

**Subject** proposed community dialogue committee  
**From** Warren Munroe <qualicumvillage@shaw.ca>  
**Date** Thursday, May 12, 2011 11:24 pm  
**To** Leona Matte <lmatte@shaw.ca>  
**Cc** Eve Flynn <eflynn@sd69.bc.ca> , Inez Hutchison <ihutchis@sd69.bc.ca> , rjwilliam@shaw.ca , Bruce Cownden <bcownden@sd69.bc.ca> , Bill Preston <bpreston@sd69.bc.ca>

Hello Leona,

Please consider this to be a formal request for clarification of information regarding the facilities review and the proposed Community Dialogue, Planning committee announced in your May 5, 2011 email.

As the district PAC representative, could you please put forward my requests to PAC the DPAC and the Qualicum School District Board of education (referred to here as the board) and administration (admin).

I would like to know

1) whether the board and admin are considering a school closure???

2) Is it the understanding of the board and the admin that there has been no formal school closure announcement, therefore, a formal public consultation has not been initiated, and that a recommendation only has been put forth to close a school and that the recommendations to close a school made in Oct. 2010 is not an announcement.

Please recall also, the SD69 admin and board announced that a decision on which of 3 recommended options would be approved in December 2010; however, the school could not be closed legally because the Regulations required 4 months notice to select groups.

2) is it true that these meetings (Community Dialogue ) with individuals and groups are not considered part of the formal process that is legislated when an announcement is made?

Also, could you please clarify

3) whether these meetings are open to the public or not??

4) Can refinements be made to the title, scope and terms of reference for these meetings (provided in your email)?

5) Can students from each secondary school be invited to attend these meetings?

6) Since the people who refer to themselves as the Oceanside Community for Quality Education have asked for a seat on this committee, and since this group is primarily interested in maintaining schools in Qualicum Beach, could people from other areas also be assured seats?

7) will the board and admin apologize for having announced they were considering closing a school, then instead of being forthcoming with requested information, they chose instead to try and restrict the school closure order (3040) ?

8) Will the board please withdraw the motion to change the 3040. ?

9) will the board agree to hiring an independent, neutral, public consultation process specialist/facilitator?

10) will the board direct staff to make available all the data ( in a machine readable format such as .csv or .xls) that was used in the consultant's (Matrix consulting) report and the methods and models and inputs used to create future enrolment numbers?

Also, the SD admin and board should take responsibility to the negative effect that the consultant's report has had on the town of Qualicum Beach for having tried to overemphasise the decline side of the population fluctuations.

11) Will the Board pay for a full page in each of the local news papers comparing the chart they used to justify school closures and one showing enrolment since 1983, when KSS opened, with the addition of all the students?

The SD69 admin and board and community are not required to look just at "Declining Enrollment" which only serves to limit the scope of

the "special committee". The Facilities Review is to look at enrolment to 2024 which includes increases.

12) will the board acknowledge that the enrolment forecast includes increases and therefore, direct admin to change references to declining enrolment to the more applicable " fluctuating enrolment"?

The school opening and closure order authorized by the Ministry of Education requires adequate opportunity for community involvement....

13) what does the board think is adequate?

As mentioned, the Facilities Review and the legally required pcp provide an excellent opportunity to show students and the community how a fair pcp can work well to come up with alternatives to a permanent closure of a town's only high school.

In the spirit of the stated goals of the School District, to provide the best education experience for all students,

14) Will the board approve the addition of courses in public consultation processes for secondary school students and community members? ( I will ask VIU for assistance in putting together such a course.

Thank you for putting forward my concerns and suggestions,

Warren

250-594-4322

----- Original Message -----

From: Leona Matte <lmatte@shaw.ca>

Date: Monday, May 9, 2011 7:35 pm

Subject: RE: next steps

To: 'Kelly Wray' <kfaywray@hotmail.com>, 'Cilla' <swedishblue@gmail.com>, 'Lynette Kershaw' <wildsalmon@shaw.ca>  
 Cc: 'Warren Munroe' <qualicumvillage@shaw.ca>, dash34@hotmail.com, 'Scott Tanner' <setanner@shaw.ca>, 'Ryan Lay' <robertryanlay@shaw.ca>, 'Ruth Mandt' <rrmandt@shaw.ca>, 'Ron Campbell' <qualicumcoffee@gmail.com>, 'Phil Carson' <phil@screenweavers.com>, 'Mirella Trozzo' <biscottidinotte@shaw.ca>, mirjo32@shaw.ca, 'Martin Stewart' <mstewart@bltk.com>, 'Luigi' <netlui@shaw.ca>, 'Louise McCormick' <lemccormick.mccormick@gmail.com>, 'Kenneth Callaghan' <khcallaghan@shaw.ca>, julie@screenweavers.com, 'David Osbourn' <daosborn@shaw.ca>, 'Barb Watson' <b\_\_watson@shaw.ca>, 'Andy Telfer' <andrew.c.telfer@gmail.com>, 'Ross' <falconbeach@telus.net>

> Hello Kelly - from what I know as a Dpac rep - Dpac is  
 > responsible for  
 > getting the word out to parents as that is the group they  
 > represent. The  
 > others to sit on the planning committee are chosen I believe by  
 > the School  
 > Board...2 business people, 1 Mata rep, 1 Cupe rep, a principal,  
 > 1 district  
 > Staff, 1 Trustee, 3 parents (and 1 alternate parent).  
 >  
 > My thoughts on this committee is that let's put our names  
 > forward to Mike Seselja - go to the Steve Dotto Workshop on May  
 > 12th and  
 > meet with him and the others who want to be on this  
 > committee (after the  
 > workshop that nite) and find out what's what with Mike....I  
 > think if we get  
 > vocal people to sit on this, ( the parent group  
 > makes up about 1/3 of this  
 > committee) it is far better to be sitting at this table and  
 > making noise and  
 > advocating for the best solution in Sd69 than standing on the  
 > sidelines. OCQE can continue and will continue to advocate for a

> fair and transparent  
 > process and sitting on this committee should be just one more  
 > avenue to  
 > accomplish that end. I look at it as a good opportunity.  
 > So far the only  
 > parents who have put their names forward are all a part of OCQE,  
 > save for  
 > Jill Pinkerton who was a member at the beginning, so would be  
 > advocating for  
 > KSS..and Renate Child - the Vice chair for Dpac - makes  
 > sense to have a  
 > dpac rep on it....I am not putting my name forward to sit on  
 > this committee  
 > but I will go to the meeting afterwards to see how Mike goes  
 > about the  
 > process of choosing...he did advocate to the Board for more  
 > representation and did get 3 parents and an alternate instead of  
 > 2 parents as was  
 > originally planned. The reason this committee is being  
 > formed is to "ensure  
 > that an accessible and open process for community dialogue is  
 > implemented."HOpe this answers some of your questions  
 > Kelly..Leona  
 >  
 >  
 >  
 >  
 >  
 > From: Kelly Wray [mailto:kfaywray@hotmail.com]  
 > Sent: May-09-11 6:21 PM  
 > To: Cilla; Lynette Kershaw  
 > Cc: Warren Munroe; dash34@hotmail.com; Scott Tanner; Ryan Lay;  
 > Ruth Mandt;  
 > Ron Campbell; Phil Carson; Mirella Trozzo; mirjo32@shaw.ca;  
 > Martin Stewart;  
 > Luigi; Leona Matte; Louise McCormick; Kenneth Callaghan;  
 > julie@screenweavers.com; David Osbourn; Barb Watson; Andy  
 > Telfer; Ross  
 > Subject: RE: next steps  
 >  
 >  
 >  
 > We need to call a meeting for the OCQE. It seems that many  
 > members are busy  
 > or away this week. However, did we need to have the parents  
 > confirmed for  
 > the board's "Working Group" by the 12th of May? Why is DPAC  
 > making the  
 > choice and decision for all who sit at the table other than  
 > School District  
 > employees? Who is making the decision on the two business people  
 > that will  
 > sit on this "Working Group?" Why aren't the trustees making all the  
 > decisions? So many questions with never a straight up answer.  
 > I'm getting  
 > tired.  
 >  
 >  
 >  
 >  
 > \_\_\_\_\_  
 >  
 > Date: Mon, 9 May 2011 18:01:39 -0700  
 > Subject: Re: next steps  
 > From: swedishblue@gmail.com  
 > To: wildsalmon@shaw.ca  
 > CC: qualicumvillage@shaw.ca; dash34@hotmail.com; setanner@shaw.ca;  
 > robertryanlay@shaw.ca; rrmandt@shaw.ca; qualicumcoffee@gmail.com;

> phil@screenweavers.com; biscottidinotte@shaw.ca; mirjo32@shaw.ca;  
> mstewart@bltk.com; netlui@shaw.ca; lmatte@shaw.ca;  
> lemccormick.mccormick@gmail.com; khcallaghan@shaw.ca;  
> kfaywray@hotmail.com;julie@screenweavers.com; daosborn@shaw.ca;  
> b\_\_watson@shaw.ca;andrew.c.telfer@gmail.com; falconbeach@telus.net

> Hi all,

> I have been mulling this over...I must say that after talking a  
> bit with  
> Warren I  
> some questions...maybe get the ball rolling on a decision of  
> some kind...

> By accepting the board's offer to have a few parents on their  
> committee, are  
> we implying that we consider this as their legal version of a  
> fair pcp?

> To be asking for only one seat on their committee, is that a  
> strong enough  
> position for OCQE to be in?

> Cilla

> On Sat, May 7, 2011 at 9:53 AM, Wild Salmon  
> <wildsalmon@shaw.ca> wrote:

> Hi Group

> Warren raised some interesting points in his email, do we as a  
> group ignore  
> what the Board is doing with regards to a very rigid steering  
> committee or  
> do we try to get as many members on the 3 parent allotment as we  
> can? There  
> are pros and cons to doing either. I have not sent out the  
> letter to the  
> Trustees yet but would like some consensus on doing this or not.  
> It should  
> be sent Monday at the latest. It may be too late to delay or have  
> reconfigured the steering committee at this point and I  
> personally would  
> rather have some of us involved in this than none of us. We  
> should have a  
> meeting soon to discuss the Trustee meeting and to decide on  
> what our next  
> steps are. Unfortunately I must step back a little as our family  
> has just  
> started Prawn season and this is one of our busiest times. I  
> will still be  
> involved and attend meetings as much as I can.

> Regards Lynette