



Chair (Vancouver DPAC) <chair@vancouverdpac.org>

## Trustee letter - Feedback process - Build2Learn

Chair (Vancouver DPAC) <chair@vancouverdpac.org>

Mon, May 10, 2021 at 9:10 AM

To: Barb Parrott <barbara.parrott@vsb.bc.ca>, "Oliver C. Hanson" <oliver.hanson@vsb.bc.ca>, Carmen Cho <carmen.cho@vsb.bc.ca>, Estrellita Gonzalez <estrellita.gonzalez@vsb.bc.ca>, Janet Fraser <janet.fraser@vsb.bc.ca>, Lois Chan-Pedley <lois.chan-pedley@vsb.bc.ca>, Allan Wong <allan.wong@vsb.bc.ca>, Fraser Ballantyne <fraser.ballantyne@vsb.bc.ca>, Jennifer Reddy <jennifer.reddy@vsb.bc.ca>  
 Cc: "Suzanne Hoffman (Superintendent)" <shoffman@vsb.bc.ca>, David Nelson <dnelson@vsb.bc.ca>, "Vice-Chair (Vancouver DPAC)" <vicechair@vancouverdpac.org>

Dear trustees:

This is feedback about providing feedback.

This letter comes somewhat belatedly, as it specifically relates to the Build2Learn SPUR engagement, but it continues to be relevant for trustees as they consider future engagements.

I've spoken to a few trustees about this feedback at a high level. A number of dedicated parents had concerns about the consultation (shared by DPAC exec), so they solicited feedback and comments from many that participated in the Build2Learn process to create a summary for our exec. I think it's important that trustees also hear these concerns.

As you recall, the Build2Learn engagement for the LRFP contained two phases -- an online survey and online workshops for stakeholders, families, community members and individuals that identify as Indigenous. There is feedback on both phases, although most of the comments are concerned with the Phase 2 engagement which was intended to be a deeper dive. Among other concerns, parents raised concerns that the Phase 2 consultation was:

- poorly advertised and communicated, short notice for some sessions, no translation
- unclear on relationship of the engagement to LRFP
- restrictive presentation, parents could not discuss what was important to them
- feedback was not reflected back in the report summaries
- did not adequately engage local Nations

More detail is available in the report. Although we recognize that online engagement was not originally envisioned when this work was commissioned, many of the issues identified by parents are not related to the mode of engagement.

I've attached the 17 page report to this email. I would encourage you to take a read. We have included a section for comments that were mostly solicited from parents that identify as Indigenous, and those comments are especially relevant in light of our commitments.

A few takeaways:

- Approach and attention to detail matter when selecting a party to collect feedback for the VSB
- Stakeholders may be able to help focus the conversations if involved in early stages of engagement or even pre-engagement. For example, phase 2 involved questions about new builds and upgrades -- stakeholders might have suggested participants that had experienced an upgrade or build, to provide informed (vs hypothetical) experience.
- A reminder that local Nations need additional lead time to engage.
- Be willing to change approach mid-engagement if initial feedback indicates that it may be warranted.
- *(I come back to this one from time to time, please forgive my repetition.)*


There is an administrative procedure on engagement. DPAC believes that decision makers should have a significant role in shaping the engagement process. We believe that the administrative procedure should put more authority into the hands of trustees when the engagement relates to decisions of trustees, such as the LRFP. We ask trustees to consider whether they felt they had sufficient influence in shaping the Build2Learn engagement to answer the questions they needed answered.


Thanks,

Gord.

---

**2 attachments**

 **VSB consultation meeting 11.3.20-final.pdf**  
10653K

 **VSB consultation meeting 11.3.20-final.pdf**  
10653K