

From: Christine Payne <chpayne@RRC.CA>
Sent: Friday, September 05, 2014 9:23 AM
To: Richard Lennon; Kimberly G Jasper
Cc: Kathi Gudmandson; David Rew; Conor Lloyd; kknight@ictam.ca; Robert L.J. Buisson
Subject: RE: FW: Marble

Good morning,

Conor, Rob and I had a conversation this morning and it is our recommendation that unless we have access to the report, we cannot provide advice on messaging. Without reading the report, we would be speculative in our communications advice.

We await your reply. We are available to discuss at your convenience.

Regards,
Christine

From: Richard Lennon [mailto:richard.lennon@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 05, 2014 8:22 AM
To: Kimberly G Jasper
Cc: Christine Payne; Kathi Gudmandson; David Rew; Conor Lloyd; kknight@ictam.ca; Robert L.J. Buisson
Subject: Re: FW: Marble

Good morning,

I've spoken again with [redacted] who was the investigator responsible for the report to confirm a number of details. I also had a conversation with [redacted] the lawyer who acted for the board in the agreement with SF and who had reviewed [redacted] report at the time.

[redacted] indicated the policy was not verified because the individual responsible was away and documents that might confirm policy compliance could not be located in that person's absence.

Robin is not a communications expert, but suggests we say as little as possible. We only have partial answers to these questions and there is not much to go on. We can refer to the confidentiality of HR matters and to the Province's review. We might get some bad press saying we won't comment, but confirming any of these details may fuel this for longer than we'd like. If we do go down the path of discussing details publicly, Robin suggests we should likely share with SF's lawyer.

So to Katie Nicholson and Colin Craig, can we decline comment on specific allegations while the provincial review is ongoing? We can perhaps reiterate that all relevant factors were considered by the board in its agreement with Ms. Forsyth to end her employment as President.

Richard

On Thu, Sep 4, 2014 at 4:26 PM, Richard Lennon <richard.lennon@gmail.com> wrote:
All good questions. Any suggestions to offer, Kim?

46

Some quick responses -

The report stated there is marble in the residence from PGI but that it was unable to determine if policies were broken due to lack of documentation. The report does not say no wrongdoing occurred so we cannot use that as an answer. It also did not confirm any wrongdoing.

At the very least, we should say today that the college did not pay for installation/construction of marble in SF's residence. Whether intended for disposal or not will be important to include because I think there is a difference in the public eye regarding this.

We do not have a listed amount of marble or a valuation of the marble.

The province is prepared to respond re the review.

Richard

On Thu, Sep 4, 2014 at 3:40 PM, Kimberly G Jasper <kJasper@rre.ca> wrote:

Christine, Rob and I find this problematic. There is no context for this story. It is indecisive/wishy washy and unconvincing. (possible media questions are below.)

1. Is there marble in the house from PGI? if so, how much and has this fact been verified by the investigator or a third party. (remember, her home and photos are on MLS listing with a fair bit of counters and backsplashes visible – with a before and after comparison of the house before and after the renovation on two different listings from different time periods);
2. Her indication that this was marked for disposal is not verified by a third party and therefore, not a credible answer.
3. Has or had it been valued? Marble is highly expensive, even in small quantities.
4. Why couldn't there be a straightforward answer regarding whether there was a breach of policy? Why is it inconclusive? Does it need to be reviewed? Is the policy currently obtuse? How old is it? (BTW: 1997 is the last policy... why hasn't it been updated?)
5. Could this be deemed to be a criminal act if the value is, indeed, high?
6. If the report says that no wrongdoing has occurred, then that is the answer we need to use.
7. If this investigative report has been forwarded to the government, what is the govt's responsibility at this point? Will it be part of the public response regarding the review?

Kim Jasper

CHIEF ADVANCEMENT OFFICER