



HOLDING OF PUBLIC MEETINGS

Legal References: *Education Act, Section 207 and Division E – Education Development Charges*

Related References:

Effective Date: *February 23, 1998*

Revisions:

Reviewed: May 11, 2015

1. Preamble

1.1 It is the policy of the Waterloo Region District School Board to:

- 1.1.1 encourage engagement at public meetings in order to facilitate communication between itself and its constituents;
- 1.1.2 differentiate clearly between meetings sanctioned by the Board and those held by Board members or employees in connection with their duties or responsibilities;
- 1.1.3 approve, by formal motion, all public meetings which it conducts, sponsors, or sanctions.



HOLDING OF PUBLIC MEETINGS

Legal References: *Education Act, Section 207 and Division E – Education Development Charges*

Related References:

Effective Date: *February 23, 1998*

Revisions:

Reviewed: **September 12, 2016**

1. Preamble

1.1 It is the policy of the Waterloo Region District School Board to:

- 1.1.1 encourage engagement at public meetings in order to facilitate communication between itself and its constituents;
- 1.1.2 differentiate clearly between meetings sanctioned by the Board and those held by Board members or employees in connection with their duties or responsibilities;
- 1.1.3 approve, by formal motion, all public meetings which it conducts, sponsors, or sanctions.



COMMUNITY USE OF SCHOOLS

Legal References:	<i>Education Act, Section 171 (24); Section 234 (1)</i> <i>Smoke-Free Ontario Act</i>
Related References:	Administrative Procedure 3085 – Safe Welcome Program Administrative Procedure 4230 – Open Flames Administrative Procedure 4360 – Principals of Business Conduct for Board Employees Administrative Procedure 4990 – Facility Partnerships Ministry of Education Memorandum 2006: B13 Community Use of Schools Program Board Policy 1011 – Facility Partnerships Board Policy 6000 – Safe Schools
Effective Date:	<i>February 23, 1998</i>
Revisions:	March 23, 2015
Reviewed:	

1. Preamble

- 1.1 The Waterloo Region District School Board values and encourages community use of schools according to the guidelines and agreements as approved by the Board for such use, recognizing that:
 - 1.1.1 the primary responsibility of the Board is to provide quality education to students at each of its facilities;
 - 1.1.2 legislation and regulations allow a school board to make school buildings and premises available for any educational or lawful purpose it deems proper, provided there is no cost to the Board;
 - 1.1.3 the community use of schools program is administered on a cost recovery basis;
 - 1.1.4 use by the community shall not interfere with the proper conduct of school and Board programs nor with the security and maintenance of Board's properties
 - 1.1.5 all users will be required to respect the property of the Board and abide by the terms and conditions set out in their rental contract.



COMMUNITY USE OF SCHOOLS

Legal References:	<i>Education Act, Section 171 (24); Section 234 (1)</i> <i>Smoke-Free Ontario Act</i>
Related References:	<i>Administrative Procedure 3085 – Safe Welcome Program</i> <i>Administrative Procedure 4230 – Open Flames</i> <i>Administrative Procedure 4360 – Principals of Business Conduct for Board Employees</i> <i>Administrative Procedure 4985 – Community Use of Schools</i> <i>Administrative Procedure 4990 – Community Planning and Facility Partnerships</i> <i>Ministry of Education Memorandum 2006: B13 Community Use of Schools Program</i> <i>Board Policy 1011 – Community Planning and Facility Partnerships</i> <i>Board Policy 6000 – Safe Schools</i> <i>Board Policy 6001 – Code of Conduct</i>
Effective Date:	<i>February 23, 1998</i>
Revisions:	<i>March 23, 2015, September 12, 2016</i>
Reviewed:	

1. Preamble

- 1.1 The Waterloo Region District School Board values and encourages community use of schools according to the guidelines and agreements as approved by the Board for such use, recognizing that:
 - 1.1.1 the primary responsibility of the Board is to provide quality education to students at each of its facilities;
 - 1.1.2 legislation and regulations allow a school board to make school buildings and premises available for any educational or lawful purpose it deems proper, provided there is no cost to the Board;
 - 1.1.3 the community use of schools program is administered on a cost recovery basis;
 - 1.1.4 use by the community shall not interfere with the proper conduct of school and Board programs nor with the security and maintenance of Board's properties;
and
 - 1.1.5 all users will be required to respect the property of the Board and abide by the terms and conditions set out in their rental permit.



APPROVAL OF RESEARCH PROJECTS

Legal References:

Related References: *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*

Effective Date: *February 23, 1998*

Revisions: *January 24, 2003; May 30, 2005; November 28, 2005*

Reviewed: *March 28, 2011*

1. Preamble

- 1.1 It is the policy of the Waterloo Region District School Board to permit authorized research personnel, in adherence to ethical guidelines as set out by the *Tri-Council Policy Statement of Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*, to use its facilities and involve students from the Waterloo Region public school system in various research projects with the prior approval of the Director of Education, or designate, recognizing that:
 - 1.1.1 the Board appreciates that the increasing interest in social science studies in the universities brings with it the need for research into education and the learning process;
 - 1.1.2 Waterloo Region is a preferred area of local universities for use in various studies;
 - 1.1.3 students and employees can benefit in many ways as a result of some of the studies in which they participate;
 - 1.1.4 the number of requests to conduct research in schools is of sufficient quantity to require some kind of control in order to permit schools to fulfill their main role of providing students with certain basic skills;
 - 1.1.5 the Board's research team will include a trustee representative and a representative from the Waterloo Region Assembly of Public School Councils;
 - 1.1.6 school councils will be informed of new research initiatives.

2. Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans

- 2.1 The standard for university and non-university ethics review is the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans* (TCPS) which was jointly developed by the former Medical Research Council of Canada, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC).
- 2.2 The complete document can be accessed on that Government of Canada website at: <http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/english/policystatement/policystatement.cfm>
- 2.3 Included in the document are the following *Guiding Ethical Principles*: The approach taken in this framework is to guide and evoke thoughtful actions based on principles. The principles that follow are based on the guidelines of the Councils over the last decades, on more recent statements by other Canadian agencies, and on statements from the international community. The principles have been widely adopted by diverse research disciplines. As such, they express common standards, values and aspirations of the research community.

- 2.3.1 **Respect for Human Dignity:** The cardinal principle of modern research ethics, as discussed above, is respect for human dignity. This principle aspires to protecting the multiple and interdependent interests of the person -- from bodily to psychological to cultural integrity. This principle forms the basis of the ethical obligations in research that are listed below. In certain situations, conflicts may arise from application of these principles in isolation from one other. Researchers and REBs must carefully weigh all the principles and circumstances involved to reach a reasoned and defensible conclusion.
- 2.3.2 **Respect for Free and Informed Consent:** Individuals are generally presumed to have the capacity and right to make free and informed decisions. Respect for persons thus means respecting the exercise of individual consent. In practical terms within the ethics review process, the principle of respect for persons translates into the dialogue, process, rights, duties and requirements for free and informed consent by the research subject.
- 2.3.3 **Respect for Vulnerable Persons:** Respect for human dignity entails high ethical obligations towards vulnerable persons -- to those whose diminished competence and/or decision-making capacity make them vulnerable. Children, institutionalized persons or others who are vulnerable are entitled, on grounds of human dignity, caring, solidarity and fairness, to special protection against abuse, exploitation or discrimination. Ethical obligations to vulnerable individuals in the research enterprise will often translate into special procedures to protect their interests.
- 2.3.4 **Respect for Privacy and Confidentiality:** Respect for human dignity also implies the principles of respect for privacy and confidentiality. In many cultures, privacy and confidentiality are considered fundamental to human dignity. Thus, standards of privacy and confidentiality protect the access, control and dissemination of personal information. In doing so, such standards help to protect mental or psychological integrity. They are thus consonant with values underlying privacy, confidentiality and anonymity respected.
- 2.3.5 **Respect for Justice and Inclusiveness:** Justice connotes fairness and equity. Procedural justice requires that the ethics review process have fair methods, standards and procedures for reviewing research protocols, and that the process be effectively independent. Justice also concerns the distribution of benefits and burdens of research. On the one hand, distributive justice means that no segment of the population should be unfairly burdened with the harms of research. It thus imposes particular obligations toward individuals who are vulnerable and unable to protect their own interests in order to ensure that they are not exploited for the advancement of knowledge. History has many chapters of such exploitation. On the other hand, distributive justice also imposes duties neither to neglect nor discriminate against individuals and groups who may benefit from advances in research.
- 2.3.6 **Balancing Harms and Benefits:** The analysis, balance and distribution of harms and benefits are critical to the ethics of human research. Modern research ethics, for instance, require a favourable harms-benefit balance – that is, that the foreseeable harms should not outweigh anticipated benefits. Harms-benefits analysis thus affects the welfare and rights of research subjects, the informed assumption of harms and benefits, and the ethical justifications for competing research paths. Because research involves advancing the frontiers of knowledge, its undertaking often involves uncertainty about the precise magnitude and kind of benefits or harms that attend proposed research. These realities and the principle of respect for human dignity impose ethical obligations on the prerequisites, scientific validity, design and conduct of research. These concerns are particularly evident in biomedical and health research; in research they need to be tempered in areas such as political science, economics or modern history (including biographies), areas in which research may ethically result in the harming of the reputations of organizations or individuals in public life.

- 2.3.7 **Minimizing Harm:** A principle directly related to harms-benefits analysis is non-maleficence, or the duty to avoid, prevent or minimize harms to others. Research subjects must not be subjected to unnecessary risks of harm, and their participation in research must be essential to achieving scientifically and socially important aims that cannot be realized without the participation of human subjects. In addition, it should be kept in mind that the principle of minimizing harm requires that the research involve the smallest number of human subjects and the smallest number of tests on these subjects that will ensure scientifically valid data.
- 2.3.8 **Maximizing Benefit:** Another principle related to the harms and benefits of research is beneficence. The principle of beneficence imposes a duty to benefit others and, in research ethics, a duty to maximize net benefits. The principle has particular relevance for researchers in professions such as social work, education, health care and applied psychology. As noted earlier, human research is intended to produce benefits for subjects themselves, for other individuals or society as a whole, or for the advancement of knowledge. In most research, the primary benefits produced are for society and for the advancement of knowledge.



APPROVAL OF RESEARCH PROJECTS

Legal References:

Related References: *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*

Effective Date: *February 23, 1998*

Revisions: *January 24, 2003; May 30, 2005; November 28, 2005*

Reviewed: **September 12, 2016**

1. Preamble

- 1.1 It is the policy of the Waterloo Region District School Board to permit authorized research personnel, in adherence to ethical guidelines as set out by the *Tri-Council Policy Statement of Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*, to use its facilities and involve students from the Waterloo Region public school system in various research projects with the prior approval of the Director of Education, or designate, recognizing that:
 - 1.1.1 the Board appreciates that the increasing interest in social science studies in the universities brings with it the need for research into education and the learning process;
 - 1.1.2 Waterloo Region is a preferred area of local universities for use in various studies;
 - 1.1.3 students and employees can benefit in many ways as a result of some of the studies in which they participate;
 - 1.1.4 the number of requests to conduct research in schools is of sufficient quantity to require some kind of control in order to permit schools to fulfill their main role of providing students with certain basic skills;
 - 1.1.5 the Board's research team will include a trustee representative and a representative from the Waterloo Region Assembly of Public School Councils;
 - 1.1.6 school councils will be informed of new research initiatives.

2. Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans

- 2.1 The standard for university and non-university ethics review is the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans* (TCPS) which was jointly developed by the former Medical Research Council of Canada, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC).
- 2.2 The complete document can be accessed on that Government of Canada website at: <http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/english/policystatement/policystatement.cfm>
- 2.3 Included in the document are the following *Guiding Ethical Principles*: The approach taken in this framework is to guide and evoke thoughtful actions based on principles. The principles that follow are based on the guidelines of the Councils over the last decades, on more recent statements by other Canadian agencies, and on statements from the international community. The principles have been widely adopted by diverse research disciplines. As such, they express common standards, values and aspirations of the research community.

- 2.3.1 **Respect for Human Dignity:** The cardinal principle of modern research ethics, as discussed above, is respect for human dignity. This principle aspires to protecting the multiple and interdependent interests of the person -- from bodily to psychological to cultural integrity. This principle forms the basis of the ethical obligations in research that are listed below. In certain situations, conflicts may arise from application of these principles in isolation from one other. Researchers and REBs must carefully weigh all the principles and circumstances involved to reach a reasoned and defensible conclusion.
- 2.3.2 **Respect for Free and Informed Consent:** Individuals are generally presumed to have the capacity and right to make free and informed decisions. Respect for persons thus means respecting the exercise of individual consent. In practical terms within the ethics review process, the principle of respect for persons translates into the dialogue, process, rights, duties and requirements for free and informed consent by the research subject.
- 2.3.3 **Respect for Vulnerable Persons:** Respect for human dignity entails high ethical obligations towards vulnerable persons -- to those whose diminished competence and/or decision-making capacity make them vulnerable. Children, institutionalized persons or others who are vulnerable are entitled, on grounds of human dignity, caring, solidarity and fairness, to special protection against abuse, exploitation or discrimination. Ethical obligations to vulnerable individuals in the research enterprise will often translate into special procedures to protect their interests.
- 2.3.4 **Respect for Privacy and Confidentiality:** Respect for human dignity also implies the principles of respect for privacy and confidentiality. In many cultures, privacy and confidentiality are considered fundamental to human dignity. Thus, standards of privacy and confidentiality protect the access, control and dissemination of personal information. In doing so, such standards help to protect mental or psychological integrity. They are thus consonant with values underlying privacy, confidentiality and anonymity respected.
- 2.3.5 **Respect for Justice and Inclusiveness:** Justice connotes fairness and equity. Procedural justice requires that the ethics review process have fair methods, standards and procedures for reviewing research protocols, and that the process be effectively independent. Justice also concerns the distribution of benefits and burdens of research. On the one hand, distributive justice means that no segment of the population should be unfairly burdened with the harms of research. It thus imposes particular obligations toward individuals who are vulnerable and unable to protect their own interests in order to ensure that they are not exploited for the advancement of knowledge. History has many chapters of such exploitation. On the other hand, distributive justice also imposes duties neither to neglect nor discriminate against individuals and groups who may benefit from advances in research.
- 2.3.6 **Balancing Harms and Benefits:** The analysis, balance and distribution of harms and benefits are critical to the ethics of human research. Modern research ethics, for instance, require a favourable harms-benefit balance – that is, that the foreseeable harms should not outweigh anticipated benefits. Harms-benefits analysis thus affects the welfare and rights of research subjects, the informed assumption of harms and benefits, and the ethical justifications for competing research paths. Because research involves advancing the frontiers of knowledge, its undertaking often involves uncertainty about the precise magnitude and kind of benefits or harms that attend proposed research. These realities and the principle of respect for human dignity impose ethical obligations on the prerequisites, scientific validity, design and conduct of research. These concerns are particularly evident in biomedical and health research; in research they need to be tempered in areas such as political science, economics or modern history (including biographies), areas in which research may ethically result in the harming of the reputations of organizations or individuals in public life.

- 2.3.7 **Minimizing Harm:** A principle directly related to harms-benefits analysis is non-maleficence, or the duty to avoid, prevent or minimize harms to others. Research subjects must not be subjected to unnecessary risks of harm, and their participation in research must be essential to achieving scientifically and socially important aims that cannot be realized without the participation of human subjects. In addition, it should be kept in mind that the principle of minimizing harm requires that the research involve the smallest number of human subjects and the smallest number of tests on these subjects that will ensure scientifically valid data.
- 2.3.8 **Maximizing Benefit:** Another principle related to the harms and benefits of research is beneficence. The principle of beneficence imposes a duty to benefit others and, in research ethics, a duty to maximize net benefits. The principle has particular relevance for researchers in professions such as social work, education, health care and applied psychology. As noted earlier, human research is intended to produce benefits for subjects themselves, for other individuals or society as a whole, or for the advancement of knowledge. In most research, the primary benefits produced are for society and for the advancement of knowledge.

DRAFT



SCHOOL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

Legal References: *Education Act, Policy/Program Memorandum 150 – School Food and Beverage Policy*

Related References:

Effective Date: *September 2009*

Revisions: *June 2011, June 15, 2015*

Reviewed:

1. Preamble

- 1.1 It is the policy of the Waterloo Region District School Board to promote healthy food choices in collaboration with parents, students and staff, that have a maximum nutritional value, are reasonably priced, and are sensitive to cultural needs and food allergy concerns.
- 1.2 The Waterloo Region District School Board supports partnerships in the implementation of nutrition programs, offering food and beverages in all schools at no cost to students, and that these programs allow for universal access and are inclusive in nature to address student hunger.
- 1.3 The Waterloo Region District School Board recognizes the importance of effective communication and collaborative partnerships to ensure sustainability of student nutrition programs, within the financial constraints of available Board resources.



SCHOOL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

Legal References: *Education Act, Policy/Program Memorandum 150 – School Food and Beverage Policy*

Related References:

Effective Date: *September 2009*

Revisions: *June 15, 2015*

Reviewed: ***September 12, 2016***

1. Preamble

- 1.1 It is the policy of the Waterloo Region District School Board to promote healthy food choices in collaboration with parents, students and staff, that have a maximum nutritional value, are reasonably priced, and are sensitive to cultural needs and food allergy concerns.
- 1.2 The Waterloo Region District School Board supports partnerships in the implementation of nutrition programs, offering food and beverages in all schools at no cost to students, and that these programs allow for universal access and are inclusive in nature to address student hunger.
- 1.3 The Waterloo Region District School Board recognizes the importance of effective communication and collaborative partnerships to ensure sustainability of student nutrition programs, within the financial constraints of available Board resources.

**Report to Committee of the Whole
September 12, 2016**



**Waterloo Region
District School Board**

Inspired Learners – Tomorrow's Leaders

SUBJECT: Waterloo Collegiate Institute/Northdale Feasibility Study Final Report

ORIGINATOR: This report was prepared by Matthew Gerard, Superintendent, Business Services & Treasurer of the Board; Dennis Cuomo, Manager of Planning, and in consultation with Coordinating Council.

PURPOSE/STRATEGIC PLAN:

To present to the Board of Trustees the Waterloo Collegiate Institute (WCI)/Northdale Feasibility Study Final Report. This report relates to the three strategic priorities of the Waterloo Region District School (Board) as it puts our students first – each and every one, has involved staff, families and caregivers as partners in every student's learning journey, and more specifically, our culture of innovation builds students' confidence and success as they face the future.

BACKGROUND:

On March 23, 2015 the Board received a report entitled, "*Secondary Boundary Update 2015*". Consultants, Watson and Associates, presented their review of secondary accommodation in the Waterloo Region District School Board, updating an original report undertaken in May 2010. Their report contained seven recommendations - three short-term, three medium-term and one long-term.

One of the short-term recommendations was:

That the Board be aware of and monitor the potential implications of the City of Waterloo's land use and community improvement plan for the Northdale neighbourhood and the impact it might have on future enrolment at Waterloo Collegiate Institute. In addition, the Board should also explore potential partnerships opportunities that may arise from this initiative.

In the Accommodation Planning 2015-16 Report presented to Trustees on May 11, 2015 Trustees were informed that a stakeholder committee, comprised of Board, City of Waterloo (City) and Wilfred Laurier University (WLU) representatives had been formed to discuss our unique interest in the neighbourhood, our potential contributions to neighbourhood revitalization efforts and to assist the City in prioritizing projects identified in the IBM Smarter Cities report on Northdale.

Those discussions, led to the undertaking of a feasibility study by the three stakeholders, with under the direction of a consultant from February 1 to August 31, 2016.

STATUS:

A Strategic Advisory Team made up of staff from the Waterloo Region District School Board, City of Waterloo and Wilfrid Laurier University, identified the shared land holdings and infrastructure owned by the three partners and set out to engage a consultant to prepare a feasibility study to explore the potential for redevelopment and revitalization of these assets. Following the selection of *Live Work Learn Play*, the consultants hired to undertake the study, stakeholder engagement was conducted and reviewed by the team.

Stakeholders were identified to explore partnership opportunities in the areas of disaster recovery, academic and educational synergies, shared physical and community resources, and programming. Stakeholders identified gaps in infrastructure and programming in the Northdale neighbourhood as well as their desires for improving services and facilities. In addition, stakeholders provided insights into the possibilities to redevelop the shared lands and buildings to create a new community hub.

Board stakeholders included the Director; Superintendent, Business Services; Superintendent, Student Achievement & Well-Being; the WCI Visioning Committee, and WCI Parent Council representatives.

The community hub envisioned within the development themes identified in the feasibility study report, includes a renewed Waterloo Collegiate Institute along with centres for Arts & Culture, Health & Wellness and Focused Education.

Appendix A provides an Executive Summary of the results and recommendations flowing from the feasibility study.

COMMUNICATIONS:

Staff will develop a communication plan in conjunction with the City of Waterloo and Wilfrid Laurier University.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

The feasibility study was funded through contributions made by the City of Waterloo, Wilfrid Laurier University, and the Ministry of Education through the Council of Senior Business Officials Effectiveness and Efficiency fund.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended:

That the Waterloo Region District School Board staff be directed to report back to the Board of Trustees by January 2017 with recommendations for how the Board of Trustees should proceed regarding the Feasibility Study after further consultation with the City of Waterloo, Wilfrid Laurier University, and other potential stakeholders.

 **Director of Education**