



**Governance Committee Meeting of the Board of Education of  
School District No. 27 (Cariboo-Chilcotin)  
AGENDA**

Tuesday, February 13, 2018

3:30 pm

Committee Room

---

**1. Opening by Committee Chair**

**1.1 Call to Order**

**2. Agendas and Minutes**

**2.1 Adoption of Agenda**

**Recommended Motion**

**THAT the agenda of the Governance Committee of the Board of Education be adopted as presented.**

**2.2 Adoption of Minutes**

**Recommended Motion**

**THAT the minutes of the Governance Committee of the Board of Education, dated \_\_\_\_ be adopted as presented.**

### 3. Business of the Committee

#### 3.1 Business

##### 3.1.1 2018-2019 Preliminary Budget

The Secretary Treasurer will provide information regarding identified cost pressures associated with the 2018-2019 Preliminary Budget. The Governance Committee is asked to consider the following:

1. Are there any unidentified cost pressures that the Board should be made aware of?
2. To ensure that our learners are receiving a relevant and engaging learning experience, our schools and staff need to be supported with appropriate resources. What areas should be given priority and/or additional attention in the 2018-2019 budget?
3. Over the years, there are sometimes things that are done in a certain way because it's the way things have always been done. Improving efficiencies at a Board level is an on-going process. Identify any efficiencies that the Board should be considering for the 2018-2019 budget (please list them)
4. Lis any creative ways or opportunities that departments and schools could reduce their budgets.
5. If the Board had funds available for some one-time investments not entailing ongoing costs (eg. equipment, supplies, and renovations) what would be some priorities for these funds?

An on-line survey will be made available after the Principal/Vice-Principal meeting on 19 February for stakeholders and public to contribute to the conversation.

### 4. Adjournment

#### Recommended Motion

THAT the meeting be adjourned at \_\_pm.



**Governance Committee Meeting of the Board of Education  
School District No. 27 (Cariboo-Chilcotin)  
MINUTES**

**Tuesday, December 12, 2017  
Committee Room**

Committee Members Present    Tanya Guenther, Chair  
   Christine Dymont, Vice-Chair

   Yvonne Davis, CCPVPA Rep  
   Murray Helmer, CCTA Rep

Absent                                    Alice Tresierra, IUOE Rep  
   DPAC Rep  
   FNEC Rep  
   Student Reps

Staff Present                         Mark Wintjes, Superintendent of Schools  
   Kevin Futchter, Secretary Treasurer  
   Connee Newberry, Executive Assistant

**1. Opening by Committee Chair**

**1.1 Call to Order**

The Committee Chair called the meeting to order at 3:32 pm.

**2. Agendas and Minutes**

**2.1 Approval of Agenda**

**It was duly moved and seconded:**

THAT the agenda of the Governance Committee of the Board of Education be adopted as presented with the addition of item 3.1 Education CCTA Questions.

**CARRIED Unanimously**

**2.2 Adoption of Minutes**

**It was duly moved and seconded: TG**

THAT the minutes of the Governance Committee of the Board of Education, dated 13 June 2017 be adopted as presented.

**CARRIED Unanimously**

**3. Business of the Committee**

**3.1 Education - No Items**

Although the Governance Committee has no items under Item 3.1 Education on its agenda, the CCTA requests the following question be answered. District Staff has provided the response following:

**Q:** It has been six months since the last Governance Committee meeting, and the Superintendent's Education Liaison Committee has yet to meet this year, yet there are no agenda items for the Education portion

of the agenda. Given the non-compliance issues with class size, composition and non-enrolling language in the district, coupled with the TTOC shortage that see members covering for absent colleagues without compensation, and non-enrolling services cancelled while members in those positions are reassigned to cover, there seems to be many issues needing resolution. Where are these issues being addressed?

**Response:**

The Governance Committee is a committee that is directed by the Board and deals strictly with governance issues. This means that the Board drives the committee; the committee does not drive the Board.

The Superintendent's Education Liaison Committee is not under the direction of the Board. Therefore, items placed on the Education portion of the Governance Committee would be directed there at the will of the Board and the item would be of a governance nature. Collective Agreement interpretations would not be dealt with at the Governance Committee, but rather at the Consultative Liaison Committee. Operational issues are dealt with directly by District Staff.

The Governance Committee schedule was changed this year so that there are a fewer face-to-face meetings to make it less onerous for stakeholder groups to attend and provide their feedback on budget, policy, education and other Governance related issues. As such the Board looks to stakeholder groups to send a representative to the meetings in order to provide feedback.

The Board has scheduled only two face-to-face Governance Committee meetings with stakeholders this year. The Governance Committee is still, however, expected to participate via electronic means regarding feedback on Policy. These on-line meetings occurred in September and again in October. The last face-to-face meeting was in June.

**3.2 Business**

**3.2.1 2016-2017 Financial Statements Review**

The CCTA has posed the following questions; District Staff have provided the responses following:

**Q:** The Ministry made recommendations to the district as a result of last year's audit. Will these recommendations be provided to the committee to ensure our processes comply with their recommendations?

**Response:**

The Ministry of Finance's audit is available online under the BC Government's website. It was presented to the Board in its open meeting on 26 September 2017 and is available on the District's website within that agenda. If/When the Committee is requested to consider a topic that would require direction from the audit, it will be

brought to the attention of the Committee at that time. It is the ultimate responsibility of the Board, Superintendent and Secretary Treasurer to ensure that its processes do not violate legislation. At its meeting on 26 September 2017, the Board of Education directed District Staff to work towards the completion of the actionable items as listed in the report and report back to the Board of Education from time to time.

**Q:** Last June's computer purchase was made without the involvement of the District Technology Committee, whose mandate it is to review and recommend purchases, and was not budgeted for. Where did the funds come from for the purchase and what approval process was used? A grievance was filed in June and never responded to.

**Response:**

The District Principal (Information Technology) is responsible for the operations of the IT Department and has been delegated responsibility for reviewing, recommending and purchasing IT equipment. The District Principal may seek input from the District Technology Committee when purchasing replacement equipment; however this is not required.

Records show that the District Technology Committee has been in operation sporadically over the past 15 years and has not met this school year due to the lack of representatives from stakeholder groups. As such it would be impractical to have the District

Technology Committee reviewing and recommending purchases of replacement IT equipment.

This is further evidenced when in November 2017 two of the large servers in the District experienced acute problems and required replacement (as reported at the 28 November 2017 Open Board meeting) yet the District Technology Committee still is not up and running.

The funding for the purchase of student laptops came from within the 2016-2017 Amended Budget and was approved by the Board of Education (as reported at the 30 May 2017 Open Board meeting).

**Q:** In last year's Amended Budget, the Salaries and Benefits amount in the Instructional function was increased from \$36,166,980 to \$37,739,070, which is roughly the equivalent of 16 FTE positions, which at the time were not posted, nor was there any indication that our Teacher FTE had increased. The Audited Financial Statement indicated this additional funding was not

spent. Why was the district surplus allocated into additional staffing positions that were never created?

**Response:**

The dollar figures above, \$36,166,980 and \$37,739,070, are comprised of the total staffing charged to “Function 1 –Instruction”. This Function not only includes teachers but also Principals and Vice Principals, Educational Assistants, Support Staff and other professionals.

The actual teaching salaries budgeted in “Function 1 –Instruction” are as follows:

Preliminary 2016-2017 budget	\$20,420,520
Amended 2016-2017 budget	\$21,221,680

During the budget process, preliminary or amended, schools and departments work with the HR Department to determine their staffing levels. These FTE numbers are the basis upon which the budget is built. These FTE numbers are multiplied by the average salary costs to determine total salary costs.

The difference between the budgeted amounts listed above is less than 4% of the total salaries and primarily due to differences in average cost estimates and salary increases from budget to budget.

The Governance Committee is not the venue to discuss contractual obligations and specific postings and the CCTA is encouraged to bring this topic to its next Consultative Liaison Committee.

**3.2.2 2017-2018 Amended Annual Budget Update**

The Secretary Treasurer provided an over-view of the Amended Annual Budget process. CCPVPA Rep requested information regarding where funding came from to fund salary increases for Exempt Staff. BCPSEA has authorized salary increases. The Secretary Treasurer reinforced that schools and departments, working with the HR Manager, identify the number of personnel required to staff the District.

The CCTA has posed the following question; District Staff have provided the response following:

**Q:** Last June, the district’s submission for the Ministry’s Classroom Enhancement Fund was rejected, as the district claimed positions that were already in place and funded from the Operating Budget. At the time of our rejection, the Superintendent said we would be able to reapply this fall after our enrolment figures were

in. What is the status of this reapplication, and how much additional funding will the district receive from the CEF?

**Response:**

The Ministry of Education provided \$2,280,364 in “Notional CEF 2017/18 Compensation Funding” and \$292,970 in “Notional CEF 2017/18 Overhead Funding” to the District. The District then undertook a process to try and maximize the use of these funds. The Classroom Enhancement Fund (CEF) was then submitted to the Ministry of Education for approval. The initial CEF was targeted towards the non-enrolling ratios, as the difference between what was being provided in these areas compared to our reinstated language, exhausted the notional funding. The Ministry argued that because we were spending in special education categories above what the reinstated language stated, we would need to continue spending in these areas as they felt this was a budgetary concern, not a CEF concern. The Ministry responded that they needed to see how the District needed the funding, specifically looking at the differences between the reinstated language and the present language.

The District undertook a re-evaluation and provided the Ministry with its views the very next day. For example: A school that was currently configured with 1 division, as it had 22 students with kindergarten, would have to be configured with 2 divisions as the class size limit of classes enrolling kindergarten was now 20. This enabled the District to claim 1 division through the CEF. The District provided the Ministry with a new CEF submission based on the evaluation of each school as well as the comments received from the Ministry the previous day. The District also included an argument about the need for the District’s funding protection to be included in the calculations; this argument was not accepted by the Ministry as they felt it was a budgetary concern not a CEF concern.

The District received notification in June that \$1,955,488 had been approved with an additional \$184,750 in overhead. The District also received notification that remedy funding would be calculated after September 30, 2017. The District was also advised that final classroom organization would not be determined until September 30, leaving the District with concerns as to whether the proposed funding would be too high or too low.

The District undertook another evaluation of CEF funding in September and determined that the CEF funding proposal submitted was appropriate. Some of the District’s schools dropped out of the CEF while others were added. For example: The school mentioned above grew to 24 students, this meant that the existing

language would require two divisions while the reinstated language would also require two divisions, thus the school would not qualify for CEF funding, but would have to be found within the District’s operating budget.

The District submitted its CEF submission in October 2017 which included the following:

Position Type	#FTE	Total Salary	Total Benefits	Total Compensation
Enrolling	16.551	\$1,228,415	\$300,897	\$1,529,312
T/L	2.100	\$155,862	\$38,178	\$194,040
T/C	0	0	0	0
SPED	3.700	\$274,614	\$67,266	\$341,880
LAT	0.300	\$22,266	\$5,454	\$27,720
ELL	2.100	\$155,862	\$38,178	\$194,040
<b>Total</b>	<b>24.751</b>	<b>\$1,837,019</b>	<b>\$449,973</b>	<b>\$2,286,992</b>

We have not yet heard back from the Ministry of Education regarding our CEF October submission. It is important to note that we have been advised that unspent CEF monies will return to the Ministry of Education.

**Q:** The 2017-2018 preliminary budget allotted less funding to Career Programs, Library Services, Counseling, Special Education, ELL, and Aboriginal Education that was actually spent last year according to the District Audited Financial Statement. Given that our restored contract language was meant to improve non-enrolling services for our students, why was reduced funding budgeted, a fact that had led to non-compliance grievances in class size, class composition, and district non-enrolling ratios? We are exceeding ratios for elementary schools.

**Response:**  
 The 2017-2018 Preliminary Budget and the 2016-2017 Financial Statements do not specifically break-down the figures of non-enrolling teachers and the CEF as implied by the question above. Overall the Preliminary Budget reflects \$23,062,950 in teacher staffing, with the 2016-2017 Financial Statements reflecting \$21,517,793 – an increase of \$1.545,157.

**Q:** Was the district compensated for the use of the school facilities and buses during the summer wildfires, and were there salary savings from the evacuation of employees who normally work in the summer?

**Response:**

In cases of mass emergency evacuations, compensation for the use of School District facilities and buses is charged to appropriate organizations on a cost-use basis. The District did not benefit from the tragedy of the summer's wildfires. Salary savings for any scheduled employees working over the summer, if any, would be minimal, as most staff were able to use vacation and/or banked time.

**Q:** Has the district considered shared service arrangements for things like payroll and accounting as a cost-saver, as well as other 'economy of scale' arrangements for purchasing, etc.?

**Response:**

The District does use shared service agreements. The Board's purchasing policy was changed recently to reflect this (28 November 2017 Open Board Meeting for final adoption) and reported in item 3.3.1 of this agenda. The purchase of MDF equipment was one of our most recent purchases using this strategy (30 May 2017 open meeting of the Board).

The District has considered, and continues to consider, many shared service agreements.

**Q:** Effective Jan. 1, 2018, current rates for Medical Services Plan (MSP) Premiums will be reduced by 50 per cent. What are the expected savings to the district for the remainder of this fiscal year as a result of this change?

**Response:**

Preliminary research indicates that the MSP savings, effective 01 January 2018, will be offset by the increase in premiums for Teachers Pension Plan and the Canada Pension Plan. Teacher pension costs will be a flat percentage of 13.23% (instead of 12.81% on the earnings before the CPP maximum is reached) and all staff not reaching maximum CPP will result in an increase to pension costs. In addition the CPP maximum for all staff is also increasing in January 2018 with results in an increase of costs to the District.

**Q:** What was the cost to the district of the trip to China over Fall Break, what revenue do you anticipate the exchange will generate, and given the overcrowding in many of our schools, where will these students attend?

**Response:**

Final costs have not been tallied, as credit card information is still being processed in Accounting. I anticipate the cost to be approximately \$8,000.00. It is anticipated that this expense will be recovered by a project that is in the works, but until details are more solidified, not being released – yet.

**3.2.3 2018-2019 Preliminary Budget**

**3.2.3.1 Budget Timeline**

The Secretary Treasurer presented the draft timeline of the 2018-2019 Annual Budget Process Timeline. Discussion around how the principals and vice-principals can discuss the budget in February. (different venue / face-to-face)

**3.2.3.2 Cost Pressures**

The Secretary Treasurer provided information regarding anticipating cost pressures for 2018-2019.

The CCTA has posed the following question; District Staff have provided the response following:

**Q:** In our Step 3 grievance meeting last week over class composition, [District Staff] said that if Category H students were included in the composition compliance numbers, we would not have sufficient space in our schools to house them. Is the district giving consideration to reopening closed schools next year to address these capacity issues?

**Response:**

Grievances are considered confidential; therefore, this Committee will not make comment regarding the specifics of any grievance.

However, the Board does consider all aspects when considering its budget, including school capacity. It is guided by the School Act and collective agreements in regards to opening and closing schools. These initial discussions occur with the Board in closed sessions and may not be shared in this public Governance Committee meeting.

**Q:** It was the goal of the Board that last spring's Superintendent Search would result in a Vision for the district, and this Vision would drive all budget decisions. What is the Vision that will drive the development of the 2018-2019 Preliminary Budget?

**Response:**

In June 2016, the Board of Education approved its Strategic Plan. In September 2016, the Board began its process for hiring a new Superintendent. Part of the Ideal Candidate Criteria identified vision in Leadership Skills and that the vision will be developed through the Strategic Plan. At the end of May 2017, the Board hired its superintendent. Currently, District

Staff, under the Superintendent’s direction, are working on the Framework for Enhancing Student Learning. Together, with the Board, the Framework will identify specific goals to be focused on for the Strategic Plan.

The Board is in the initial stages of using the Framework and other criteria as necessary to setting its vision for the 2018-2019 Preliminary Budget.

**3.2.3.3 Budget Review of Trustee Expenditures**

The Secretary Treasurer provided information regarding upcoming 2018-2019. Increases to elections, technology and remuneration may be increased.

The Committee did not provide any further input for the Board.

**3.3 Policy**

**3.3.1 Update**

It was noted that stakeholders did not provide any on-line feedback regarding proposed policy revisions. At the 28 November 2017 meeting of the Board, the Board adopted the following policies:

- 1. 1315 Naming Facilities
- 2. 1161 Trustee Remuneration
- 3. 1120.5 Committees of the Board
- 4. 1150 Appeal Procedures
- 5. 1210 Parents' Advisory Councils
- 6. 1324 Access to Schools: Commercial or Other Agencies
- 7. 3310 Purchasing
- 8. 4115 Board Initiated Transfers
- 9. 5145 Protection of Students and Maintenance of Order

The Board also confirmed the following policies:

- 1. 1710 Small Rural Schools
- 2. 4115.01 Moving Relocation Expenses for Principals/Vice-Principals
- 3. 6141.4 French Immersion

The CCTA has posed the following questions; District Staff have provided the responses following:

**Q:** With no responses from stakeholders through an online response process, is the Board considering other ways to solicit input?

**Response:**

It was work of this Governance Committee that agreed to work through an on-line response process to provide feedback regarding

Board policy recommendations. It is the expectation of the Committee that all members participate in the on-line process.

**Q:** The dual CEO model for the position of Superintendent has been in effect for over a year in the district, but Board Policy 2100 still reflects the sole CEO expectation for the district. Is it the intention of the district going forward to update the policy to reflect current practice, or to abide by the policy as it is currently written?

**Response:**

Only the Board of Education has the authority to override its policies. At its meeting on 14 September 2016, the Board of Education passed a motion that, in recognizing the dual leadership model, that any policy that contravened the model, the Board's motion of implementing the dual model would supersede. Meaning, that where it says Superintendent, it is to be read Superintendent or Secretary Treasurer as appropriate. As policies come through for their cyclic review, they will be updated accordingly.

The Board's role is to ensure that policy is in place. The Board looks for feedback from all stakeholders.

**3.4 Other**

**3.4.1 Trustee Elections**

At its meeting on 2017.11.28, the Board of Education held its annual election of officers:

- Board Chair: Tanya Guenther (re-elected)
- Board Vice-Chair: Christine Dymont (re-elected)
- BCSTA Provincial Council Representative: Linda Martens (re-elected)
- BCSTA Prov Council Rep (Alternate): Sheila Boehm (re-elected)
- BCPSEA Representative: Christine Dymont (re-elected)
- BCPSEA Rep (Alternate): Brice O'Neill

Committee Appointments will be made as early as the 19 December 2017 meeting of the Board.

The CCTA has posed the following questions; District Staff have provided the responses following:

**Q:** The roles assigned to Board Trustees indicate that no responsibilities were assumed by the new Trustees serving since the by-elections, while other Trustees hold more than one representational responsibility. Is there a reason they were overlooked for these roles, as it would seem beneficial for them to 'get their feet wet' in their new positions?

**Response:**

The first clarification required is that Officers of the Board, as per the Board's Procedural Bylaw B2702, are elected through a

nomination and secret ballot voting process. One cannot control the democratic process on who gets elected or nominated. The Election of Officers of the Board occurs at the November meeting, with office to take effect on December 1.

As noted on the agenda, and again in accordance with the Bylaw, Committee Appointments will be made at the 19 December 2017 meeting of the Board.

**6. Adjournment**

**It was duly moved and seconded:**

THAT the meeting be adjourned at 5:55 pm.

**CARRIED Unanimously**