



RISK ED

Volume 16, Issue 1

Fall 2011

In this Issue:

- ❖ Team Leader's Message
- ❖ Getting the Most from a Risk Assessment
- ❖ Automatic Sprinkler System Considerations
- ❖ School Sports and the Law
- ❖ Property Claims
- ❖ Avoiding Uncertainty in Policies and Contracts
- ❖ Neighborhood Learning Centres
- ❖ About our Organization
- ❖ Our Team of Professionals

Please feel free to copy and distribute as necessary.

If you would like to receive an electronic version of this publication just drop us a line at protection.program@bc spp.org and we will add you to our distribution list.

A Risk Management Newsletter for the Schools Protection Program Members

TEAM LEADER'S MESSAGE

Welcome to our latest of Risk Ed. This edition contains many new articles which we hope you will enjoy and find both useful and informative. Please feel free to contact us with any suggestions for future topics (protection.program@bc spp.org) and, as always, we will do our best to accommodate you.

This year has seen some relaxation on travel restrictions as we move away from recession. As a result this year I was able to attend the BC Association of School Business Officials 53rd Annual General Meeting at Penticton. It was a great conference, well organised, with quality speakers, and it was a fantastic opportunity for me personally to meet face to face with many of the district staff putting a face to the name.

Each District will have received policy endorsements effective July 1st. One change is the increase in deductible from \$3,000 to \$10,000 for Property and Boiler and Machinery coverage agreements. Should your District wish to know how this would have affected previous years claim's payments we can run a report showing the financial impact of this change. This may be of use from a budgeting perspective. Feel free to contact your risk management consultant for more details.

Finally, we would like to take this opportunity to ask for feedback regarding our web site. Should you require some help on the site, please feel free to contact any of our team and we will be pleased to take your call.

Andrew Green, Director, SPP

GETTING THE MOST FROM A RISK ASSESSMENT

You already know many of the risks and issues when undertaking a new project or program or procurement, that is why you were tasked with the job. (Note that risks are anticipated *future* events—not yet occurring—while issues are *current* events). Therefore, you might be thinking, "I know this stuff. I do it every day. Why bother with a risk assessment?"

A risk assessment is more than a prioritized list of things that can go wrong. It is a governance tool in that risk-based decision making is a management best practice. It is a due diligence tool that demonstrates your analysis of costs and benefits, organizational capacity, stakeholder considerations and alignment with greater goals and objectives. Moreover, it supports transparency and defensible decision making that demonstrates that choices were thoughtful and based on the best information available at the time.

A risk assessment becomes a significant communications tool to differing audiences. It tells a story about your project. It describes vulnerabilities, causes, impacts and solutions. It shows gaps in resources and expertise. It highlights interdependencies and interrelationships. It pits investment against return. It communicates an organization's tolerance for risks. It informs and assures constituents and decision makers.

(Continued on page 2)

GETTING THE MOST FROM A RISK ASSESSMENT

(Continued from page 1)

The sooner this process is undertaken the greater the return. This is because you ask the hard questions early, before any significant commitments to people, plans or things are made. When a project or program is at the conceptual stage, a high-level risk assessment will help expose vulnerabilities and aid in determining viability. At this stage you are asking, “have we sufficiently defined the problem and scope of the solution? Would this project support our business goals and objectives? Is this project a potential risk to our goals and objectives? Do we have the money and expertise to deliver? Is it money well spent? Are there policy, privacy or other legal implications? Could something happen that would reduce people’s confidence in our services?” Now is the time to investigate further, halt or reconfigure before momentum and investment become too great.

To satisfy this breadth and depth of questioning you need the right expertise. We suggest risk assessments via a working group with members who can speak to budget, policy, service delivery, systems, internal capacity and so forth. This kind of setting—with representatives around the table—provokes information sharing and understanding among constituents. A knowledgeable and representative working group can bring greater value than the sum of its parts in that you can rely less on assumption, find solutions quicker and create a common vision.

I have yet to tell you how to *do* a risk assessment. The how-to is the easy part really. You can find the Province’s risk management standard (endorsed by the Schools Protection Program) and supporting guidelines for a detailed description of the process under Enterprise Risk Management tab available on our website at www.bcsp.org.

However, a simple way to think about the how-to part is to ask your working group the following:

- What can go wrong?
- How likely is that something to go wrong?
- What is the impact if that something does go wrong?
- What are we doing to manage this currently?
- Are we doing enough?
- What else will we do?
- Who is responsible?

These seven questions illustrate the simplicity and the logic of a good risk assessment. Refer to our standard, guideline and risk register template which provide a structured process and contain detailed how-to instructions. The process is the same for all risk assessments – the volume of risks and level of detail you include depends on the complexity and scope of the project.

The key part of the risk assessment is identifying events, causes and impacts. Collectively these three elements comprise a risk. Risk identification always begins with connecting a vulnerability or opportunity to the achievement of business goals and objectives. An event is something happening that stands in the way of achieving these aims. A cause is the source or condition that triggers the event and the impact is the consequence.

For example, a local non-profit society has a goal of increasing public awareness. A negative risk event could be poor attendance at an open house. Low attendance could be caused by inclement weather, ineffective marketing or limited accessibility to their location. The impacts could be to their budget or reputation and ultimately to the business goal of increasing awareness. As you can see, there is a logical progression through the risk identification process.

Risks can also lead to positive outcomes. For example, a new policy, priority or direction from the Ministry of Education could provide an opportunity for your district to increase its mandate and serve more students. However, we typically consider risk as a negative thing.

After you identify risks via event, cause and impact, you then rate them according to likelihood and consequence. Do not agonize over this step. While you strive to assess accurately, remember that the objective is an ordered ranking from most to least threatening. Extended debates around the table about whether the likelihood of some event rates a four rather than a five will make little practical difference to its relative position in the list. Worse yet, the exercise

(Continued on page 3)

GETTING THE MOST FROM A RISK ASSESSMENT

(Continued from page 2)

will quickly become tedious and participants may disengage.

Typically, we rely on our experience and knowledge to assess likelihood rather than applying a fixed formula. Loss history and other statistical data may inform your rating but usually it's a gut feel based on experience. We suggest you consider likelihood within a fixed period, say over the project's lifecycle or within a three-year planning cycle. You may look further out if warranted. Use a period of time that is practical and meaningful. The Province's risk register template includes a likelihood and consequence matrix with descriptors that you can modify to fit your particular context.

It can be challenging to rate consequence. This is where it is critical to define and communicate the context and scope of your risk assessment with the working group. For example, how will the group define a catastrophic event? Will the failure of your initiative bring down the District? That is unlikely. Will a failure bring down your program? That is unlikely too, but there is bound to be some ripple effect. For example, a significant loss within a program area could mean the program fails to meet its primary objectives, yet a Board of Education may absorb the financial and performance loss with relatively minor impacts to its budget and business objectives. In the same way that you limited the period when assessing likelihood, you need to limit the reach of consequence. We advise that you limit consequence to that which falls within your immediate control – to the business, program, or project objectives for which you are immediately responsible.

Once you have identified and rated your risks you proceed with evaluating the adequacy of current controls to determine the need for further mitigations. From here, the process relies on typical project management practice toward implementing your activities. All the while, you monitor your risk environment for changes, communicate with key constituents, keep your risk register updated, and re-assess when necessary.

Clarifying context and scope, identifying risks via event, cause and impact, and defining likelihood and consequence are the critical first steps to ensuring you produce a high quality and valuable resource to assist you, the project team, and senior decision makers through your project's lifecycle.

The Schools Protection Program has many resources available to assist you, including professional advice, training and facilitation services.

AUTOMATIC SPRINKLER SYSTEM CONSIDERATIONS

The National Fire Protection Agency (NFPA) in the United States has been keeping records of fires and their causes for some time. Using these records the NFPA has developed statistics on the effectiveness of Sprinkler systems and the causes when the systems have not been effective.

Automatic sprinkler systems are an effective way to protect buildings from the threat of fire. When a fire breaks out in a building with a high fuel load (paper, furniture, etc) temperatures can reach the point where most materials (fuel) will spontaneously combust in 6-10 minutes. As the response time for most fire departments is 6-10 minutes you can see that in many cases a fire will be well established by the time the firefighters are able to start their work. This time line reinforces the importance of an automatic sprinkler system that will activate well before temperatures reach that critical point. Some common mistakes that could severely impede a sprinkler system's effectiveness and result in a major loss include:

- The sprinkler system fails to operate. In two thirds of cases where a sprinkler system failed to operate it was due to the system being shut off when the fire occurred. It is not unusual for a sprinkler system to be shut down for maintenance, upgrades or repair, but it is essential that the system is returned to service after shutdown.
- Poor maintenance attributed to another 11% of system failures making human error responsible for a total of 75% of the cases in which sprinkler systems failed to operate.

To aid our clients in ensuring that systems are not left non-operational after maintenance SPP operates a fire impair-

(Continued on page 4)

AUTOMATIC SPRINKLER SYSTEM CONSIDERATIONS

(Continued from page 3)

ment notification program to serve as a reminder of steps to take both prior to shutting down a system and upon completion of work. Information on the SPP fire impairment notification form is available [here](#).

In 2006, the NFPA reported that when sprinkler systems do operate they are 96% effective at extinguishing. For the remaining cases that were not effective, water did not reach the fire 55% of the time, 38% of systems failed to release enough water due to system damage, and a further 2% of systems had the water turned off before the fire was extinguished.

If we assume that the sprinkler system was designed and installed correctly to provide appropriate coverage, why are so many losses the result of water not reaching the fire? Obviously something has happened that interferes with the system's ability to cover a room when it is activated. One common item noted in the loss control inspection reports is that items are stored too close below the sprinkler heads. The minimum distance required in order for a sprinkler to create the full spray pattern and ensure complete coverage of the space is 45cm (18 inches). It is essential to maintain this distance below the sprinkler for it to be effective.

Consider inspecting your storage areas on a regular basis to ensure that the sprinkler heads are clear and unimpeded. This is close below the sprinkler head. Additionally, it may be useful to post an appropriate warning sign outside rooms where this is a problem.

Another common item reported in loss control inspection reports is missing ceiling tile. This is important to the sprinkler head's operation as a missing ceiling tile will allow a fire's heat to rise above the dropped ceiling and delay the heat build-up at the sprinkler head (delaying activation). The more time a fire has to build before the sprinkler head activates, the less likely the sprinkler system will be able to control the fire. Therefore, it is important that any time ceiling tiles are removed they be replaced again as soon as possible so that the sprinkler system will function as designed.

Sprinkler systems are an effective way of protecting buildings and people from fire. However, it is important to remember that when a sprinkler system is interfered with it is less likely to operate effectively. We can mitigate these risks by taking a few simple steps to ensure that our sprinklers will perform as designed.

SCHOOL SPORTS AND THE LAW: Meeting the Appropriate Standard of Care as a P.E. Instructor

Physical activities at school are a vital aspect of student life. Being active has many known benefits, including improved health and general wellbeing, increased coordination, the development of teamwork skills, and general fun and entertainment. Teachers play an invaluable role by engaging their students in physical activities. Cultivating active lifestyles can have lasting positive effects throughout people's lives.

Unfortunately, the potential for injury is inherent in all sports activities. In most instances, sports injuries are accepted as blameless accidents. On occasion, however, an injured person may allege the injury was the result of another person's negligence. In the school setting, when a student is injured in Physical Education (PE) or during a school sports team activity, he or she may sue the School District, arguing that the injuries were the result of the teacher or coach's negligence, and/or the negligence of other players.¹ By understanding the legal framework used to assess negligence claims in the school sports law context, physical education teachers and school coaches may ensure that their practices are in keeping with legal expectations.

1. It is important to note that section 94 of *The School Act* [1996] C. 412 protects teachers from being pursued individually in a lawsuit where there are allegations of negligence against them while caring out their duties as a teacher or school coach, unless the allegations are of **gross** negligence or malicious or wilful misconduct. Thus, where a student alleges that a school teacher was negligent, in almost all circumstances, the student will sue the School District, not the teacher. The teacher should not be a named defendant unless there are allegations of gross negligence or malicious or wilful misconduct.

SCHOOL SPORTS AND THE LAW: Meeting the Appropriate Standard of Care as a P.E. Instructor

(Continued from page 4)

The Standard of Care: The Careful or Prudent Parent

In the Supreme Court of Canada (“SCC”) case, *Myers v. Peel County Board of Education*² the SCC reviewed the legal criteria used to assess negligence where a student is injured in PE class. The SCC confirmed that *Thornton v. Board of School Trustees of School District No. 57 (Prince George)*³ set out the applicable standard of care:

P.E. teachers have a duty to take care of each student “in the manner of a reasonable and careful parent, taking into account the judicial modification of the reasonable-and-careful-parent test to allow for the larger-than-family size of the physical education class and the supraparental expertise commanded of [the instructor]....”⁴

Thornton provided the following additional guidelines for assessing the negligence of a PE teacher or school coach:

“It is not negligence or breach of the duty of care on the part of the school authorities to permit a pupil to undertake to perform a [physical activity]:

- *if it is suitable to [the student’s] age and condition (mental and physical);*
- *if [the student] is progressively trained and coached to do it properly and avoid the danger;*
- *if the equipment is adequate and suitably arranged; and*
- *if the performance, having regard to its inherently dangerous nature, is properly supervised.*

These are the component criteria constituting the appropriate duty or standard of care which is saddled upon the school authorities in a case of this kind and upon which we are to judge whether there has been observance sufficient for the school authorities to avoid a finding of negligence and its consequential liability.”⁵

In *Myers*, the SCC confirmed that while this was the appropriate criteria for assessing gymnasium accidents, it was not to be regarded as a code. The SCC indicated the test could not be applied in the same manner and to the same extent in all cases. Instead, the application would vary from case to case, depending upon:

- **the number of students being supervised at any given time;**
- **the nature of the exercise or activity in progress;**
- **the age and the degree of skill and training which the student may have received in connection with such activity;**
- **the nature and condition of the equipment in use at the time;**
- **the competency and capacity of the students involved; and**
- **a host of other matters which may be widely varied but which in a given case may affect the application of the prudent parent standard to the conduct of the school authority in the circumstances.**⁶

2. [1981] 2 SCR 21 In *Myers, supra*, a 15-year-old student fell while dismounting from gymnastics rings. As a result of the fall he was rendered a quadriplegic. The student had been permitted to practice with a student spotter, but without teacher supervision. The SCC held that there was a breach of the standard of care due to the lack of supervision, and the insufficient thickness of the crash mats. The student Myers was held to be partially responsible for his own injury (contributorily negligent) due to the fact that he dismounted when the spotter had moved away from the mat.

3. (1976), 73 D.L.R. (3d) 35 at 57-58 (B.C.C.A.) Gary Thornton was injured in Grade 10 P.E. class when he attempted an aerial front somersault off of a springboard. He was rendered a quadriplegic. The teacher was found to be negligent for failing to supervise, and for insufficient instruction.

4. *Thornton, supra*, para 71.

5. *Thornton, supra*, para 71.

6. *Myers, supra*, page 32

SCHOOL SPORTS AND THE LAW: Meeting the Appropriate Standard of Care as a P.E. Instructor

(Continued from page 5)

Recent B.C. Cases Considering the Law:

Two recent B.C. cases have considered the law as it relates to the required standard of care for PE teachers: *Hussack v. School District No. 33 (Chilliwack)* and *Hamilton v. School District No. 37(Delta)*.⁷

In *Hussack*, the School District was held liable for a student's injuries when he was hit on the bridge of the nose by another student's field hockey stick in a grade 7 PE class. The student had a history of chronic absenteeism which led him to miss most of the physical education classes prior to the day of the accident. He had missed all of the previous field hockey classes, during which the other students had been taught the building blocks of the game. The physical education teacher knew the student had a history of playing ice hockey, floor hockey and roller hockey, and believed that the skills he possessed would carry over into the game of field hockey. Due to this belief, the teacher allowed Mr. Hussack to participate in the game even though he had not taken part in any of the previous field hockey classes and had no previous field hockey experience. On the day of the accident, the teacher reminded all of the students to obey four basic rules: no hitting the ball with the back part of the stick, no using feet to touch the ball, no lifting the sticks above the knees and no checking from behind. Checking from behind meant players could not approach an opposing player from behind with the intention of taking the ball away.

After warming up, the students were assigned to four teams and sent to play round robin games while the teacher paced back and forth between the two separate fields, supervising. The injury occurred when Mr. Hussack and another student simultaneously broke two of the rules: Mr. Hussack back-checked at the same time that a fellow student lifted her stick above her knees. The other player's stick hit Mr. Hussack across the bridge of the nose.

The trial judge accepted the opinion of Mr. Hussack's field hockey expert, who indicated that it was unsafe for the student to have participated in the class without having the building blocks in place. The trial judge concluded that while all the other criteria from *Thornton* had been met, the student had not been progressively trained and that had he been, he would not have been injured. The trial judge did not accept that informing Mr. Hussack of the rule not to back check was sufficient.

Following on the heels of *Hussack*, was *Hamilton*, a case in which a student suffered an injury when she was hit on the nose by a fellow student's floor hockey stick. Ms. Hamilton argued that the teacher failed to require the class to wear protective gear, had not provided appropriate equipment, had not adequately reinforced rules, and had not provided adequate supervision. The judge rejected all of these arguments, finding all the criteria from *Thornton* were met. The judge noted: "Ms. Hamilton's injuries were certainly unfortunate. However, there is some risk of injury inherent generally in high school physical education activities and sports. The standard [the teacher] is required to meet is one of reasonableness, not perfection."

As these cases make clear, the criteria set out in *Thornton* and *Myers* will be applied to assess negligence in cases where a student who is injured during P.E. or a school sports team activity pursues a legal action. The test will be applied and considered on a case by case basis. By reviewing practices in light of these criteria, teachers will be better able to keep their students safe, and will be better able to demonstrate that their practices are safe, reasonable and appropriate.

Practical Tips:

- Choose activities that are age appropriate (e.g. field hockey may be appropriate for older children, but may not be the best choice for primary school children).
- Teach student skills progressively (teach the basic skills first and build on them).
- If a student has missed all the classes where building blocks were taught progressively, consider whether or not you think it is safe for the student to participate in the activity. (if you deem it to be unsafe, pick another activity for that student to do).

⁷ *Hussack v. School District No. 33(Chilliwack)* 2009 BCSC 852, affd on liability 2011 BCCA 258 2010 BCSC 71

(Continued on page 7)

SCHOOL SPORTS AND THE LAW: Meeting the Appropriate Standard of Care as a P.E. Instructor

(Continued from page 6)

- Ensure all equipment is in good repair and is appropriate for the activity (if pieces are broken, missing or ill-fitting, do not use them. If the equipment available is not in good repair, choose another activity).
- Ensure safety equipment is used where appropriate (e.g. back catchers in softball should wear properly fitted face protection).
- At the beginning of each class, always review general safety rules and reinforce rules of the game. Consider modified rules if appropriate.
- Always record attendance and keep attendance records.
- If you develop any written outlines for activities, keep copies.
- Provide appropriate levels of supervision.
- Ensure your practices comply with School District policies and any applicable guidelines (use Curriculum references, refer to any relevant District Policies)
- Know the procedures for attending to an injury and ensure injuries are reported to your Administrator.

WHAT TO DO WHEN FACED WITH A PROPERTY CLAIM

The beginning of the school year is a great time to review some of the basics of property claims. The simplest starting point when faced with a potential claim is to consider the following;

- Is the property covered?
- Is the event that caused the loss covered?
- What exclusions, if any, may apply?

The severity of the loss should be the deciding factor for your response. The very simple and low value claims that fall under the \$10,000.00 deductible should still be reported, but the School District can use its own discretion on how to address the issues. On the other hand, non-complex losses that will exceed that \$10,000.00 threshold, and the larger more severe losses, will require involvement of the SPP claims team.

It is imperative that SPP be notified as quickly as possible for all types of claims. Use of the online reporting system is generally preferred, but for a severe water or fire damage event please call the claims examiners immediately. Late reporting may prejudice our ability to determine cause, extent of related damages, and to ensure proper steps are being taken to minimize further damage and costs. If our position is prejudiced, your claim may be prejudiced as well.

While the sooner the better is always the best rule of thumb and we encourage you to initiate emergency clean up or bring in an accredited restoration services to assist, we do ask that you be sure to take steps to preserve any evidence that would help to prove the cause of the loss. In addition, photographs or video of the damage prior to the commencement of clean up is always recommended.

There may be some things you can do which will assist in the processing of your claim. The more information you have available, the more efficiently the SPP team can help you to bring your claim to completion. Here are examples of the types of information that may be requested after you have submitted your incident report:

- What was damaged? Is this real property owned by the School District?
- How did it occur? Damage by water, fire, theft, explosion, etc.

(Continued on page 8)

WHAT TO DO WHEN FACED WITH A PROPERTY CLAIM

(Continued from page 7)

- When did it occur?
- What is the estimated cost for repairs to damaged property? Have you obtained two quotes where applicable?
- Have photos of the damages been taken to support the claim file?
- Is there a known responsible party that has caused the damages? The information will be utilized for possible recovery of costs
- Is there involvement of local law enforcement? Police detachment, file number, and name of constable should be available upon request where applicable
- Have steps been taken to preserve the evidence? An adjuster/engineer may need to view a damaged item/equipment/machinery to be able to build a case for recovery of costs
- Have you begun to gather supporting documentation for your claim? For example;
 - original acquisition receipts
 - replacement receipts
 - repair quotes/invoices
 - building material invoices
 - summary tracking of labor costs

If it's a major loss, such as a major fire or water event, and it's after hours, you can call our main line for emergency contact to an on-call examiner 250-356-1794.

AVOIDING UNCERTAINTY IN POLICY AND CONTRACTS

This article (part 1 of 2) is reprinted with permission from the blog of Hilary Findlay of the Sport Law and Strategy Group (formerly the Centre for Sport and Law). The Sport Law and Strategy Group has been providing strategic insights into sport and law in Canada since 1992. Although written from the perspective of a sports organization, this information on drafting policies and contracts is equally applicable to Boards of Education.

We know ... writing and reading policy documents and contracts can be boring and tedious. I can attest to this as I have spent the last several months as a member of a team negotiating a collective bargaining agreement at a Canadian University. But these documents are important and they are essential elements of making the business of your organization happen. Policies guide the actions of our members, committees, boards and staffs and contracts are the way that we manage relationships with stakeholders, partners, suppliers and contractors. So don't turn away from this blog! It is not boring or tedious! It contains important information on how to make your drafting of documents better and your reading of them more discerning. This can only help you to be a better sport manager.

Uncertainty is a fact of modern life and we have all adapted to being managers and leaders in uncertain and complex times. But uncertainty in a contract or policy invites additional problems that can be avoided through careful drafting of policy and contract language. Ken Adams, who writes prolifically on legal drafting, says that uncertainty arises from six sources – *ambiguity, undue generality, inconsistency, redundancy, conflict and vagueness*. Often ambiguity, the first of the six sources is used as a catch all for the five sources of uncertainty. But all six are different, and to lump them together simply obscures the problem and does little to help a manager improve his or her own drafting skills. (*Redundancy, conflict and vagueness will be addressed in the Spring 2012 issue of Risk Ed.*)

AMBIGUITY

Something is ambiguous if it is capable of conveying two or more meanings. Ambiguity can arise from several sources. One is the order in which words and phrases appear. I have become very familiar with this as part of my current role in negotiating the collective bargaining agreement. The process requires that we negotiate by putting forward versions of the proposed contract language for the collective agreement. One word, or even one comma, misplaced can change the whole meaning of a contract clause! To illustrate how something so little can have an

(Continued on page 9)

AVOIDING UNCERTAINTY IN POLICY AND CONTRACTS

(Continued from page 8)

effect so large, but without going into details, in the year 2000 the status of a very well-known national team athlete with the Canadian Olympic team turned entirely on the improper placement of a two-letter word in the Standard Operating Procedures of the Canadian anti-doping policy in effect at that time.

A second source of ambiguity arises where there is not sufficient context given so as to interpret certain words. As noted by Adams, “ambiguity generally passes unnoticed during the drafting process”. Think of times you may have thought you made something crystal clear only to have someone see it from a totally different vantage point – one that you hadn’t considered. Having someone else review documents before release will often catch some of this ambiguity.

GENERALITY

Sometimes a clause is drafted so generally that it catches far more than was ever intended. For example, don’t refer to “all team members” if you are meaning only athletes and coaches – because “all team members” could include team leaders, managers and support personnel in addition to athletes and coaches.

This almost happened in our negotiations and we had to quickly retract a certain proposal. The generality of our language led to serious consequences when it was applied beyond what we had intended. Our general language caused confusion in the eyes of the membership as to what we had originally intended.

INCONSISTENCY

Inconsistency in drafting comes from employing one word or phrase to convey two different meanings or, the same meaning. We have witnessed many policy disputes as a result of the inconsistent use of terms:

- Do “tournament” and “championship” mean the same thing?
- Do “results” and “performance” and “ranking” mean the same thing? Likely not.

As a general rule, it is best to just use a single term, and define it if you can. We also suggest avoiding saying the same thing twice, in different places, in one document. Doing this just invites inconsistency.

Inconsistency also arises where one clause contradicts or creates uncertainty with the meaning of another clause. This usually happens because an existing policy or agreement is amended to address a new or different situation, and in making this amendment no effort was made to be sure that the amendment did not have repercussions through the rest of the document. In the extreme some documents or policies exhibit what we call the topsy-turvy effect – there has been so much added to it over time, in little bits and pieces, but these additional provisions have never been reconciled with the rest of the document or with other documents, with the result that the whole thing becomes unbalanced and unworkable. In this case the only way forward is to start over with a clean slate.

NEIGHBORHOOD LEARNING CENTRES

In collaboration with the Ministry of Education, the Schools Protection Program has developed a series of materials which are designed to assist Districts interested in developing Neighbourhood Learning Centres in the communities they serve. Working together and sharing facilities makes good sense but takes a bit of work. There are a number of things that need to be thought through to make sure the arrangement meets everyone’s needs. A shared use agreement formalizes these arrangements between schools and community groups and/or other organizations. The process does not have to be long and complicated, it should be scaled to the complexity of the arrangement that you are putting in place. For example, making an agreement for a sports league to use a school gym on Monday evenings should be relatively quick and easy; one for a private daycare centre to operate in the school would take more time; one for reciprocal joint use of all school district and community recreation facilities perhaps even more time.

You can find the new materials under the General Tab on the front page of the SPP website (www.bcspp.org). You do not need a password to access these documents. Additional information on Neighbourhood Learning Centres is available on the Ministry of Education’s website at www.neighbourhoodlearningcentres.gov.bc.ca.

About Our Organization...

We are the Client Services Team for the Schools Protection Program (SPP). SPP is a self-insurance program funded by the School Districts. The Program is housed within the office of the Risk Management Branch and Government Security Office of the Ministry of Finance, which also has responsibility for similar programs such as the Health Care Protection Program, and the University, College & Institute Protection Program. As part of the services of our Program, we provide risk management and claims and litigation management services to SPP member entities including all School Districts.

RiskEd is published two times a year by the Schools Protection Program

Our Team of Professionals

Andrew Green – Director, Client Services (250) 952-0785
andrew.green@gov.bc.ca

Janet Hoefler – Senior Risk Management Consultant (250) 952-0851
janet.hoefler@gov.bc.ca

Suzanne Armour – Senior Risk Management Consultant (250) 952-0864
suzanne.armour@gov.bc.ca

Lori Watson – Risk Management Consultant (250) 356-6111
lori.watson@gov.bc.ca

Margo Piikkila – Senior Claims Examiner (250) 952.0842
margo.piikkila@gov.bc.ca

Kirsten Coupe—Senior Claims Examiner/Legal Counsel (250) 356-5578
kirsten.coupe@gov.bc.ca

Robert Flett—Claims Examiner (250) 952-0834
roberta.flett@gov.bc.ca

In addition to the core Education Team above, UCIPP continues to rely on the expertise of many individuals within the Risk Management Branch including:

Kim Oldham, Director, Claims and Litigation Management
 (250) 952-0837 kim.oldham@gov.bc.ca

Shaun Fynes, Chief Security Officer, Government Security Office
 (250) 387-0522 shaun.fynes@gov.bc.ca

CONTACT INFORMATION

MAILING ADDRESS:
 PO Box 3586
 Victoria BC V8W 3W6

PHONE:
 (250) 356-1794

FAX:
 (250) 356-6222

CLAIMS FAX:
 (250) 356-0661

E-MAIL:
Protection.program@bc spp.org

We're on the Web!
 See us at:
www.bcspp.org

It should be clearly understood that this document and the information contained within is not legal advice and is provided for guidance from a risk management perspective only. It is not intended as a comprehensive or exhaustive review of the law and readers are advised to seek independent legal advice where appropriate.