From: David Rew <DRew@RRC.CA>
Sent: Friday, September 05, 2014 6:15 AM
To: Kimberly G Jasper
Cc: Christine Payne; David Rew
Subject: Re: Marble

One element concerns me, reading through the email string and that is the reference to college policy. I don't think it matters to the public what policy says. Referencing policy to justify or support a position risks creating the impression the College is hiding behind policy.

The simple fact is that marble is in SFs house and a certain quantity came from PGI. Even if it was marked for disposal it shows poor judgement at best, dishonesty at worst.

In order to protect the College and the Board, it seems to me, that responsibility for this has to be placed with SF

Early morning thoughts

David

Acting President
Red River College
C708, 2055 Notre Dame Avenue
Winnipeg, MB. R4H 0J9

On Sep 4, 2014, at 9:23 PM, "Kimberly G Jasper" <kJasper@RRC.CA> wrote:

> Agreed, we need a definitive answer to protect the board and the college.
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On Sep 4, 2014, at 8:09 PM, "Christine Payne" <chpayne@RRC.CA> wrote:
>
> > Good evening,
> > Without reading the report, my level of comfort is low in terms of advising the Board on messaging. The response provided begs additional questions and is somewhat elusive in details. I recommend a strong message be provided based on the language used in the report. The findings have been provided to the province and thus could be available publicly. Given this may be the case, perhaps a discussion with the minister's office be initiated tomorrow? These are just my thoughts and I welcome feedback. This story will definitely receive media attention once published.
> >
> > Regards

Christine

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 4, 2014, at 5:09 PM, "David Rew" <DRew@RRC.CA> wrote:

> Kim and Christine
> I understand you wanted to discuss this with me. Sorry I missed you both. I understand we will be responding tomorrow?
> I have read the emails on this. Not sure I can offer more than the questions raised by you, Kim, and Rob
> I'll read them again tonight
> David
>
> **From:** Kimberly G Jasper
> **Sent:** Thursday, September 04, 2014 3:41 PM
> **To:** Richard Lennon; Christine Payne
> **Cc:** Kathi Gudmandson; David Rew; Conor Lloyd; kknight@ictam.ca; Robert L.J. Buisson
> **Subject:** RE: FW: Marble
>
> 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
Red River College