

# Parent Involvement Committee

## June 4, 2008 @ J.D. Hogarth Public School (7:00-9:00 pm)

Present: Mark Bailey, Ann Charles, Kay Elford, Neta Gear, John Gray, Erin Kelly, Linda McDougall, Martha Rogers, Anna Spiteri, Janet Hofstra

Regrets: Bob Borden, Joyce Kirkup, Cheryl Hincks, Elaine Capes, Eric Lunn, Jerry Diamond

Item	Information	Action/Timing
Review/accept Minutes + approve Agenda	Janet Hofstra welcomed all. April's minutes were accepted and June's agenda was approved	
Post-Betty Boulton Presentation Review	<p>Kay Elford read several emails from attendees. Consistent positive feedback was noted. Additional highlights include, the attendance being 90 persons, 40 different schools represented in attendance, several new schools the PIC has not had a history of dialogue participated, the event was attended by 50% parents and 50% administrators, excellent support from our Board's staff, information booths enhanced the feeling of partnership, approximate overall cost \$6500, healthy amount of sharing at tables, speaker wisely researched Ontario stats for presentation.</p> <p><b>Recommendations for next time:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Check acoustics and sound quality</li> <li>• Set-up a registration table to collect exact information such as who is in attendance and from which schools.</li> <li>• Ensure presentation content/length matches time granted</li> <li>• Maintain Information Booths Idea</li> <li>• Ask speaker for guest speaker recommendations</li> <li>• Consider Betty Boulton for a full day workshop (Betty is currently scheduled to be back in Ontario on Nov.4 in Grand Erie)</li> </ul>	
New Members	Our parent liaison, Kay Elford reported that a New Members 'Letter of	New Members' Sub-

Update	<p>Interest' had been posted on First Class, UGDSB website/PIC link, principals, Dufferin Family of Schools communication, and advertised at our Betty Boulton presentation.</p> <p>The contact is <a href="mailto:kay.elford@ugdsb.on.ca">kay.elford@ugdsb.on.ca</a> or Fax 519-823-2471 or Westwood Public School attention Kay Elford and the PIC application deadline of June 9 was noted.</p> <p>The need for Dufferin Area representation was recognized.</p> <p>In addition, the 'tap on the shoulder' method was talked about but not utilized because of its exclusive nature. Although this method may be employed if representational gaps become evident and/or interest in membership falls short of the desired committee structure.</p>	<p>Committee to meet and review applications.</p> <p>All applicants will be contacted in a timely manner not exceeding two weeks from application deadline.</p> <p>Sub-Committee: Cheryl Hincks, Neta Gear, John Gray, &amp; Joyce Kirkup</p>
PIC Terms of Reference Review	<p>Martha Rogers began by reading through the Committee Structure and Number of Members in the Terms of Reference page 5. Input was sought regarding the current document &amp; committee structure. John Gray initiated discussions by recommending the addition of a former parent and/or community members for consideration. The Ministry mandate was highlighted in which it clearly, states that parents must be in a majority on PICs and as such, talks about the committee's size arose. Conversation touched on PIC members building awareness at meet-the-teacher nights in September to an overall comfort level with the concept of PICs to resurrecting the geographical families of schools and a resistance to another night of meetings. Before moving onto the Representativeness Section, members acknowledged that the size of the committee appeared intimidating and because of this the PIC may be perceived as ineffective in accomplishing projects. Advertising that the committee has a budget may ensure others understand that the PIC is goal oriented and forward thinking.</p> <p>Page 5 Representativeness section was approved.</p> <p>Minor edits to Term of Office section were accepted. It will read, "Parent members will normally serve for two years. Terms will be staggered."</p> <p>Martha moved onto page 6 Responsibilities. Both Members and</p>	<p>Linda McDougall and Erin Kelly to develop an assessment survey of the parent liaison position to determine whether or not it is a valued service.</p>

	<p>Chairperson were given the nod of approval though the Secretary position posed a problem. A concern about an individual having time to fulfill this duty was raised and hence the suggestion that the PIC meeting minutes become part of the parent liaison's responsibilities was proposed. The idea of having a rotating secretary was suggested as a possible solution as well and despite administration sharing from personal experience that it wasn't an onerous task, several parents continued to express their disapproval of the rotating secretary idea.</p> <p>The item of the Parent Liaison position began with Martha Rogers circulating two emails IPIC chairperson, Janet Hofstra wrote dated Feb.15, 2007 and Feb. 20, 2007. These emails provided the committee with the background history necessary in understanding the conception and intention of the parent liaison position. The emails show "that we'd pilot the project and assess how it goes – see if there's a need and whether it's a valued service." Considerations for establishing an assessment process of the parent liaison position was deemed necessary. The development of a survey to measure whether or not the parent liaison objectives are valued and the parent liaison service is valued was approved. Both Linda and Erin offered to design the formalized assessment and send it out to all committee members.</p> <p>During discussions many questions came up like: whether the parent liaison should be a parent, or whether the position would have to follow unionized hiring practices, or whether experience on the PIC was necessary?</p>	
<p>Orientation Package for New Members</p>	<p>Anna Spiteri went through the package she put together for new members. Most sections were taken from our Terms of Reference or from school council's code of conduct.</p>	
<p>Environmental Issue: Water Bottles</p>	<p>Trustee, Mark Bailey circulated a hand-out entitled "Is Bottled Water Appropriate for Sale in our Schools?" Interesting facts such as municipal water testing is more stringent than bottled water quality testing: it</p>	

	<p>requires more water to produce a plastic water bottle than it holds in water; 9 out of 10 plastic water bottles are not recycled; and Waterloo District School Board has passed a motion banning bottled water sales. Mark pointed out that the issue is water bottles vss. Tap water and not water bottles vs. pop.</p> <p>The committee agreed that the sale of bottled water for profit when quality tap water is available for free is not a good means for schools to generate revenue especially, when one considers the environmental impact as well. Time did not permit the committee to propose other ideas to offset school revenue loss.</p> <p>PIC will send a delegation to support the Board presentation of this issue.</p>	
--	--	--