

## Report to Governance Working Group

**To:** Chair and Members  
Governance Working Group  
**From:** Cathy Saunders, City Clerk  
**Subject:** Advisory Committee Review – Interim Report VI  
**Date:** May 17, 2021

## Recommendation

That, on the recommendation of the City Clerk, the following actions be taken with respect to the Advisory Committee Review:

- a) the report dated January 11, 2021 entitled “Advisory Committee Review – Interim Report VI”, BE RECEIVED; and,
- b) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to report back to a future meeting of the Governance Working Group with respect to feedback related to the draft Terms of Reference, attached as Appendix A to this report.

## Executive Summary

The purpose of this interim report is to provide draft details for consideration, related to a proposed new advisory committee structure. This report has concurrently been provided to all current advisory committee members. It is recommended that the report be received at this time, with additional discussion at a future meeting in order to provide an opportunity for additional feedback from advisory committee members with respect to this matter.

## Analysis

### 1.0 Background Information

#### 1.1 Previous Reports Related to this Matter

- Finance and Administrative Services Committee, February 27, 2012
- Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee, December 16, 2013
- Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee, March 17, 2014
- Civic Works Committee, June 19, 2018
- Corporate Services Committee, November 13, 2018
- Corporate Services Committee, March 19, 2019
- Governance Working Group, August 24, 2020
- Governance Working Group, November 10, 2020
- Corporate Services Committee, April 19, 2021

#### 1.2 Previous Council Direction

The following was resolved at the November 24, 2020 meeting of the Municipal Council:

That the following actions be taken with respect to the 2nd Report of the Governance Working Group from its meeting held on November 10, 2020:

- a) the following actions be taken with respect to the Advisory Committee Review:
  - i) the report dated November 10, 2020 entitled "Advisory Committee Review - Interim Report III", BE RECEIVED;
  - ii) the City Clerk BE DIRECTED to report back to the Governance Working Group (GWG) with respect to the next steps required to implement the revised Advisory Committee Structure, as outlined in the report noted in a) above subject to the following modifications:

- A) the proposed Environmental & Ecological Committee and Childcare Advisory Committee shall remain as Advisory Committees;
  - B) a minimum numbers of meetings will be provided for;
  - C) Experts Panels are to be clarified; and,
  - D) comments provided by the Governance Working Group with respect to the proposed revised Advisory Committee Structure be further considered;
- iii) the City Clerk BE DIRECTED to consult with the current Advisory Committees with respect to the proposals set out in the staff report subject to the modifications listed in b) above and report back to the GWG with the results of that consultation;
  - iv) the communication, dated November 8, 2020, from D. Wake regarding this matter BE RECEIVED;
- b) the City Clerk BE DIRECTED to report back to the Governance Working Group (GWG) providing an overview of other municipalities' policies and processing with respect to the handling of unsolicited petitions, and to provide draft policies and procedures for the consideration of the GWG with respect to this matter; and,
  - c) clauses 1.1 and 2.1 BE RECEIVED for information. (5.1/18/SPPC)

## **2.0 Discussion and Considerations**

### **2.1 Individual Committee Structure(s)**

Previous reports have reviewed options for the purpose of any given advisory group, in terms of “engagement” versus “expert advice”. Currently, and in accordance with the above-noted direction, there is not a recommendation to proceed with the establishment of any new expert panels.

This report proposes that ‘Advisory Committee’ be used as a term to define specific types of groups, such as the Environmental & Ecological Planning Advisory Committee and Childcare Advisory Committee. These two committees were specifically identified by Council to remain in the status of ‘Advisory Committee’. The membership of these committees would be more specific, although not as specialized as the requirements of membership on an ‘expert panel’.

“Community Engagement Panel” is a new term proposed for other groups that the council may convene, that have a purpose more closely related to engagement on specific matters. In the case of these committees (panels), membership would be more generalized to provide for representation of a broader nature. Individuals would be expected to have an interest in the subject matter, but specific ‘qualifications’ would not be required. The community engagement panel membership appointments could be managed differently than advisory committee appointments; these panels are proposed to encourage broad participation for all who may be interested in a particular subject matter.

### **2.2 Draft Terms of Reference**

Attached to this report, as Appendix A, are draft Terms of Reference for the proposed committees as previously directed by Council (except for the Community Safety and Well-Being Advisory Committee). Please note that most ‘names’ associated with the proposed committees are intended for discussion purposes.

In each of the proposed Terms of Reference, the Non-Voting Resources have been updated to be as flexible as possible in order to better serve the needs of the respective committees. There are some included non-voting membership suggestions, however these are intended to be potential guidelines and it would not be expected that there

would be “appointments” of resource members or that would attendance of any resource members for all meetings.

These Terms of Reference attempt to balance the feedback received to date, which was quite broad, with the direction from Council at this time.

*Legislatively Required Committees:*

Community Safety and Well-Being Advisory Committee – This committee is currently outside of this advisory committee structure but is Corporately established in accordance with the applicable legislation, the *Police Services Act*. This is not included with this report.

London Planning Advisory Committee – The committee will fulfil the legislative requirement under the *Planning Act*, 1990 for the establishment of a Planning Advisory Committee and will address heritage-related matters.

Accessibility Advisory Committee – The proposed Terms of Reference has been streamlined and is primarily based on the legislative requirements.

*Additional Committees/Groups:*

Ecological Advisory Committee

Child Care Advisory Committee

Integrated Transportation Community Engagement Panel

Environmental Stewardship and Action Community Engagement Panel

Diversity, Inclusion and Anti-Oppression Community Engagement Panel

Animal Welfare Community Engagement Panel

## **3.0 Next Steps**

### **3.1 Continued Consultation**

The City Clerk’s Office will work to gather feedback on the proposed Terms of Reference provided with this report. This will include consultation with elected officials, advisory committee members and the Civic Administration to ensure this structure is appropriately aligned with the corporate structure, and that the roles are reflective of current established direction. At the same time, work will continue on the General Terms of Reference for all Advisory Committees.

### **3.2 Additional Considerations**

Traditionally, the advisory committees have enjoyed a parliamentary structure less formal than the City Standing Committees or Council. At the same time, the parliamentary structure that is required of the advisory committees has inadvertently created difficulties for the functionality of the committees. A few examples are the quorum requirement for meetings and the lack of a member who is interested to serve as the committee Chair. Occasionally, there have also been committees that have not been as efficient as they may otherwise be, due to a lack of parliamentary procedure experience. Should there be support for the above-noted proposed structure, it would be recommended to also consider differentiating the operation of these structures in the General Guidelines for All Advisory Committees. This could include, but not be limited to, modifying the quorum requirement, and having a staff person lead the committee in more of a moderator role for the community engagement panels.

#### **4.0 Financial Impact/Considerations**

None at this time.

#### **5.0 Conclusion**

The responses received from current advisory committee members related to the previously considered structure varied significantly. This is not unlike the previous feedback that was provided in the report from March 2019, which included the previous advisory committee membership. As such, the Committee may wish to provide additional specifics for staff, to be better positioned to present an implementation plan.

#### **Prepared, Submitted and Recommended by:**

**Cathy Saunders, City Clerk**  
**Michael Schulthess, Deputy City Clerk**  
**Barb Westlake-Power, Deputy City Clerk**