

HALTON CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

Minutes of the Policy Committee Meeting

Date: Tuesday, September 21, 2010
Time: 5:30 p.m.
Location: Trustee's Meeting Room, 802 Drury Lane, Burlington
Chair: A. A. LeMay
In Attendance - Trustees: A. Danko, P. Houlahan, A. Iantomasi, A. A. LeMay, J. Matters, B. van de Vrande, E. Viana
Regrets: S. Koso, R. Palmieri
In Attendance – Staff M. W. Pautler, J. Langill, T. Pinelli
Recording Secretary: T. Stocco

	Agenda Items	Summary	Action	Follow-up/Resp.
1.	Opening Prayer/Welcome	The meeting began at 6:00 p.m. with a prayer led by A. A. LeMay.		
2.	Approval of Minutes	The minutes of the September 7 th meeting were reviewed and approved.		
3.	Review of Policies –	<p>a) II-45 Equity and Inclusive Education</p> <p>J. Langill thanked everyone for attending the additional policy committee meeting this month. The meeting was required due to the impending date set by the Ministry of October 1st for the implementation of the Equity and Inclusive Education policy as well as to address trustee inquiries from the September 7th meeting.</p> <p>J. Langill submitted an information report with accompanying legal opinion from Keel Cottrelle and the letter to Bishop Bergie from the Chair of the Board. To date, there has not been a response from the Bishop's office. J. Langill and T. Pinelli had attended a meeting and were advised that individual letters would be sent to the Boards and a collective letter from the Bishops would be distributed in regards to their position on the issue.</p> <p>J. Langill informed the committee that, in response to the trustees' request for further information, the Director, through OCSOA, surveyed other Catholic boards to</p>		

Agenda Items	Summary	Action	Follow-up/Resp.
	<p>determine the status of their respective Equity and Inclusive Education policies.</p> <p>A. A. LeMay shared information from the day's OSCTA meeting that the majority of boards have either passed their policies, some are in the interim, but most boards are in compliance with the Ministry directive.</p> <p>A discussion was held as to whether the policy could be brought forth for final reading at the October 5th Board meeting or should the committee wait for a response from the Bishop. M. Pautler shared that a tentative date for the response from the Bishop was October 4th. Consensus from the members of the committee was to wait for the response from the Bishop and bring the policy forward on October 19th. J. Langill indicated that, under the circumstances, that timeline could be acceptable to the Ministry.</p> <p>M. Pautler informed the committee that the Ministry is monitoring the policies.</p> <p>P. Houlahan led a discussion on the purpose of the committee, which is to vet policies prior to approving them at Board meetings. It was felt that the committee has not fully explored the language in this policy and that there are fundamental denominational challenges to the wording of the policy. Should the policy be totally rewritten, thereby not meeting the Ministry compliance date, and send a letter of explanation to the Ministry or adopt the policy as written. The feeling is that the Board is already inclusive. A discussion ensued regarding the language in the policy.</p> <p>J. Langill expressed confidence in the policy, as do the Bishops and ICE. Sister Joan Cronin, on behalf of the Catholic partners, was part of the implementation of the language of the policy template.</p> <p>Further discussion was held regarding the fact that the Bishops have not addressed the issues that are of concern to the committee.</p> <p>Concerns were raised regarding outside/inside influences. It was reinforced that our denominational rights are</p>		

Agenda Items	Summary	Action	Follow-up/Resp.
	<p>recognized and boards are not required to go against their rights, which are protected under the law.</p> <p>Clarification was requested as to how the policy will be enforced. M. Pautler indicated that the day-to-day responsibility rests with the Director with assistance from Senior Staff then down to administrators. The Director is accountable for the enforceability of policy.</p> <p>The Director and Senior Staff will undertake the consistency and compliance of the policy through extensive training of staff.</p> <p>The Chair quoted the Purpose section of the Policy and asked if the Purpose did not address the direction of the policy. There was further discussion on accountability and language, and could there be BNA challenges in the future.</p> <p>Trustee Danko asked what process will be in place when complaints regarding individual rights not being complied with will be handled. Will a committee, similar to the Student Discipline Committee, be struck in order to adjudicate complaints on a case by case basis and be able to make decisions on outcomes and resolutions.</p> <p>The Chair said that language to that effect could be added to the policy.</p> <p>Trustee Houlahan led a discussion around the Ministry deadline for implementation of the policy. As mentioned in an earlier discussion, the Board is not taking this stand solely to delay approval of the policy, but the words in the policy must reflect the words of the Trustees.</p> <p>M. Pautler responded that he is not unduly concerned regarding not hitting the timeline from the Ministry, however, he shared his concern if, at some point, the Board began to articulate a position that the policy would not be approved. The Ministry has the legal entitlement to set policy and that is embedded in the Education Act. As a publicly funded board, we have an obligation to conduct our operations to be compliant with the direction of the Ministry. If trustees go outside of the legal obligation as a</p>		

Agenda Items	Summary	Action	Follow-up/Resp.
	<p>Board, the Director has an obligation to respond in the way that the Education Act defines. M. Pautler reiterated that as the Director, he can only advise the trustees, but when a decision is made contrary to the Education Act and Regulations, he must report said action to the Ministry of Education.</p> <p>M. Pautler led a discussion around the concern of giving away or weakening our denominational rights. The response from various legal firms representing the Catholic partners indicates that our rights are protected. The Bishops were actively involved in the discussion with the Ministry of Education and have given an umbrella approval in principle with the policy template and support the policy. As previously noted, the Board has written to Bishop Bergie and await his response.</p> <p>A. Iantomasi felt that due diligence has been done regarding the policy, and that it is difficult to close all loopholes in the language. Pending receipt of the letter from the Bishop, she would support approving the policy.</p> <p>B. Van de Vrande stated that that majority of the policy is acceptable; however, some sections need to be amended in order for approval by all trustees. <i>B. Van de Vrande referenced the legal opinion which was included in the information report but feels that the letter is not balanced as it does not reference denominational rights.</i></p> <p>J. Matters stated that if some aspects of the policy are not congruent with our faith and moral teachings, she cannot support approval of the policy and feels that adjustments need to be made.</p> <p>A. Danko questioned the decision by the Ministry to bring this document forth as a PPM as opposed to a Regulation. A discussion ensued.</p> <p>The suggestion was made by various trustees to review policies from other Catholic Boards. A. A. LeMay had copies of various policies and these will be submitted via email to Trustees.</p>	<p>Copies of various Board policies, as well as a Word version of HCDSB policy, will be sent to trustees for their review and input.</p>	<p>J. Langill/ T. Stocco</p>

Agenda Items	Summary	Action	Follow-up/Resp.
	<p>Trustee Van de Vrande requested that staff rework the existing policy for further trustee consideration.</p> <p>The Chair suggested that since trustees have various language that they wish to have change/edit/embed in the policy, trustees should send their comments directly to J. Langill by October 1st. A Word version of the policy will be sent to trustees for editing.</p> <p>J. Langill informed the trustees that the religious accommodation and sexual orientation language is very prescriptive, but it is not written directly in the policy, only in the administrative procedure. B. Van de Vrande suggested that language be added in the policy to School Community Relationships Action Item 3.2 to reflect a Catholic statement.</p>	<p>Trustees will submit to J. Langill their input and language by October 1st.</p>	<p>J. Langill</p>
	<p>3 b) I-35 Trustee Honoraria</p> <p>J. Langill presented the policy as written and referenced the Regulation. The implementation date for the policy is October 15th. J. Langill quoted from the August 10, 2010 letter from OCSTA, which stated “.....boards are no longer required to form and consult a citizens’ advisory committee regarding the honorarium policy.”</p> <p>A discussion was held regarding the fact this is policy is driven by regulation and therefore non-negotiable. Regulation states that a policy must be approved.</p> <p>An amendment to the wording in Base Amount points 1 & 2 was suggested to be consistent in both points (change from “adding” to “addition”).</p> <p>A discussion was held regarding the base amount and how the funding model is set.</p> <p>The Chair asked for a consensus to add the policy to this evening’s Board meeting for 1st Reading approval. All agreed.</p>	<p>Change wording in Base Amount sentences 1) and 2) to be consistent.</p>	<p>J. Langill/T. Stocco</p>

	Agenda Items	Summary	Action	Follow-up/Resp.
4.	Update on Policies and Procedures, Review and Implementation	<p>J. Langill reviewed the policies that were implemented and/or revised during the 2009 – 2010 school year and what the Policy Committee will be reviewing this year.</p> <p>An addition to the list is Full Day Kindergarten Extended Day Program Policy and Procedure.</p> <p>Summary: I -Governance Policy will be brought forward for approval at September 21st Board Meeting.</p> <p>I-35 Trustee Honoraria Policy will be brought forward for 2nd and 3rd Readings on October 5th. Consensus was to send the policy to stakeholders for their information only.</p>	Forward Trustee Honoraria to stakeholders for their information.	J. Langill/T. Stocco
5.	Policy Committee Future Dates/Times	It was agreed that future meetings would begin at 5:30 p.m. with a light dinner and meeting to follow at 6:00 p.m.		
6.	Future Items/Policies	None were brought forward.		
7.	Adjournment	The meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.		
8.	Next Meeting	Tuesday, October 5, 2010		