

PIAC was established to provide advice to the Trustees on issues relating to parental involvement and any other issues deemed necessary. In our first year of operation, we have worked diligently to establish guidelines for the successful operation of this body, as well as our sub-committees. Trustees and staff have been strong supporters of PIAC from the start. However, their role on PIAC has not been established beyond the initial directive from the Board. Therefore, acknowledging the valuable input of Trustees and staff, but recognizing the need for PIAC to be a body independent of the Board, and acknowledging the conflict of Trustees voting on issues going forward to the Board as advice, I move that the following guidelines be put into place:

1. PIAC will be co-chaired by two parent members of the committee, to be elected by the parent members, as outlined in PIAC Procedures.
2. Only Parent members of PIAC shall have voting rights, as outlined in PIAC Procedures.
3. Trustee representation on PIAC shall be limited to two(2). Additional Trustees, wishing to attend specific meetings may do so, as observers.
4. The role of the trustee is to provide background information to PIAC, so that PIAC members may make fully informed decisions on any issue brought forward by PIAC members or the Board. In that capacity, trustees should not lead, nor be regular contributors to PIAC discussions.
5. Specific requests for advice from the Board, or individual Trustees, must be sent to the Chair within the time constraints set forward in Procedures for the setting of the Agenda. The Executive Committee will decide on the appropriate inclusion in the Agenda.
6. As per procedures, it is role of the appointed Trustees to report to the Board on any recommendations made by PIAC. If consensus has not been reached and the decision was arrived at by vote, the Trustees *may* explain the divergent arguments expressed by PIAC members. Otherwise, discussions at PIAC meetings should be seen as confidential by all participants.

Lloyd's comments on Ward 18 Motion

Rec 1 and 3

In the consultation leading to the establishment of the new Parent Involvement Policy which recommended that the Board establish community advisory committees, parents wanted a less independent relationship to the Board than the precursor (Parent Community Network). Parents felt that this independent advocacy group role of the former PCN was not effective in terms of a positive working relationship with the Board because it did not have a formal institutional link which was recognized by the Board. The requirement in the current procedure for the Board appointment of the trustee liaison members and a trustee co-chair was a response to that issue and was one important way of establishing a formal link with the Board and consequently a more structured and less ad hoc working relationship with the Board.

The abolition of the trustee co-chair would be seen to move back in the opposite direction. (It could also be argued that the experience with the previous PIAC trustee co-chair has provided an important balancing resource to the committee to ensure that there is a useful connection with the Board).

If the issue is too many trustees, then that is easier to address in terms of a smaller number. For that I would recommend that, if PIAC agrees in principle with fewer trustees, the co-chair simply have that discussion internally with the five trustees concerned and let them come to an agreement about reducing their own numbers (including who would agree to step down) and if that were agreeable to PIAC, the trustees through the current trustee co-chair, would then communicate that to the Chair of the Board or Chair's committee as appropriate. That process would keep the process collaborative and informal and avoid tying up the Board with unnecessary back and forth discussion.

The main difficulty with a proposal to reduce trustee numbers at this time is that there is no evidence that the present number of PIAC trustees (5) who were appointed by the Board in December has in fact detracted from the operation or decision-making of PIAC since their appointment. (Neither has the fact that there is a trustee co-chair).

Please note the following procedure approved by the Board regarding trustee appointments to community Liaison committees:

The Board will appoint trustee liaison members to serve on each community advisory committee, including one trustee co-chair for each committee who will co-chair along with a parent or community member as selected by the committee.

Rec 2

Community Liaison Group members who are represented on PIAC also have voting rights. A CLG member may not necessarily have a child currently in the system.

Rec 4

Staff provides background information. Trustees also provide background on issues at the Board table, but to restrict their role to background information only may lose the opportunity for parents to benefit from the insights and perspectives that trustees may bring to any issue under discussion. I think the intent here is to avoid having trustees sway committee decision-making by their own political positions on issues. That's fair. It's useful to develop a protocol or an understanding among trustees about that (I don't think you can eliminate it entirely, because of the fine line between insights and positions). But I have seen the helpfulness of trustee insights on other community advisory committees which does not cross the line and which is helpful to the committee.

Rec 5

Seems quite reasonable. (Timelines for referring matters don't always mesh with meeting schedules, but this can be worked out)

Rec 6

Last line: "Discussion at PIAC should be seen as confidential by all participants". Not sure that this would be seen as a good thing. Reps need to share information with their constituents. You may be referring to private matters, but I don't know what those may be.