

CALGARY BOARD OF EDUCATION
CBE STAFF ASSOCIATION
CHIEF SUPERINTENDENT'S TASK FORCE
April 29, 2009 from 8:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.
Education Centre – Conference Room 5E

Present:	Naomi Johnson	Cliff Hosfield
	Jenica Copithorne	Cathy Evanochko
	Sydney Smith	Albert Herscovitch
	Deborah Lewis	Linda Angelo
	Hilary Smith	

Guests:	Jane Rogerson	Karen Demassi
	Tracey Ross	Joel Benjamin

- 1) Check-in
- 2) Review agenda
- 3) Status/Update of Task Force Recommendation Flow Chart

A draft flow chart was prepared by Diana and distributed. Discussion was held on the updates to the flow chart and it was decided that the updates would be kept short and brief and posted on the websites. The update is attached but not completed as yet as time ran out.

- 4) Updates from the Specific Task Force Groups

Lead: Joel Benjamin

Question 1: 10 month pay over 12 months

An HR bulletin outlining the ability to split pay into two bank accounts was sent out to the system on February 19, 2009. Joel has received a system cost estimate for the three options a) all 10 month SA employees received their pay over 12 months; b) 10 month SA employees make a one time election to receive their pay over 12 months; c) 10 month SA employees make an annual election to receive their pay over 12 months. A meeting will be arranged with Bill Flookes to go over the information and develop a formal report for the next Task Force meeting.

Question 2: What opportunities and implications exist to manage more effectively positions within PSS that share common qualifications, responsibilities, purposes and accountabilities?

First meeting is schedule for Monday, May 4, 2009.

Question 3: What are the examples concerning position descriptions that are at odds with the collective agreement? What resolution is required to correct them? What is the plan to align job titles in PeopleSoft with collective agreement titles and how will this be communicated?

First meeting is scheduled for Monday, May 4, 2009.

Comments: Task Force members asked if there is a place in the process to have someone review these position descriptions with the needs of students in mind? It was noted that an Education Assistant was not on the team and Deborah Lewis and Joel will meet to find a representative.

Lead: Jane Rogerson

Question: Acknowledging the principals' accountability to direct the management of the school (*School Act* section 20(e)), what is necessary to ensure that the deployment of staff in the supervision of students is in accordance with the purpose of the work and the position description?

- Keith Peterson is facilitating the process using PELP
- Jean Minifie has asked to join the specific task group
- Developed the problem statement "The deployment of school-based support staff for supervision of students is in accordance with the purpose of the work and the position description."
- Members are focused and task oriented and wrestled with the challenges of work and the processes
- A couple more meetings are planned and then a recommendation will be brought to the Task Force.

Lead: Karen Demassi, Tracey Ross

Question: Acknowledging the principal's accountability to direct the management of the school (*School Act* section (e)), what parameters should be followed when changing the hours of work of support staff?

- Four ½ day sessions were held with a focus on the five preferred futures
- PELP project approach was used to analyze the problem. develop theory of actions and built key assumptions
- A problem statement was developed - "In the Calgary Board of Education there is significant variance in the way principals adjust the hours of work for support staff."
- Final two symptoms that have the greatest impact on the CBE were addressed: 1) Some support staff feel undervalued or lack of respect as a result of the process in which their hours of work are adjusted; 2) There is a lack of clarity and misunderstanding about the parameters for adjusting the hours of work by the principals and support staff.

Questions/Comments:

Q: Did the process work for you?

A: Yes it did. The group members were outstanding. We trusted the process and each other and really listened to the stories. The process was a good model and helped to keep us focused. It was a very positive experience for everyone.

Q: Have you had an opportunity to discuss parameters?

A: The next work may be looking at these parameters (communication, engagement process) and are they right. A concern was raised by Staff Association that this is why it came to the Task Force because these parameters were developed without any consultation or input by Staff Association. This will be brought to the Task Force who will decide where we should go from here.

Submission to the Task Force/presentation paper is attached. Thank you for Karen and Tracey for the good work and excellent joint leadership.

Meeting adjourned. Next meeting scheduled for June 3, 2009 from 9:00 a.m. – 12 noon at Highfield, Conference Room “C”.