan in many ways include helping students achieve credits.

He addressed that the appendixes noted in the report were not included but are available to trustees if interested. It was noted the appendixes were worksheets that the chair of each sub-committee used as speaking notes when sharing information with the steering committee. They were not "polished" and they would have made the report around 40 pages in length.

The four short term planning recommendations (with possible budget implications) were reviewed.

- J. Angus, as member of committee was impressed that such a huge review would be summarized and narrowed down to a short list of recommendations.
- D. Werden agreed that recommended method changes are a good concept, if the recommendation is revenue neutral.
- C. A. Sloat would like to see data on credit accumulation and agreed that it is important to look at the possibility of a vice-principal for GELA.
- A. Nesbit clarified that for recommendation #4, one person would be key point of contact for two departments (Communications and Finance) to provide faster service. The goal is to re-organize and restructure to find efficiencies that would serve students better.

In response to R. Collver and if the recommendations would be brought to budget and implemented for the fall of 2014, A. Nesbitt explained some would be a complicated exercise to untangle some of the existing structures. Secondary staffing will begin shortly, so it won't be likely they would be able to review the staffing model prior to this year's staffing process.

The additional recommendations for short-term planning and future planning were reviewed.



February 10, 2014 Education Centre, Board Room

In response to C.A. Sloat and future planning recommendation #1, A. Nesbitt indicated that this would be considered eventually, there are also other recommendations to consider.

In response to D. Dean, A. Nesbitt explained that future planning recommendation #1 would explore the concept of organizing areas of expertise within the Board. He referred to the example of SAL that is run by each school. The goal will be to see if students are better served by connecting the SAL program to GELA.

In response to D. Werden, and recommendation #6, A. Nesbitt commented that the GELA review committee recommended the exploration of rebranding existing programs as a way of best suiting the students.

J. Angus referred to the continuing education in alternative type programs could include SAL, safe schools, and home instructions.

Moved by: C.A. Sloat

Seconded by: T. Waldschmidt

THAT the Grand Erie District School Board receive the "Grand Erie Learning Alternatives Review Report", as information with a progress report to be provided by the Committee of the Whole No. 2 Meeting in May 2014.

Carried

In response to R. Collver and if the Committee will continue or disband, A. Nesbitt explained that their work is complete, and senior administration will determine next steps.

J. Gunn suggested the Board could provide direction on short term priorities during the pre-budget meeting.

D-2 New Business – Information Items

(a) Draft Proposed School Year Calendar 2014-2015

W. Baker reviewed background, background information and communication. He reviewed the calendar specifications for elementary, secondary, GELA, and Sprucedale.

The premise is to operate and align the proposed calendars with the coterminous boards due to cost of transportation.



February 10, 2014 Education Centre, Board Room

W. Baker noted a spelling correction for K. Amy's name.

D. Dean voiced a concern of five exam days to write four exams for secondary schools. W. Baker responded that the Ministry of Education allows boards to use 10 days for exams in one year, and how this is convenient if weather conditions affect exam days.

It was requested that the calendars be reader friendly for parents to understand and easily identify school holidays, exam days, professional activity days, and Board designated holidays.

In response to C.A. Sloat and why a PD is scheduled on the last day of school in June, W. Baker explained that the time on this day is spent completing OSRs, conducting interviews with parents and/or students, staff meetings, and outlining co-curricular and extracurricular activities, for the upcoming year.

Moved by: B. Doyle Seconded by: E. Dixon

THAT the Grand Erie District School Board approve the draft proposed School Year Calendars for 2014-2015 for submission to the Ministry of Education.

Carried

(b) Employee Assistance Program Annual Report (HR112)

M. McDonald reviewed rationale/background, additional information, cost of the Employee Assistance Program, utilization of program and statistical summary

He pointed out that more employees are accessing this program, but with fewer visits.

In response to T. Waldschmidt, M. McDonald explained that the Board pays only 75% of the cost because when first discussed as budget item a few years ago, we needed to ensure that it falls within the budget. It was also determined that experienced boards that pay 100% find that when there is no buy in from the employee, the program is not utilized effectively.

Moved by: R. Collver Seconded by: C.A. Sloat

THAT the Grand Erie District School Board receive the Employee Assistance Program Report, 2012-2013 as information.

Carried



February 10, 2014 Education Centre, Board Room

(c) Public Meeting Schedule for Special Education Annual Review

- J. Forbeck reviewed the report that lists three Special Education meetings held each year to the public.
- B. Doyle noted a correction to Wednesday April 30, 2014. The address should read as Cayuga.
- C.A. Sloat noted the SEAC committee is trying to increase parent participation.

Moved by: C.A. Sloat Seconded by: D. Dean

THAT the Grand Erie District School Board receive the report "Public Meeting Schedule for Special Education Annual Review" as information.

Carried

(d) Educational Technology Evaluation Plan

D. Abbey invited Sally Landon and Lynda Kilpatrick to present.

He reviewed background, additional information, budget implications and communication plan. The cost of the Technology Uses and Perceptions Survey and Technology Integration Matrix Observation tool used in this study were paid out of Educational Technology funds through the CODE Project: 21st Century Pilots for System Learning that Grand Erie participated in last year.

The proposed evaluation will focus on these two questions:

- 1) How do teachers use technology to enrich learning?
- 2) How is technology making a difference in students' daily learning?
- S. Landon highlighted Appendix A Educational Technology Initiative Logic Model and Appendix B Grand Erie Technology Initiative Evaluation Framework.

In response to D. Werden, S. Landon addressed that collecting quantitative data from teachers will be completed through the TUP Survey.



February 10, 2014 Education Centre, Board Room

In response to C.A. Sloat, S. Landon explained how it will be determined if technology is making a difference in students' daily learning. The scope of this program evaluation is

based on resources available and focuses on changed teacher practice and student learning experiences. The student voice data will be used from the session held May 2013.

Questions posed at the forum to provide a snapshot of how student's lives are changing through technology included:

- How is learning different after Ed Tech?
- What was learning like before Ed Tech?
- What will learning be like in the future?
- D. Dean inquired about addressing and evaluating the issues and frustration of reliability of service. S. Landon indicated that the purpose of the formative part of the evaluation is to review the quality of Initiative implementation and identify areas of focus moving forward.
- J. Forbeck emphasized that evidence-based decision making is grounded in using data that is compiled and analyzed.
- T. Waldschmidt added that technology in school is what we need.

In response to R. Collver, L. Kilpatrick confirmed that most of the student data was extracted from student forum questions. We hope to gather more comparative data next year.

In response to R. Collver, S. Landon explained that under qualitative data collection, the sample of 10 teachers for semi-structured, in-depth interviews is to include teachers from phases 1 to 3 who can provide rich accounts of their experiences detailing both barriers and enablers to embedding technology into daily teaching and learning.

In response to K. Amy, S. Landon explained that the sample of teachers selected for interviews will include representation from both rural and urban school settings in order to ensure the identification of barriers and enablers specific to those locations.

K. Amy added that technology in the classroom is effective, when it works.

In response to C.A. Sloat, D. Abbey explained that connectivity varies for each school and is tracked by the IT department.



February 10, 2014 Education Centre, Board Room

Moved by: R. Collver Seconded by: D. Dean

THAT the Grand Erie District School Board receive the Educational Technology Initiative

Evaluation as information.

Carried

E-1 Other Business

(a) **OPSBA Report**

Nil.

F – 1 Correspondence

Nil.

G-1 Adjournment

Moved by: C. A. Sloat Seconded by: A. Everets

THAT the meeting be adjourned at 9:21 p.m.

Carried

Committee of the Whole Board No. 2 Chair, Jane Angus