



# SBCI UPDATE

March 2011

NEWSLETTER

## MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIR

Let me first invite you to SBCI's Annual General Meeting on April 8 at the Hilton, Garden Inn in Vaughan. As members of the Co-operative, it is your organization, and we would be delighted to have as many members as possible attend the AGM. It is a good opportunity to ask questions of the Board of Directors and senior staff. The information package for the AGM has been sent to all members.

The SBCI Board of Directors has been working on a Strategic Plan for the Co-operative, looking at the next 2-3 years. One initiative that we have approved is to investigate whether any of SBCI's services should be offered to other organizations besides Ontario school boards. We have asked that market research be conducted by staff, and that a business case be presented to the Board for each viable expansion route.

After 11 years, SBCI will be moving from its present offices in Concord to a larger space in Richmond Hill. Our lease expires at the end of April and staff have spent a considerable amount of time in securing office space that will meet the needs of the organization today and into the future. This has been accomplished at an annual cost that is less than we currently pay. We anticipate that this will occur in late April and that we can transfer our phone numbers, unchanged. The staff will be letting everyone know, nearer the time of the address and any other changing contact information. Good luck in the packing and the move!

I am pleased to announce that Sylvie David has joined SBCI as Data Management Assistant, working as key bilingual support for Melissa Hewit who has taken over the area responsible for our Parklane system. But also, Melissa, herself, will be going on maternity leave

in May and we are very fortunate in that Anne Huska has agreed to cover for Melissa's maternity leave on a 3-day per week basis. Anne, as most of you will know, recently retired from District School Board of Niagara, where she was Disability Manager for many years. Our very best wishes to Melissa, and to Anne and Sylvie.

Finally, I draw your attention to the Regional Workshops that we are holding in the second quarter of 2011. Later in this Newsletter, there is an article regarding these workshops, and I encourage you to read the article and to attend one of the sessions.

If you have any questions, comments or ideas regarding the Co-operative, please give me a call or send me an email. Our aim is always to improve the services that we provide to you. I can be reached at [Gerry\\_thuss@hpcdsb.edu.on.ca](mailto:Gerry_thuss@hpcdsb.edu.on.ca) or on (519)345-2440 X330.

## TRAUMATIC MENTAL STRESS DECISION

With SBCI's assistance, one of our member school boards was recently successful in an appeal of a complicated and costly Traumatic Mental Stress (TMS) claim.

The case in question involved a custodian who developed a significant mental health condition that she claimed resulted from various events involving a co-worker over several months that constituted, in her view, harassment by the co-worker. Some of the events noted by the claimant included blocking her path in hallways, inappropriate touching, threatening the claimant's job security and preventing her exit from a custodial room by blocking a doorway. The school board completed an internal investigation of the claimant's complaints but found no evidence of intentional or unintentional harassment.

The claimant submitted a claim for TMS to the WSIB, which considered the claim and ultimately allowed it, determining that the entitlement criteria of the TMS Policy (WSIB Operational Policy 15-03-02) were met on the basis that the worker perceived that she was being harassed and placed in a life-threatening situation.

SBCI appealed the initial entitlement decision on the school board's behalf. Our appeal questioned the allowance of the claim based on the worker's perception of her situation, which we argued was inconsistent with the intent of the policy that requires objective evidence of a traumatic event in keeping with those identified in the policy. An oral hearing was requested, however, the worker advised the Appeals Resolution Officer (ARO) that she would not participate in the hearing. As a result, the ARO proceeded with a review of the file

IN THIS ISSUE	
Message from the Chair	1
Traumatic Mental Stress Decision	1
The importance of determining a disabled employee's ability to perform essential duties	2
Actuarial Update	3
Coverage while on Union Business	3
SBCI Regional Workshops 2011	4
WSIB's New Work Reintegration Policies	4
Bill 168 Refresher	4
Rappel aux conseils scolaires concernant le Bill 168	5
Update on the Tony Dean Report	5
What triggers the Duty to Accommodate?	6
SBCI Board of Directors	7
SBCI Staff	7
Dates of Meetings	7

evidence and confirmed the WSIB allowance of the claim.

Our appeal proceeded to the Tribunal and a hearing was eventually held in October 2010. The worker elected not to participate in the hearing, but was represented by a CUPE National Representative.

As we had noted in past appeals, the crux of our arguments before the Tribunal was that the events that the worker perceived as traumatic were, in fact, not traumatic and were situations completely misinterpreted by the claimant. To support this thesis, we brought forward 2 witnesses, the school board employee who investigated the harassment complaint and the co-worker who was alleged to have harassed the worker.

The school board employee testified to the content of his internal investigation report and the investigation of each alleged event reported by the claimant. This investigation concluded that the events reported by the claimant did not constitute harassment.

The co-worker provided direct testimony regarding his working relationship with the claimant. He acknowledged that some of the events detailed by the worker did occur, but that the context in which she perceived the events was incorrect. He provided reasonable explanations for all the complaints identified by the worker. He denied any inappropriate touching and stated that some of the events described by the worker, like blocking her way were done in a joking manner and that he would do these types of things to other employees and students. He acknowledged as well that at the time of the worker's complaints he was having difficulties with the school principal and would discuss his concerns with the claimant, speaking with her on one occasion in the custodial room for an extended period of time, which was the event the claimant identified as the precipitating cause of her illness.

The Tribunal called a 3<sup>rd</sup> witness, a co-worker of both the claimant and our witness. The Tribunal's witness provided testimony related to the character of the alleged harasser. She characterized him as a harmless joker who would sometimes take the joke too far. She testified that she

considered him a friend, who would stop his behaviour when told. She testified as well that she and the claimant had one lengthy conversation regarding the co-worker in which they discussed his work habits and cleaning, which was not to their standards. Beyond that the witness was not aware of the claimant's other complaints.

In our summation and review of the case evidence and testimony we submitted that the claimant's incorrect perception of the events was the injuring process and not the events themselves. We argued that the claimant's version of the events was not reliable given her perception of them, and that the described events did not meet the objectively traumatic threshold of the WSIA and WSIB Operational Policy, noting the testimony provided by the witnesses in this case. To support our arguments, we referenced previous Tribunal decisions which define objectively traumatic and which note that there is no basis for entitlement for a perceived event.

In their assessment of the evidence, the Tribunal Panel agreed that WSIB policy requires that the injuring process for entitlement to TMS must be "objectively" traumatic. By this, the Panel noted that "the subject event(s) must be traumatic, when considered, not from the unique perspective of the worker, but when considered from a perspective which is independent of the worker's personal feelings and experience".

The Panel found that there was no objective evidence that the co-worker ever threatened the worker's employment or that he had approached her in a hostile manner. The Panel indicated that the claimant's perception of the events suggested that she had a distorted view of what constitutes harassment. In several respects the Panel found that the claimant's description of the relevant events was unreliable. The Panel determined that the facts of what occurred were consistent with the conclusions of the employer's investigation of the complaints.

In their assessment of the factual evidence the Panel found that the workplace events did not constitute an objectively traumatic injuring process. The Panel determined

that the claimant was not entitled to benefits for Traumatic Mental Stress.

As a result of this decision, the entitlement granted in the claim has been overturned and the costs of the claim will be credited back to the school board. A copy of the full WSIAT decision (Decision No. 2489/09) can be accessed at the following link: <http://www.wsiat.on.ca/tracITDecisions/2011/2489%2009.pdf>

## **THE IMPORTANCE OF DETERMINING A DISABLED EMPLOYEE'S ABILITY TO PERFORM ESSENTIAL DUTIES**

Determining whether or not a disabled employee can perform their pre-disability essential duties is one of the most critical decisions in the disability management process for many reasons. The weight of this decision drives the nature of the employer's obligation to accommodate to the point of undue hardship in terms of offering either the pre-disability job or alternate available employment. It is also the critical first step in determining if an employee can continue to work and maintain their career. Additionally, the decision determines if continuing access to sick leave benefits is warranted. And finally, the decision helps to determine if an employee should be thinking about applying for Long-Term Disability (LTD) benefits. Therefore, this decision must be made carefully each time medical information is received from an employee and the decision should be supported with a clear, documented rationale and communicated in writing to the employee.

Most of the time, when people are absent from work for an extended period due to a physical or mental health condition, they make a full recovery and resume their career without the need for accommodations. However, when they have presented medically supported restrictions and limitations, the employer must now consider if the employee can return to or maintain their current occupation without accommodations or with accommodations.

First, the Disability Management Coordinator (DMC) needs to identify the essential duties of the employee's position. SBCI's *RTW Guidebook* offers a

great starting point, as it includes a listing of essential duties for various school board positions. The DMC then compares the employee's restrictions to the essential duties and identifies which of them might be a challenge for the employee to perform. At this point, the physical and/or cognitive demands associated with those essential duties should be compared to the employee's medically supported restrictions and limitations. Where the physical demands exceed the employee's restrictions, the DMC determines if accommodations can be made, often in collaboration with the employee, Principal/Supervisor and union representative. Possible accommodations must be considered to determine if they cause an undue hardship in terms of quantifying costs, assessing health and safety risks, if any, and inquiring about any outside sources of funding that may be available.

Once satisfied that the employee can be accommodated to perform their essential duties, the employee can be provided with a written offer and a Return to/Stay at Work Plan to help the employee maintain their career and reduce the need for sick leave benefits.

If it is determined that the employee cannot perform their essential duties due to a temporary disability, then a short-term RTW Plan may be considered with the goal of resuming the pre-disability job. If the employee does not progress as expected, the Plan should be reconsidered or even suspended. Updated medical information should be requested to assist in determining next steps, such as applying for LTD.

If the employee has a permanent disability, and cannot perform the essential duties of their position even with accommodation, this decision should be communicated to the employee and the school board should then look for an *available alternate* position for which the employee has or can gain the skills to perform. If or when such a position is available, determine if the employee can perform that job's essential duties with or without accommodation. If so, it should be offered to the employee in writing. If no alternate work is available for these permanently disabled employees then SBCI can assist our clients with identifying appropriate options to present

to an employee in clarifying the employee's employment status.

Without following these steps to determine if an employee can perform their essential duties, the school board does not know which obligation they have or when they need to meet their obligations to the employee. By following these steps, the school board can ensure it has done its due diligence to best support its employee, comply with its duty to accommodate, and thus minimize the impact of disability to the employee and the school board.

## **ACTUARIAL UPDATE**

---

### **2009-10 Sick Leave Utilization Study**

The study is underway with over 50 confirmed participants. Preliminary results for individual boards will be sent out at the end of March and we expect to complete the final aggregate and benchmarking results by the end of April.

If you would like to participate in the study it is not too late to submit your 2009-10 data. For more information please contact Wendy Achoy at [wendy@sbc.org](mailto:wendy@sbc.org) or 1 800 361 3516 Ext 238.

### **2010-11 PSAB Reporting on Future Benefits**

Some thoughts as we head into the year end preparation.

### **Are you due for your triennial full valuation to be completed this year?**

Your last actuarial report should indicate when it is expected to occur.

### **Have there been any plan changes decided on or implemented in 2009-10, that recognizes past service?**

This includes plan improvements, curtailments i.e. significant reduction in benefit provisions, or plan terminations.

The past service liability, may have to be recognized in 2010-11. Please call to discuss.

### **Have you sent your data in for 2009-10?**

More than likely, if you are due for a full valuation this year, it is to be performed as at August 31, 2010, and we would need data, as at that date, for each of your benefits. To help us get an early start on the valuation, please send us the data, which is already available, as soon as possible, if you haven't done so already.

### **Is your Student Transportation Consortium a separate legal entity, with its own employees, who are entitled to accumulated sick days, retirement gratuities or any other future benefit?**

Your consortium may need to have the liability for these benefits actuarially determined, particularly if past service and/or accumulated sick banks from the original school board employer are being recognized for these benefits.

## **COVERAGE WHILE ON UNION BUSINESS**

---

Clarification from the WSIB regarding coverage for School Board Employees while on Union Business is as follows:

### Coverage While Employed by the Union

Union officials, staff and members will be considered employees of the Union for WSIB purposes, providing they are engaged in Union business, paid directly by the Union and under the control and supervision of the Union at the time of the injury.

### Coverage While Employed By the School Board

Union officials, staff and members who are being paid by the School Board and are conducting Union related activities while under the control and supervision of the school board will be considered employees of the school board for WSIB purposes.

### Special Application

A person will be considered to be an employee of the Union when he/she temporarily leaves the school board's employment to engage in Union business

and is then working under the direct supervision and control of the Union at the time of the injury, but continues to be paid by the school board with the understanding that the Union will reimburse the school board.

### General Application

Unions are not automatically covered under the compensation system. The Union must have made application for compensation coverage prior to the injury for claims to be allowed where the person is considered an employee of the Union.

## **SBCI REGIONAL WORKSHOPS - 2011**

---

In 2010 SBCI put on a two-day Conference that featured presentations from SBCI staff and guests on topics dealing with Health & Safety, WSIB, Attendance Support and Actuarial Services. For 2011 SBCI is putting a number of regional workshops on the following dates and locations:

- April 8 (Kingston) hosted by Limestone District School Board
- April 15 (Ottawa) for French language school boards hosted by Conseil des écoles publiques de l'Est de l'Ontario
- April 18 (GTA) hosted by Durham District School Board
- April 19 (London) hosted by Thames Valley District School Board
- May 11 (Thunder Bay) hosted by Thunder Bay Catholic District School Board

The agenda for the Regional Training is as follows:

### **9:30 AM – 11:00 AM**

#### **WSIB Work Reintegration Policies**

- Overview of New Policies
- Commentary/informal presentation from WSIB Manager
- Case Studies and Discussion

### **11:00 AM – 11:15 AM (B R E A K)**

### **11:15 AM – 12:30 PM**

#### **Health & Safety**

- Smart Start
- Principal H&S Training Kit
- “Dashboard” – enhanced H&S stats

### **12:30 PM – 1:00 PM (L U N C H)**

### **1:00 PM – 2:30 PM**

#### **Some Important Legal Considerations in Attendance Support**

- Legal and practical considerations for implementing an Attendance Management Programme
- Key legal considerations for accommodating mental health issues. Is stress a disability?

### **2:30 PM – 2:45 PM**

#### **Questions & Other Business**

SBCI also would like to do one session by video conference so that school board officials who can not make an in person event or are unable to make the event in their region will still be able to participate in the workshop. Further details on a video conference session will be made available as soon as that is arranged.

If you have any questions concerning the Regional Workshops please contact [chris@sbc.org](mailto:chris@sbc.org).

## **WSIB'S NEW WORK REINTEGRATION POLICIES**

---

After a multi-year review and numerous consultations, the WSIB has implemented five new policies, which replace the following:

- Early and safe return to work
- Re-employment
- Labour Market Re-entry

Under the new policies the WSIB takes on a more active role with regards to early and safe return to work with new timelines being imposed to meet with the workplace parties at the employer's worksite no later than 12 weeks into a claim where the worker has capabilities but is not at work. New guidelines are now in place on what is considered suitable employment and sustainable employment as well as new penalties to enforce worker and employer cooperation. The WSIB will be taking a more rigorous

review in situations where employers claim that no suitable employment is available. In essence, the WSIB will in effect be enforcing the tenets of the *Duty to Accommodate* found in the *Ontario Human Rights Code*. In addition, work reintegration (which replaces LMR) has a greater focus on maintaining the relationship between injured worker and employer. A new feature found in the new policies is Training on the Job (TOJ). The WSIB will sponsor TOJ at an employer's worksite anywhere from four to 26 weeks.

What school boards should be aware of is that the WSIB's new Work Reintegration Specialists have been given the mandate to be very forceful in demanding meetings with very little notice given and making demands on employers. This was not previously the case. These demands include having the right to request a full listing of jobs in order to influence employers to return injured workers to jobs that in the past would have been seen to be outside the scope of the return to work process. Work Transition and Work Reintegration will also give workers greater say in job retraining. The WSIB may also offer to relocate workers when appropriate in order to ensure a successful return to work.

The new policies took effect December 1, 2010 and on behalf of our school board members, SBCI made a submission in mid-February providing our feedback and suggestions for improvement. The submission was shared with all of our boards.

## **BILL 168 REFRESHER**

---

Bill 168 – The Ontario government bill amended the Occupational Health and Safety Act to include workplace violence and workplace harassment. The duties to employers were greatly enhanced to ensure employees were protected from the potential of violence and harassment in the workplace. This amendment has been in place since June 15, 2010.

### **Requirements for School Boards**

1. School boards are required to develop written policies with respect to both workplace violence and workplace harassment which must be reviewed annually.

2. School boards must develop and maintain programmes to implement the policies and to deal with incidents and complaints of workplace violence and harassment.
3. School boards must assess the risk of workplace violence that may arise from the nature of the workplace, the type of work or the conditions of work. The programme developed to implement the workplace violence policy must include measures and procedures to control the risks identified in the assessment. This assessment needs to be shared with your organization's Health and Safety Committee.
4. School boards must take every reasonable precaution to protect the worker, when the employer becomes aware or ought reasonably to be aware, that domestic violence would likely expose a worker to physical injury in the workplace.
5. School boards must provide a worker with information and instruction on the contents of the workplace violence policy and programme and the workplace harassment policy and programme.
6. School boards must provide workers with means to summon immediate assistance when workplace violence occurs.
7. School boards must report to JHSC within 4 days when an act of violence occurs.

SBCI created the Workplace Violence Prevention Guide as a tool to aid School Boards in developing their specific violence and harassment programmes. Many boards are having Ministry of Labour orders to put in place appropriate processes and provide the necessary instruction for employees on their violence prevention programme. The guide will aid in compliance in many areas and if your board is struggling please contact your Health and Safety Specialist at SBCI for assistance.

## **RAPPEL AUX CONSEILS SCOLAIRES CONCERNANT LE BILL 168**

---

Bill 168 – Le gouvernement de l'Ontario a amendé la *Loi sur la santé et la sécurité au travail* pour inclure une section sur la violence et le harcèlement sur les lieux de travail. Cet amendement affecte grandement la responsabilité des employeurs qui leur demande d'assurer que les travailleurs sont protégés des risques potentiels de violence ou de harcèlement sur le lieu de travail. Cet amendement est en vigueur depuis le 15 juin 2010.

### Exigences pour les conseils scolaires

1. Les conseils scolaires doivent développer deux politiques écrites, soit une sur le harcèlement au travail et une sur la violence au travail. Elles doivent être revues annuellement.
2. Les conseils scolaires doivent évaluer les risques potentiels de violence au travail qui peuvent découler de la nature du lieu de travail, du genre de travail et des conditions de travail. Les résultats de cette évaluation doivent être partagés avec votre ou vos comités mixtes de santé et de sécurité au travail.
3. Les conseils scolaires doivent développer et maintenir des programmes pour la mise en œuvre de ces politiques ainsi que des mesures pour gérer les incidents et les plaintes reliés à la violence ou au harcèlement survenus sur le lieu de travail. Ces programmes doivent aussi inclure les mesures et procédures mises en place pour contrôler les risques identifiés dans l'évaluation.
4. Les conseils scolaires doivent prendre toutes les précautions raisonnables pour la protection des travailleurs lorsqu'ils prennent connaissance ou devraient raisonnablement avoir connaissance du fait qu'il peut se produire, dans le lieu de travail, de la violence familiale susceptible d'exposer un travailleur à un préjudice corporel.
5. Les conseils scolaires doivent fournir aux travailleurs l'information et la formation sur le contenu des politiques et des programmes de prévention en place

sur la violence et le harcèlement au travail.

6. Les conseils scolaires doivent fournir aux travailleurs les mesures pour obtenir une aide immédiate lorsqu'il se produit ou est susceptible de se produire de la violence au travail.
7. Les conseils scolaires doivent informer le CMSST dans les 4 jours suivant un acte de violence survenu au travail.

SBCI a un Guide de prévention de la violence au travail pour aider les conseils scolaires a développé leurs propres programmes de prévention de la violence et de harcèlement. Depuis la mise en vigueur de cette Loi, plusieurs conseils scolaires de l'Ontario ont reçu des ordres du ministère du Travail de mettre en place des processus appropriés d'intervention et de formation pour du personnel sur le programme de prévention en place. Ce guide est un outil pour aider aux conseils scolaires à se conformer aux différentes exigences de cette Loi.

Si votre conseil scolaire éprouve des difficultés dans la mise en place d'un tel programme de prévention, n'hésitez pas à communiquer avec votre spécialiste en santé et sécurité de SBCI.

## **UPDATE ON THE TONY DEAN REPORT**

---

On December 16, 2010, the Expert Advisory Panel on Occupational Health and Safety tabled its Report and Recommendations to the Minister of Labour ("Report") on ways to improve workplace health and safety in Ontario. As recommended by the Report, the government announced the creation of a Chief Prevention Officer position, which will be tasked with ensuring effective health and safety services and enforcement at workplaces throughout Ontario.

The panel, chaired by Tony Dean, professor in the School of Public Policy and Governance at the University of Toronto, made a number of additional recommendations, including the following:

- tracking the performance of workplaces and sectors through

enhanced information gathering and sharing methods;

- providing recognition and incentives for high-performing employers;
- increasing stakeholder involvement in the development of regulations;
- providing training to improve foundational knowledge on the rights and responsibilities of workers and supervisors;
- enhanced training and the establishment of minimum standards for high-risk activities such as working at heights in the construction industry;
- increasing penalties where standards for training, supervision and the provision and use of safety equipment are not met;
- targeted outreach to non-English speaking workers;
- increased collaboration and integration between agencies delivering health and safety services; and
- enhancement of enforcement tools for health and safety inspectors.

The government will determine how best to implement the panel's remaining recommendations. The Ministry of Labour is holding consultation but has accepted all the recommendations. The impact on school boards will be like other employers, but the need for mandatory safety training for supervisors/principals to deem them competent, will be an additional responsibility for school boards. SBCI will be working to ensure we have programmes that aid in this area.

## **WHAT TRIGGERS THE DUTY TO ACCOMMODATE?**

Traditionally, employers began the accommodation process once a disabled employee identified that they had a disability requiring accommodation.

In essence this makes sense, as the Ontario Human Rights Code stipulates that the duty to accommodate arises when an employer has *knowledge* that an employee has a disability requiring accommodation. However, it is important to note that there are two possible ways in which that knowledge can come about: 1. when an employee has identified that they have a disability requiring accommodation and requests said accommodation; or 2. when an employer has 'constructive knowledge' of an employee's possible disability.

In the first scenario, the onus is on the employee to identify their need for workplace accommodation due to disability and to provide supporting medical documentation indicating their restrictions and limitations. The following example supports this premise: In the *United Nurses of Alberta, Loc 33 v. Capital Health Authority* case, a nurse was denied a request for accommodation because the medical information neither indicated any underlying disability requiring accommodation, nor did it provide any link between the symptoms and the accommodation requested. The arbitrator determined that the medical evidence did not establish that the employee suffered from a disability and was therefore insufficient to trigger the employer's duty to accommodate. Upon appeal, the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench upheld the arbitrator's conclusion.

In the second scenario, the onus is placed on the employer to investigate a potential disability situation further and/or initiate the accommodation process if it has 'constructive knowledge' of an employee's condition. 'Constructive knowledge' means that an employer either knew or ought to have known that something was wrong with the employee. In the Alberta case of *UFCW, Loc 401 v. Canada Safeway*, an arbitration board reinstated a grocery clerk whose employment was terminated due to poor performance. Although the employee did not request workplace accommodation, the arbitrators determined that the termination was discriminatory because the employer did not make appropriate inquiries in response to tell-tale signs and bizarre behaviour on the employee's part, which demonstrated that the employee suffered from mental illness. In this

particular case, the arbitrators made note that the employee's behaviour was so bizarre that 'an observer need not be a psychologist or psychiatrist to realize that the grievor was probably mentally disabled.'

At the end of the day, arbitrators recognize that while employees are obligated to provide the employer with sufficient information during the search for accommodation, the employer is responsible for initiating the accommodation process. Arbitrators agree that a lack of knowledge will not protect an employer from liability. Therefore, employers cannot ignore or turn a blind eye to circumstances which should lead them to investigate further before taking action, particularly in the situation of a possible link between poor job performance and a potential disability.

Supreme Court Justice, John Sopinka, summarized it best in the *Central Okanagan School District No 23 v. Renaud (1992)* decision: "...ordinarily the employer, who has charge of the workplace, will be in the better position to formulate accommodations. The employer, therefore, can be expected to initiate the process."

SBCI provides the framework for identifying employees who may require workplace accommodation due to disability through its Attendance Support Programme. For further information on how we can assist your board, please contact Cheryl Luke, Attendance Support Practice Leader at: [Cheryl@sbc.org](mailto:Cheryl@sbc.org).

## **SBCI BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

Gerry Thuss (Chair)  
Lynda Coulter (Vice Chair)  
Ronald Bender  
Carolyn Miljan  
Mark Musca  
John O'Connor  
Maura Quish  
Roger Richard  
Mary Lynn Schauer  
Anna Sequeira

## **DATES OF MEETING**

Board of Directors (*April 7, 2011*)  
Annual General Meeting (*April 8, 2011*)  
Board of Directors (*May 13, 2011*)

## **SBCI STAFF**

*Brian Brown*, Chief Executive Officer  
*Lynn Porplycia*, Chief Operating Officer  
*Wendy Achoy*, Chief Actuary  
*Joe Huang*, Actuarial Analyst  
*Ellen Xu*, Actuarial Analyst  
*Mary Luck*, Senior Claims Manager  
*Darlene Iwaszko*, Claims Manager  
*Christopher James*, Claims Manager & Lawyer  
*Kelly Melanson*, Claims Manager  
*Robert Orrico*, Claims Manager  
*Louise Bellamy*, Financial/Office Coordinator  
*Lina Gallo*, Executive Assistant  
*Natasha Sylge*, Administrative Assistant  
*Melissa Hewit*, Supervisor, Data Management  
*Anne Huska*, (Acting) Supervisor, Data Management  
*Sylvie David*, Data Management Assistant  
*Emma Sachs*, Bilingual Data Entry Clerk  
*Helene Thomson*, Bilingual Data Entry Clerk  
*Rolly Montpellier*, Marketing Consultant  
*Robbin Lavoie*, Senior Health & Safety Specialist  
*Christina Bick*, Health & Safety Specialist  
*France Germain*, Health & Safety Consultant  
*Cheryl Luke*, Attendance Support Practice Leader  
*Byron Franson*, Attendance Support Consultant  
*Kathleen Gratton*, Attendance Support Consultant  
*Shoba Thomas*, Bilingual Attendance Support Consultant  
*Patrick Gani*, Senior Programmer Analyst