



## **2011-2012 BUDGET QUESTIONS**

1. The offset 2011-2011 budget decisions totaling \$3.0 million were discussed at the Budget Committee of 17 January 2011. Please provide a summary of the budget decisions made in 2010- 2011 for the 2011-2012 budget year. (*17 January Budget Cte. meeting*)

*Summary of decisions are outlined below:*

<b>2010-2011 Budget - Board Approved Reductions</b>		
<b>Approved Reduction (Academic Staff)</b>	<b>Approved for 2011-2012 (Use of Reserves)</b>	
	<b>FTE</b>	<b>Amount \$</b>
<b>Instruction:</b>		
Curriculum Services - Reduction in Instructional Coaches (Elementary)	2.0	\$200,000
Reduction in Special Education Learning Centre Teachers - General Instruction	5.0	\$500,000
<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>\$700,000</b>
<b>Instruction (Regular Day School):</b>		
Reduction of English as Second Language Teachers (Elementary)	4.0	\$360,000
Reduction of English as Second Language Teachers (Secondary)	1.0	\$90,000
<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>\$450,000</b>
<b>Instruction (Special Education)</b>		
Learning Support Teachers	6.0	\$600,000
<b>Total Reductions in Academic Staffing</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>\$1,750,000</b>
<b>Approved Reduction (Non Academic Staff)</b>	<b>Approved for 2011-2012 (Use of Reserves)</b>	
	<b>FTE</b>	<b>Amount \$</b>
<b>Instruction:</b>		
Business and Learning Technologies - Services and Staff Reductions	5.0	\$371,000
<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>\$371,000</b>
<b>Instruction (Regular Day School):</b>		
Secondary School Technicians	5.0	\$295,545
Reduction in Multi Cultural Liaison Officers		\$165,000
Safe School - Principal of Safe School	1.0	\$128,500
<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>\$589,045</b>
Human Resources	1.5	\$119,025
Financial Services - Reductions in Operating Budgets	2.0	\$125,300
<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>\$244,325</b>
<b>Total Reductions in Non Academic Staffing</b>	<b>14.5</b>	<b>\$1,204,370</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>\$2,954,370</b>

2. Please provide the number of full-time equivalent employees impacted by the calculated compensation differential for 2010-2011. *(17 January Budget Cte. meeting)*

*Details are outlined below:*

	Funding Benchmark *	Actual Cost	GAP	Staffing Numbers Assumed in Grant	OCDSB Staffing Numbers
Elementary Teachers	\$86,243	\$90,090	\$3,847	2,059.14	2,129.80
Secondary Teachers (Including Library and Guidance)	\$89,854	\$96,328	\$6,474	1,439.42	1,464.04
Consultant Teachers	\$108,495	\$94,609	(\$13,886)	33.39	6.17
Educational Assistants	\$44,321	\$48,030	\$3,709	8.70	18.00
Professional & Paraprofessionals	\$67,133	\$71,461	\$4,328	126.46	142.90
Elementary School Staff	\$50,761	\$52,152	\$1,391	185.02	187.00
Secondary School Staff	\$53,457	\$53,256	(\$201)	113.73	112.50
Elementary Principals	\$122,960	\$126,312	\$3,352	117.00	117.00
Secondary Principals	\$134,071	\$134,319	\$248	26.00	26.00
Elementary Vice-Principals	\$116,482	\$120,064	\$3,582	47.15	41.00
Secondary Vice-Principals	\$122,870	\$121,061	(\$1,809)	46.94	48.67

( ) = Funding Larger than cost

\* Foundation Grant and Qualification & Experience Grant

3. Can you confirm if supervision funding will be provided in 2011-2012. *(17 January Budget Cte. meeting)*

*Supervision funding will be included in the 2011-2012 budget. Ministry estimates in August 2008 for 2011-2012 were \$834,426.*

4. Revenue from the Solar Program was noted to be included in the 2011-2012 revenues. Please provide a summary of revenues received from the Solar Program since its commencement. *(17 January Budget Cte. meeting)*

*Gross revenues received to date for 2010-2011 (as of 28 January 2011) total \$266,668.*

5. Can you provide copies of the speaking notes used for the Budget Committee meeting presentation of 17 January 2011 (PowerPoint presentation). *(17 January Budget Cte. meeting)*

*Speaking notes have been posted on the OCDSB web site under 2011-2012 Budget.*

6. What is the current funding shortfall for the Early Learning Program? *(17 January Budget Cte. meeting)*

*The projected Early Learning Program funding shortfall for 2010-2011 (including the impact of the latest Provincial Discussion Table agreement for Early Childhood Educators) is approximately \$406,000.*

7. How many classroom teaching position does the Ministry's funding model generate in comparison to OCDSB actual staffing that is in place for the 2010-2011 school year? *(17 January Budget Cte. meeting)*

*The Ministry's funding model generates 3,412.88 full-time equivalent (FTE) classroom teachers based on OCDSB enrolment while the OCDSB has 3,508.01 (FTE) positions in place for a net difference of 95.13.*

8. If the OCDSB chose to staff only the academic positions actually funded by the dollar assumptions included in the Ministry's funding (Foundation Grant), what would be the calculated position shortfall? *(17 January Budget Cte. meeting)*

*The calculated shortfall would be 90.9 FTE elementary positions and 92.6 FTE secondary positions (using the 2010-2011 OCDSB staffing and the 2010-2011 Ministry's Foundation Grant assumptions).*

9. Does the Board have the option of cutting \$5M to balance the budget or to not make those cuts, if they wish to deplete the reserves? *(17 January Budget Cte. meeting)*

*Yes, so long as staff's projection of 2011-2012 revenue and expense is on target, and if the Ministry does not say no.*

10. As it gets closer to the end of the year and estimates get more refined, is it possible that you may find that the Board has a higher reserve amount? *(17 January Budget Cte. meeting)*

*The January forecast for 2010-2011 still has us using \$0.9M of reserves to balance 2010-2011. If we don't have to use this, then final reserves will be higher than expected. Not higher than they are now, just the same as they are now. If we had to use the \$0.9M, the year end reserves balance will be \$0.9M lower than it is now.*

*If there is a surplus at the end of 2010-2011, then this will be added to existing reserves.*

11. Do trustees and senior staff have an opportunity to move motions for additional spending at this time? If they do, must they propose cost cutting to offset the cost of their proposals? *(17 January Budget Cte. meeting)*

*Yes, trustees can move motions to do additional spending now for 2011-2012, but the normal budget practice would be to defer the motion to the main budget process. Staff can recommend additional spending, but it would also be deferred.*

*Trustees can move to do additional 2011-2012 spending to be covered by use of reserves. The Board would have to pass the motion. Staff could also recommend additional spending. It would have to be approved by the Board.*

*In either case, they could state an offsetting cut – or not.*

12. If additional reserves become known, could those reserves be used for one time spending proposals without any additional impact to the budget the following year? *(17 January Budget Cte. meeting)*

*It depends on what the proposal is. If it truly is a one time, one year spending that stops at the end of the year, then there would be no impact on the next year's budget.*

*A lot of proposals start as one year things and then turn into on going programs.*

13. Does the provincial funding system treat all boards equitably? (17 January Budget Cte. meeting)

*Transportation is the only grant line which is not based on a province wide formula. The transportation grant is still mainly based on what a school board was spending on transportation at the start of the current funding system.*

*All other grants are based on province wide formulas. Differences between boards as to the amounts received can be explained by differences in the grant conditions. Two boards of equal size with the same conditions will receive the same amounts.*

*The Special Education high needs portion is based on individual student cases claims as of 2005-2006. The amounts have been continued but as the province moves to the new measures of variability it is being converted to a calculation based on Ottawa's demographics, instead of specific student needs.*

14. At the October consultation on Special Education funding, the Ministry mentioned that each board was allocated a HNA amount based on a specific per student rate for that Board (such rate having been determined based on historical issues). As well, I have heard that the new SEA per pupil amount is based on a per board student rate (again based on historical utilization of the grant). Is this information available to all boards as part of the information they receive from the Ministry with the GSN package, and could that be shared with SEAC budget representatives group? Additionally, is information available to all boards about how many Special Education students there are in all boards in Ontario? (Email – 31 January)

*The HNA amount per student for the OCDSB is \$498 which is part of the calculation for determining the total HNA funding. The HNA funding calculation is included in Section 2 Special Education, of the GSN package and can be shared with SEAC. It is available on the Ministry website:*

*<http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/funding/1112/technical1.pdf>*

*The SEA funding is made up of two components, Special Education Equipment Amount (SEA) per pupil amount including base of \$10,000 per board and SEA claims-based amount. The SEA per pupil amount will transition school boards from a school board-specific per pupil amount that is based on each board's historical access to SEA funding to a single provincial per pupil amount by 2014-15.*

*The SEA per pupil amount will be calculated using the following formula:*

*Base amount + School board amount \$10,000 per pupil amount x ADE*

*+ ADE x \$33.39*

*+ Claims based amount (determined by OCDSB)*

*Number of Special Education students in Ontario:*

*This information is not readily available to all school boards however staff was able to obtain information for 2007-2008 through the Board's Ministry Finance contact.*

<http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/general/elemsec/speced/ontario.html>

*It indicates the following (3rd paragraph):*

*In the 2007/2008 school year (the most recent figures available) more than 192,000 students were identified by an IPRC as exceptional pupils. A further 96,600 students who were not formally identified were provided with special education programs and services.*

*Note that the information above applies to 2007-08 and the province is experiencing declining enrolment.*

b) In reference to the SEA calculation (4<sup>th</sup> paragraph) the base amount of \$10K appears to have gotten moved to the per pupil amount in explaining the calculation. Re table per pupil amount is actually \$33.39 if I understand correctly. *(Email – 23 May)*

*Yes the SEA per pupil amount is \$33.39 for 2011-2012. The Board amount of \$10,000 is a separate factor in the SEA calculation.*

15. Service Technicians – Boiler Venting Replacement adds 2.0 FTE to repair contracted work performed between 2002-2008 and to retain those workers on staff for as yet undefined major issues. Has legal recourse for faulty work or poor design been sought? Should it not be defined as a 2 year project with the intent to reassign the workers upon completion? *(9 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*Legal action would be difficult and expensive. Designs and installations were not faulty as the venting materials were an industry standard at that time. Many installations across Ottawa are facing the same issues. The problem is that final Code approvals were not given to venting products (while they were in the midst of product testing and certifications), and ultimately alternate venting products were developed and approved. As assurances were made at the time of installations by the manufacturers, the designers and contractors worked within "good faith", based on manufacturer's letters of pending approvals. At this time, we are replacing boiler venting to new standards on a progressive approach, as boiler venting nears the end of service life.*

16. What is the Special Education operation budget? *(9 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*Please see details of the Special Education operating budget on page 96 of the 2011-2012 Budget Presentation dated 09 May 2011.*

17. Why has there been a reduction in Special Education teachers? Is this a decreased need or the result of inadequate funding? *(9 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*In our secondary schools there are 30 Student Success Teacher's, Rideauwood Counsellor, Pastoral Care, Child Youth Workers, student teachers and OCRI volunteers, along with our Guidance Counsellors and Learning Support Teachers. This non-contractual reduction acknowledges the aforementioned staff.*

18. What is the comparative number of Special Education students? (9 May Budget Cte. meeting)

*Statement of comparison includes:*

*In 5 years in the OCDSB the rate of special education as measured by providing services (IEP's) has changed from 15.8% in 2007 to 17.7% in 2010. The number of I.E.P. 'd students is 12,000.*

*In 5 years in the OCDSB the rate of special education as measured by IPRC's has changed from 13.6% in 2007 to 12.7% in 2010. The number of I.P.R.C. 'd students is 10,000.*

*In 4 years Learning Support Services has increased the number of specialized program classes and services provided to students*

*The number of special education staff per 1,000 students has not changed since 2007 with 17.5 staff in 2007 compared to 17.48 in 2010.*

19. What is a Rehabilitation Budget? (9 May Budget Cte. meeting)

*The rehabilitation budget is used to accommodate employees who are retuning to work from injury of long term illness. Expenses typically include modified work schedules or specialized office equipment. Budgets are currently in place for academic but none exists for support staff. The addition addresses support staff.*

20. Is the Educational Technology Innovation a project, a program or a policy? (9 May Budget Cte. meeting)

*B&LT assembled a principal's focus group earlier this year to help identify needs and readiness for the 21st century learner. The working title of the project was dubbed "Learning 2.0". B&LT sought to determine how the District could increase schools' capacity to connect student achievement to learning technology. Early indications from the focus group identified a need to model some new or innovative concepts of technology use in the classroom, to determine suitability for expanded use. This funding request is a project to facilitate the acquisition and ongoing evaluation of new or innovative technologies or instructional strategies using this technology. B&LT and schools would work collaboratively on this, through the use of B&LT technology coaches and consultants.*

*The innovations arising from this project will serve as a foundation for promoting and supporting system-wide innovations to improve student learning through the use of technology in our district over the next 3 to 5 years. The project will also serve as a platform for boosting the innovative potential of technology to address goals for student achievement that are set in the Board's Improvement Plan.*

21. Did the Board receive any money yet from the Ministry re Mental Health Services? (9 May Budget Cte. meeting)

*The Board has not received any money for Mental Health services.*

22. Are the resources being added to Full Day Kindergarten being funded out of the Special Education budget and are the additional SEPPA amounts being generated by these children adequate to pay for these resources? *(9 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*The Full Day Kindergarten (FDK) program is funded by the Ministry's "Education Program Other" or EPO module. The EPO grant does include a proportionate SEPPA allocation for the students. Based on updated information from the Ministry of Education, it appears that the majority of the FDK program will be funded.*

23. In terms of services for Full Day Kindergarten, can you confirm that the money received is through the fact that these kindergarten students are now each eligible for a full share of SEPPA (instead of 50% of SEPPA grant). *(9 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*That is correct. Each Full Day Kindergarten (FDK) student will generate a full share or 100% of the Special Education Per Pupil Amount (SEPPA) grant. Students also generate the Pupil Foundation grants. At present, one half is included in the regular grants and one half is a separate FDK grant.*

24. Would the Full Day Kindergarten children also be counted towards Special Education Equipment Amount (SEA) grant, High Needs Allocation (HNA) grant or any other grants that are based on Average Daily Enrolment (ADE)? *(9 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*The funding source for the Full Day Kindergarten (FDK) is not part of the regular Grants for Students Needs (GSN). Although still funded from the Ministry, the FDK grant is allocated under the "Education Program Other" or EPO module. Therefore, the incremental portion of the FDK students are not included in the calculation of SEA, HNA or ADE based grants. The Ministry Full Day Kindergarten has not included any of these areas.*

25. Is there an increase in Safe School Staff? *(9 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*The proposed 2011-2012 Budget includes the following increase in staff for Safe School:*

- i) Reinstatement of the Principals of Safe and Caring Schools (Reduced in 2010-2010 for 2011-2012)*
- ii) 1.0 FTE Education Assistant*
- iii) 1.0 FTE Social Worker to support Urban Priorities*
- iv) 1.0 FTE Psychologist and 1.0 FTE Social Worker to support Violence, Risk and Threat Assessment*

*Please see page 101 of the 2011-12 Budget Binder.*

26. What reserves are expected to be used in 2010-2011 and in 2011-2012? *(9 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*For the current year, we are not projecting to use any reserves. For 2011-2012 we are proposing to use \$6.9M in reserves.*

27. Please confirm what the compensation funding gap is for teachers and for educational assistants. *(9 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*For 2011-2012 the funding gap is \$3,847 for each elementary teacher, \$6,474 for each secondary teacher and \$3,709 for each Educational Assistant. See Question 2 for further details.*

28. What line item are psychologists paid out of? (9 May Budget Cte. meeting)

*The psychologists are funded from Special Education, General Instruction and Safe Schools/Urban Priorities grants. There is no specific grant for psychologists or psychological services. It is each board's choice as to what staffing mix it puts in place.*

29. What will the \$3.3M investment in transportation achieve? (9 May Budget Cte. meeting)

*The \$3.3M is not a new investment in transportation. The money is to cover the shortfall between spending and provincial funding. Board staff is proposing that \$3.3M of the existing \$3.6M shortfall be funded from the OCDSB's Accumulated Surplus/Reserves. This approach may provide some leverage to the newly created Trustee Advocacy Group that is lobbying to address the Board's transportation funding inequity. The Ministry has already stated that it will not provide additional transportation funding unless a board can show it is over spending its existing funding level. Please see Question 73 for previous years' funding shortfalls.*

30. Can you provide a breakdown of the reinvestment in schools and students envelope? (9 May Budget Cte. meeting)

*The reinvestment in schools and students consists of the Board approved Reductions that were made in 2010-2011 school year for 2011-2012. Details are as follows:*

Description	FTE	Amount *
<b>Instruction (General):</b>		
Curriculum Services - Instructional Coaches (Elementary)	2.0	\$183,400
Special Education Learning Centre Teachers - General Instruction (Elementary)	5.0	\$458,500
Business and Learning Technologies	5.0	\$371,000
<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>\$1,012,900</b>
<b>Instruction (Regular Day School):</b>		
English as Second Language Teachers (Elementary)	3.0	\$275,100
English as Second Language Teachers (Secondary)	1.0	\$97,900
Secondary School Technicians	5.0	\$268,755
Multi Cultural Liaison Officers		
Principal of Safe and Caring Schools	1.0	\$130,000
<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>\$771,755</b>
<b>Instruction (Special Education)</b>		
Educational Assistants ( In Lieu of 6.0 FTE Learning Support Teachers)	12.0	\$628,680
<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>\$628,680</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>34.0</b>	<b>\$2,413,335</b>

\* Amounts have been updated to more accurately reflect projected costs for 2011-2012.



31. Are the additional hires fully funded by the province? Please explain the revenue stream? (*9 May Budget Cte. meeting*)

*There are two pieces to this question:*

A. Provincial Funding Model staffing and funding assumptions

*The province provides funds for staff in the Pupil and School Foundation grants. The funds do not cover the actual compensation costs of the staff that the Ministry assumes the OCDSB will have. As outlined in Budget Question 8, the funds provided specifically for staffing would purchase 183.5 FTE less staff than the grant model assumes.*

*In addition, the OCDSB needs 88.13 FTE (\$7.1 million or 2%) more staff than the grant model assumes in order to meet class size and other related requirements.*

*In total there is \$25.1 million of staffing that is under funded by the specific Foundation staffing grant lines.*

*However, the OCDSB, like other Ontario school boards, uses other grants (Learning Opportunity, French as a Second Language, etc.) which do not have specific specified uses to fund these staffing differences.*

*In the Ministry's view this makes the positions funded.*

B. Enveloping Funding

*The Ministry has assigned grants to seven envelopes. Please see Page 23 of the Budget Binder.*

*The Ministry also requires school boards to report their spending and non-grant student needs (GSN) revenues by envelope.*

*As shown on Page 23, there are three envelopes in deficit (under funded) before the use of reserves.*

*The Facilities deficit is entirely one year expenditures, not ongoing items. That leaves Instruction (with \$0.5 million of one time item) and Transportation with ongoing deficits.*

SUMMARY

*The overall recommended budget needs \$6.9 million use of reserves to balance. Using the Ministry's enveloping method and backing out one time proposed expenditures, the Instruction and Transportation envelopes are the areas with ongoing deficits.*

*The combined Instruction ongoing new initiatives and September 2011 reversal of \$5.0 million is \$2.4 million under funded. Staff have assigned the \$2.4 million September 2011 reversal as a use of reserves to indicate that the Board had originally made the reduction so the OCDSB would be generating within its ongoing*

revenues and then reversed the decision, leaving the Instruction envelope operating in deficit. As reserves were used to fund these positions in the 2010-2011 budget, staff have therefore used the same funding source for 2011-2012.

The Board could choose to attribute the \$2.4 million to other Instruction causes such as English as a Second Language, Safe Schools and Special Education, all of which are operating over their specific funding.

32. Will there be additional costs with these hires as a result of our salary grid structure? (9 May Budget Cte. meeting)

New hires will increase our compensation grid structure shortfall in Instruction. Identified instructional positions that are funded from the School Foundation grant have a funding shortfall between \$248 and \$6,474 per position (based on 2010-2011 information). The cost is built into the recommended budget. Details of the calculated shortfalls are displayed on Question 2 of this document). As the Ministry does not publish salary assumptions for Facilities and Central Administration, new hires for these envelopes would have no measurable impact on our calculated compensation shortfall.

33. For professional services that benefit all students (i.e. social workers, psychologists, speech and language pathologists, LSTs, LRTs), are their costs earmarked entirely against the Special Education envelope or are the costs disbursed across Departments based on an allocation of time/fee for service model? (9 May Budget Cte. meeting)

Please see table below for allocation details of our Professional Student Services Personnel staff:

Description	Total	Charged To			
		Special Education		Other	
		Special Education	Early Learning Program	General Instruction	Safe Schools/ Urban Priorities
	FTE	FTE	FTE	FTE	FTE
<b>Professional Student Services Personnel:</b>	<b>68.40</b>	<b>52.56</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>7.04</b>	<b>4.80</b>
Psychologists	22.40	17.10	1.00	2.50	1.80
Social Workers	22.50	16.56	0.50	2.44	3.00
Speech Language Pathologists	23.50	18.90	2.50	2.10	0.00

34. How much of the \$700k deficit in Special Education funding is attributed to the decision the Board made to keep a number of gifted classes open? (9 May Budget Cte. meeting)

There is no impact on the Special Education funding when gifted classes are operating at full student capacity. However, if a class operates at less than the average class size for the grade level, there is a cost. Any gifted class that is under the average adds to the Special Education funding shortfall.

35. In March, staff had suggested that it supported the reversal of the \$2.8M in staffing cuts that were made as part of last year's budget. Can you explain in greater detail the impact of the reversal? *(9 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*The Board approved \$2.8 million of postponed staffing reductions by using reserves for the 2010-2011 budget. The Board has already approved that \$1.1 million of the positions (all of the academic positions) are to continue for the 2011-2012 school year. The Board gave informal direction that it wished to consider the remaining \$1.7 million of non-academic positions during its May budget debate of the 2011-2012 budget.*

*The Board has not yet specified a funding source. As reserves were used for 2010-2011, staff has recommended the same treatment for 2011-2012.*

*The Board could choose to assign the Safe Schools, English as a Second Language (ESL) and/or Special Education program funding shortfalls as being funded from reserves.*

*The impact of not approving the \$1.7 million is described in the impact statements provided for the 26 May 2011 Budget Committee meeting.*

36. I have been reviewing the budget and can only find one reference to OTs. On page 44, I see \$13,063,784. Does this represent the long term occasional teachers (LTO) costs for both secondary and elementary OT coverage? Where could I find the daily OT costs? Page 109 indicates that the schools are allocated OT funds based on their FTE but where do I find that budget line showing that amount? *(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*The amount on page 44 includes approximately 50% of the Long Term Occasional (LTO) costs that are sick leave related. The remaining 50% is included in the classroom teacher budget. The budget line represents the coverage for both elementary and secondary panels. The daily rates for Occasional Teachers are not published in the Budget Binder. For 2011-2012, the elementary daily rate is \$214.95 and the secondary daily rate is \$218.97. The individual occasional teacher budgets can be viewed on our Year End Financial Statements that are published on the OCDSB website under the Financial Information section.*

37. Please provide a breakdown of the transportation costs included in the shortfall for 2010-2011. *(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*Please see Question # 41. It will be the same issue for 2010-2011.*

38. The transportation staff is reported as OCDSB staff on page 48 of the 2011-2012 budget binder. As the OCDSB transportation is now part of the Ontario Transportation Authority (OSTA) should these positions be displayed in their current format? *(9 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*Staff agrees that the suggested presentation is the correct one.*

*The Ministry has instructed us to report Transportation in line with the budget binder format. We may be able to move the staff expense to a purchase of services. Staff will follow up with the Ministry.*

39. Would it be possible to ascertain if the Ottawa Catholic School Board were experiencing similar cost stresses as the OCDSB? *(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*In fact, the Catholic board has seen a reduction in costs. They claim this is due to changes they introduced to "hazard areas, effective September 2009. While not confirmed, it is also likely that they have also seen benefits from the joint planning efforts*

40. Please follow up with OSTA to obtain the costs associated with Board decisions as a result of accommodation and program reviews, including the grandfathering of students in some programs. *(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*As always it is extremely difficult to quantify the additional costs due to the overall integration of busing between schools, especially since we make such use of double and triple runs. Having said that, OCDSB staff continue to be of the opinion that the additional costs of the busing concessions that were made, did not significantly contribute to the increase in overall costs because, with phasing in of grades and programs associated with accommodation reviews, we continue to bus throughout these communities to accommodate grandfathered students. Accordingly accommodating some measure of transportation latitude has not impacted budget, but for the most part has filled existing vehicles"*

41. In the fall of 2010, the OCDSB received the year end transportation reconciliation invoice from OSTA in the amount of \$2.1M. Did the OCSSB receive a similar invoice? In addition, please provide details on the 2009-2010 transportation expenditures, including the proportion of cost sharing between the OCDSB and OCSSB. *(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*The following charts show information for the two boards. They are extracted from the notes to OSTA's financial statements. In some cases, you will see variances between these numbers and those reported elsewhere in the budget binder. This is due to reporting issues associated with PSAB changes and the method of reporting HST and the associated rebates. However, those issues would not distort the comparative figures between the two boards*



For the Year Ending August 31, 2009

	<b>Total Budget</b>	<b>Total Actual</b>	<b>OCSB</b>	<b>OCDSB</b>
<b>Expenses</b>				
Current				
Transportation contracts	\$47,510,466	\$47,594,632	\$20,468,612	\$27,126,020
Provincial schools transportation contracts	5,223,550	5,167,639	0	5,167,639
Public transit	3,390,702	2,360,040	1,677,203	682,837
Salaries, wages and benefits	1,452,865	1,659,975	716,878	943,097
Professional fees	58,800	49,991	19,995	29,996
Occupancy	22,057	24,095	12,047	12,048
Software Licensing	41,890	31,948	19,609	12,339
Staff development	13,500	6,569	3,285	3,284
First aid/safety training	0	30,576	0	30,576
Communications	32,946	57,853	28,927	28,926
Insurance	4,200	5,501	2,750	2,751
Other supplies and services	42,700	30,771	15,385	15,386
	<u>57,793,676</u>	<u>57,019,590</u>	<u>22,964,691</u>	<u>34,054,899</u>
Capital				
Furniture and equipment	50,492	14,705	7,353	7,352
Leasehold improvements	20,000	14,880	7,440	7,440
	<u>70,492</u>	<u>29,585</u>	<u>14,793</u>	<u>14,792</u>
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<u>57,864,168</u>	<u>57,049,175</u>	<u>22,979,484</u>	<u>34,069,691</u>
<b>Decrease (increase) in non-financial assets</b>	0	(15,302)	(7,651)	(7,651)
<b>Decrease (increase) in unfunded liabilities</b>	0	(98,043)	(35,611)	(62,432)
<b>Recoveries from member school boards</b>	<u>\$57,864,168</u>	<u>\$56,935,830</u>	<u>\$22,936,222</u>	<u>\$33,999,608</u>

	<b>Total Actual</b>	<b>OCSB</b>	<b>OCDSB</b>
<b>Expenses</b>			
Current			
Salaries and wages	\$1,209,234	\$560,882	\$648,352
Employment Benefits	\$450,741	155996	294745
Staff development	\$37,145	3285	33860
Supplies and services	\$120,572	63921	56651
Rental Expenses	\$24,095	12047	12048
Fees and contractual services	\$55,177,803	22168560	33009243
	<u>\$57,019,590</u>	<u>\$22,964,691</u>	<u>\$34,054,899</u>
Capital	<u>\$29,585</u>	<u>\$14,793</u>	<u>\$14,792</u>
	<u>\$57,049,175</u>	<u>\$22,979,484</u>	<u>\$34,069,691</u>



For the Year Ending August 31, 2010

	Total Budget	Total Actual	OCSB	OCDSB
<b>Expenses</b>				
Transportation contracts	\$48,227,746	\$47,390,600	\$19,284,403	\$28,106,197
Provincial schools transportation contracts	4,916,542	4,996,170	0	4,996,170
Public transit	3,576,236	3,330,687	2,112,128	1,218,559
Salaries, wages and benefits	1,758,125	1,633,733	656,315	977,418
Professional fees	166,800	165,008	72,603	92,405
Occupancy	24,265	24,973	10,988	13,985
Software Licensing	55,500	90,594	39,861	50,733
Staff development	13,500	12,779	5,623	7,156
First aid/safety training	0	2,238	0	2,238
Communications	6,000	20,436	8,992	11,444
Insurance	4,200	4,645	2,044	2,601
Other supplies and services	93,900	67,891	29,872	38,019
Amortization of tangible capital assets	7,556	7,556	3,778	3,778
<b>Total expenses</b>	<b>58,850,370</b>	<b>57,747,310</b>	<b>22,226,607</b>	<b>35,520,703</b>
Less: amortization of tangible capital assets	(7,556)	(7,556)	(3,778)	(3,778)
Add: Purchase of tangible capital assets	0	0	0	0
Decrease (increase) in unfunded liabilities	(43,698)	(56,399)	(22,451)	(33,947)
<b>Recoveries from member school boards</b>	<b>\$58,799,116</b>	<b>\$57,683,355</b>	<b>\$22,200,378</b>	<b>\$35,482,978</b>

	Total Actual	OCSB	OCDSB
<b>Expenses</b>			
Salaries and wages	\$1,300,047	\$529,552	\$770,495
Employment Benefits	\$333,686	126763	206923
Staff development	\$15,017	5623	9394
Supplies and services	\$178,921	78725	100196
Rental Expenses	\$24,973	10988	13985
Fees and contractual services	\$55,887,110	21471178	34415932
Amortization of tangible capital assets	\$7,556	3778	3778
	<b>\$57,747,310</b>	<b>\$22,226,607</b>	<b>\$35,520,703</b>

42. How many students are currently on the Special Education (gifted) waiting list? (16 May Budget Cte. meeting)

*As of May 25, 2011 there are 6 OCDSB and 7 out of board students on the gifted specialized program waitlist. There are 55 vacancies. In some cases parents have turned down placements.*

43. How many programs does the OCDSB have that exceed budgets of \$100,000 and have no direct FTE tied to them? (16 May Budget Cte. meeting)

*The OCDSB does have program over \$100,000 with no direct FTE tied to them. These programs are typically funded under the Ministry's Educational Grants Other (EPO's) and include programs such as Schools Helping Schools Network Program and the Math and Literacy Professional Learning Strategy Program.*

44. Please provide details on the \$366,440 adjustment for specialized ISA equipment? (16 May Budget Cte. meeting)

*The specialized ISA equipment budget was reduced by \$366,440 (from \$2,116,440 in 2010-11 to \$1,750,000 in 2011-12) to more closely reflect the actual spending on ISA equipment over the past several years. Actual expenses were \$1,951,635 in 2008-2009 \$1,150,692 in 2009-2010 and are currently at \$1,049,435 as at the end of April 2011.*

b) There appears to be some discrepancy in reported amounts for SEA. Slide 28 references a change from 2010-11 to 2011-12 of (\$366,440). But on the original slide 94 of the Proposed Budget, the SEA amount was reported as going from \$2,116,440 to \$2,237,747 - which would have been an increase of \$121,307. However revised SEA (per info provided on May 24th) value is \$2,050,000 which is now (\$66,440) less than 2010-11. Could you verify once more actual amount? (Email – 23 May)

*The revenue recognized for SEA is an estimate of what we expect to spend not only on the specialized equipment but also on the training we provide to students on the use of the equipment. In the past, we have not spent all the available funding for training and the excess has been transferred to deferred revenue. Any revenue that is not recognized in the 2011-2012 budget year will be captured in deferred revenue as an amount to be spent on training and equipment in subsequent years.*

45. The OCDSB has received a measure of budget relief through the provincial decision to provide additional funding for OMERS. As the board has had fewer anticipated retirements. Should the proportionate Special Education share be allocated to Special Education revenue? (16 May Budget Cte. meeting)

*The fewer anticipated retirements are academic staff who are part of the TPP pension plan which funded by the province and not OMERS. The number of retirements for employees who are part of the OMERS plan has been fairly consistent over the past years. The province has built the additional OMERS funding into the Special Education Grant factors.*

b) What is the TPP pension plan? Are there any impacts re that on the Special Education budget as per previous question re OMERS?

*TPP is the Teachers Pension Plan. No, the province pays TPP directly, so no impact on the school board (or Special Education) budget.*

c) What about retirement gratuities? How are these being handled in light of the lower retirement rate for this year? Presumably, if some of staff not retiring are Special Education staff, and assuming that retirement gratuities for Special Education

staff are allocated against the Special Education budget, then will these “savings” be returned to the Special Education budget?

*Lower retirements are already factored into the cost of benefits included in the budget projection. They are added into the Special Education compensation lines as a component of the benefits. The retirement gratuity percentage for 2011-2012 has been reduced based on the revised retirement gratuity budgets for the upcoming year.*

46. Provide additional details on the gym mat initiative. More specifically, identify the schools that currently have the gym mats and how they were funded. Also, identify the schools that need gym mats. **(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)**

*The cost of the upgrade program for secondary schools is estimated at \$190,913.50. The estimated cost for middle schools is \$102,830. The estimate includes wall mats for the end of the gymnasium and for the side walls/stage for gymnasiums with basketball standards for playing cross court.*

*There is no record of how each school funded the purchase of some gym wall safety mats, but the known sources are: School Council, fundraising, school budget and community partner.*

47. Gym mats are a good idea, what other mandated or strongly recommended improvements are possible to reduce accidents and injuries? **(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)**

*As reported to Education Committee in January 2011, the installation of gym wall mats is based on recommendations from the Ontario Physical and Health Education Association (OPHEA) and the Ontario School Board Insurance Exchange (OSBIE). OPHEA develops guidelines for safety standards for sport in schools and school districts. OSBIE, the Board’s liability insurer, recently issued a reminder to school districts of the need to upgrade safety features in all school gyms.*

*Typically, staff recommends improvements to reduce accidents and injuries based on a number of sources - OPHEA, OSBIE, and issues that are tracked by district staff in health and safety. Most health and safety issues are site specific and are dealt with directly. OCDSB maintenance staff has multi-year plans to deal with the renewal of some program areas, e.g. science labs.*

*While safety issues arise and are dealt with on an ongoing basis, this item was put forward as it is a district-wide issue, school staff have clearly stated the danger of not having the mats in gyms, and two external organizations have strongly recommended their installation.*

*Staff does not believe there are other mandated or strongly recommended improvements to reduce accidents and injuries at this time on a system-wide basis.*

48. Is the Board motion in 2010, regarding the funding of additional Full Day Kindergarten classes not covered by the Ministry of Education binding to cover ongoing costs? **(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)**

*The Board passed the following motion at its 6 May 2010 meeting:*



*D. THAT for the 2011-2012 school year and beyond, the Board will offer only the number of full day kindergarten classes that can be offered each year based on the total provincial funding provided for each phase of full-day learning, this includes total funding for operating and capital purposes.*

*Now that the additional number of classes needed to achieve reasonable Full Day Kindergarten class sizes and the growing enrolment is known, the Board may wish to consider if it wishes to rethink the motion.*

*The issues might include:*

- 1) Refuse to provide any additional FDK classes, as funded classes still have a small local cost.*
- 2) Refuse to provide the four additional unfunded classes.*
- 3) Direct staff to use existing budgets get to fund the shortfall (elementary staffing, needs allocation, etc.)*

49. Why are the proposed Child Youth Worker positions being charged to the Special Education envelope? *(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*In the Spring of 2005, the Board approved the recommendation of a Special Education Ad Hoc Committee that deemed that these types of services were mostly supporting Special Education students (identified or in process of being identified).*

b) I think though that Mental Health is not a service for Special Education students. Many non-exceptional students can have health problems. I think the whole issue of who Child Youth workers support will need some on-going discussion. *(Email – 23 May)*

*As we have experience, we can revise the costing.*

50. Could staff please prioritize the new initiatives and the use of accumulated surplus/reserve. *(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*Staff place equal weight on all of the new initiatives. The recommendations are the result of a five month process where multiple needs and options were considered. The recommendation includes the balancing of the competing needs and available resources to produce what staff sees as the best overall result.*

51. Provide a list of the facilities staff that have specific skills, versus those that have more generic skills that are interchangeable. *(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*The following table outlines the type, number and qualifications of Facilities staff:*

Position	Number	Qualifications
<b>Design and Construction</b>		
Professional Engineers	3	Bachelors of Engineering, Professional Engineering of Ontario Certificate
Certified Engineering and Architectural Technologists	9	3 year Engineering or Architectural Technologist Diploma
Certified Engineering and Architectural Technicians	5	2 year Engineering or Architectural Technician Diploma

<b>Energy Management and Conservation</b>		
Professional Engineers	1	Bachelors of Engineering, Professional Engineering of Ontario Certificate
Certified Engineering and Architectural Technologists	2	3 year Engineering or Architectural Technologist Diploma
Controls Technician	2	Certified Engineering Technician diploma or equivalent
Environmental Technician	1	2 year Environmental Technician Diploma or equivalent
<b>Operations</b>		
Human Resources Operations Management	2	Guelph University Certificate of Human Resource Management for School Board Administrators
Building Owners & Managers Institute International	4	Facilities Management Administrator (FMA) designation
Small Drinking Water Certificate	100	A Small Drinking Water Certificate is required by custodial staff in rural schools
Chief Custodian Training Package	150	
<b>Maintenance</b>		
Asbestos Technician	2	Asbestos Operations and Maintenance Certificate, Inspectors Training Program Certification
Building Tradesperson	21	Certificate of Qualification in General Carpentry
Burner Mechanic	3	Gas Technician 1, Oil Burner Technician 1
Custodial Equipment Tradesperson	2	Small Engines Trades Certificate
Electrician	12	Electrician's Inter-provincial Seal Maintenance/Construction Trades Certificate, Ontario Fire Alarm and Protection Certification License
Glazier	4	Ontario Journeyman's Trade Certificate in Glazing and Metal Mechanics
Grounds coordinator	1	No certificate required -Turf Management Skills required / Contract Administration
HVAC Technician	2	Ontario A/C and Refrigeration Certificate and License
Instrumentation Technician	3	Ontario Instrument and Controls Mechanic Certificate
Locksmith	2	Locksmithing Certificate
Mechanical Tradesperson	5	4th Class Stationary Engineer, Gas Technician 1
Plumber	10	Trades Certificate in Plumbing
Stationary Engineer 4th Class	5	Ontario 3rd or 4th Class Engineers Certificate
Trades Helper	1	No certificate require - Construction experience required
Vehicle Mechanic	2	Class A mechanics License for gasoline, diesel and alternative fuel(propane)

52. Provide a list of the 2011-2012 grants that have not been formally announced but the OCDSB is hopeful to receive. *(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*Excluding capital grants and Full Day Kindergarten grants the Board allocation for non GSN grants for 2010-2011 amounts to \$5.7 million. \$3.1 million has been confirmed for 2011-2012. Staff would hope to receive grants equivalent to or higher than the previous year to enhance student needs for a variety of programs. Based*

*on an analysis of grants received in 2010-2011 staff hope to receive the following list of additional non GSN grants that have not yet been announced for 2011-2012.*

*Summary of Other Grants*

Common European Framework	389,360
OFIP-Low Performing Schools	348,450
MISA	343,959
Effective Leadership	332,580
OFIP-Student Work Strategy	250,000
Ontario Leadership Strategy (includes 2nd installment not received)	143,987
OFIP-Instructional Leadership for Student Learning	135,000
Homework Help Pilot Program	105,000
Re-Engagement Initiative 12 & 12+	75,306
Promoting a Positive School Climate	75,245
Growing Success	50,000
Various Miscellaneous Grants under \$50,000	400,000

2,648,887

53. What are the timelines for Education Assistants (EA) placements? (*16 May Budget Cte. meeting*)

*Educational Assistants have been assigned. Schools were notified on May 17th and removal of Educational Assistants can occur until the end of September. Additional Educational Assistants can be included in the school staff next fall but it is important to have schools know their staffing and support.*

54. Has the Board been hiring Educational Assistants for 6.5 hrs or for 7.0 hrs per day? (*9 May Budget Cte. meeting*)

*For 2010-2011 all Educational Assistants are working 6.6 hrs per day. Any new hires are staffed at 6.6 hrs per day for the current year. For 2011-2012, the hours will increase to 7.0 hours per day (per Provincial Discussion Table collective agreements). Consequently, all hiring for 2011-2012 will be based on 7.0 hrs per day.*

55. Are there other opportunities where EAs and teachers can be replaced with skills instructors? *(9 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*There is no replacement as each have their defined roles.*

56. Can we assign a portion of our Educational Assistants as a group of floaters to support the multiple needs of our schools? *(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*We provide this through our I.E.A's, through proposal for Early Years E.A's, and the ASD team E.A's (floater).*

57. The budget proposes the addition of 12 Educational Assistants. What funding source are these from? *(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*These 12 Educational Assistants are funded from the 6.0 Secondary Learning Support Teachers (LST) that were not reinstated in 2011-2012 from a 2010-2011 Board decision. The 6.0 LST's were funded from Special Education Grant revenue.*

58. What statement of services will the 12 Education Assistants be providing? *(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*The additional 12 Educational Assistants will be assigned to schools to meet the specialized needs of students within the school according to the request sheets that each school submits requesting support. Education Assistants are assigned based on behaviour, safety and medical needs.*

59. Are the 5.0 Special Education Learning Centre (SELC) teachers the re-instatement of the ones that were supposed to be cut for 2011-2012? *(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*The 5.0 Special Education Learning Centre (SELC) teachers are in fact the reinstatements of the ones that were scheduled to be cut in 2011-2012.*

60. The 6.0 LSTs at the secondary level were to have been reversed, where does this show in the 2011-2012 budget? *(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*The 6.0 Learning Support Teachers (LST's) were not reversed but converted to 12.0 Educational Assistants. The Educational Assistants can be viewed on page 29 of the 2011-2012 Budget Presentation.*

61. Is the projected enrolment for 2011-2012 an extrapolation forward 12-15 months? *(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*The budget for 2011-2012 is primarily based on ADE numbers finalized in January 2011. The projected enrolment for 2011-2012 is a forecast completed by Board Planning Staff for the particular school year and is based, in part, on extrapolating historical enrolment data and trends forward to subsequent years. Other information which is used in the completion of the projected system enrolments include birth data, migration data, third-party school-age population projections, participation rates and development forecasts at the district-wide level.*

62. How is the board addressing funding shortfalls in programs? *(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*The recommended 2011-2012 budget in the Background section shows the following programs underfunded:*

<i>Special Education:</i>	<i>after the updated Ministry revenues - \$300,000.</i>
<i>Full Day Kindergarten:</i>	<i>after the updated Ministry revenues - \$600,000 of which \$500,000 is one year expense funded from reserves.</i>
<i>Safe Schools:</i>	<i>\$900,000</i>
<i>English as a Second Language:</i>	<i><u>\$1.2 million</u> \$2.5 million</i>

*Overall Instruction (all four are part of Instruction) is \$1.8 million underfunded. Other ongoing services that are part of Instruction are underspent to cover this shortfall.*

*The transportation envelope is underfunded by \$3.3 million.*

*The trustees continue to press the Ministry to address these issues.*

63. A reference was made in the presentation that an adjustment was made to budget based on run rates. What are run rates? *(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*"Run rates" is a term used to describe historical expense trends in relation to current year to date expenses that is often used to forecast future expenses.*

64. What are the funding sources for Special Education? *(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*Details on the funding sources for Special Education can be viewed on page 94 of the 09 May 2011-2012 Budget Presentation.*

65. Should the Board approve this proposed budget, what financial challenges (if any) would we be facing one year from now? *(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*Staff can not state with certainty the financial challenges for 2012-2013 or 2011-2012.*

*Unless there are large unexpected unfunded new expenses in 2011-2012, the OCDSB should be able to function within the recommended budget. The budget plan would use \$6.9 million, \$5.7 million of this to fund ongoing expenses in Instruction and Transportation. This would still leave \$4 million in reserves for use in 2012-2013.*

*However, the OCDSB has a history in the last six years of receiving mid-year grants that fund items already in the annual expense budget ((\$1 million to \$4 million), ending the year underspending compensation budgets by one half of one percent (\$3 million), and underspending the non-compensation budgets by \$2 million to \$7 million. The compensation underspend is now built into the budget (see page 27 of the Budget Binder). The other two combined range from \$3 million to \$11 million. Staff can not build this into the budget, as each year the causes are different.*

*However, if the pattern holds for 2011-2012, then some part of the \$5.7 million reserves won't be used and so remain in reserves to increase the \$4 million*

*As shown in the Multi-Year section of the budget package, the OCDSB's unfunded net cost grows \$6 million to \$8 million a year.*

*The OCDSB may well have enough in reserves to cover the 2012-2013 shortfall.*

*However, if the provincial government continues with its announced plan to not fund compensation increases in 2012-2013 and 2013-2014, but school boards are forced to sign collective agreements with compensation increases provisions, then the fiscal situation will get rapidly worse.*

66. What is the normal turnover rate (by FTE) by major employee groups? *(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*Based on 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 retirements, attrition rates by employee groups are summarized below:*

<b>Retirements by Group (FTE)</b>		
<b>Group</b>	<b>2008-2009</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>
Elementary Teachers	59.80	61.85
Secondary Teachers	41.01	40.92
Educational Assistants	15.00	10.50
Educational Support Professionals	15.50	15.00
Exempt Staff	4.00	8.00
Facilities	10.00	10.00
Professional Student Services Personnel	1.00	2.00
Principals & Vice Principals	17.00	20.00
	<b>163.31</b>	<b>168.27</b>

*Updated schedule with resignations will be provided in the near future*

67. Provide a summary of positions that have been added from 2010-2011 Revised Budget to the proposed 2011-2012 Budget. Details should include the following information by FTE: trustees' decisions, reinstatements and new initiatives. *(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*Please see details on table below:*

**2011-2012 Proposed Budget**  
**Comparative Staffing by Full Time Equivalent (FTE)**  
(Includes internally funded Proposed New Initiatives)

	2010-2011 Revised Budget	Staffing Decisions Already Made	Proposed New Initiatives	Proposed 2011-2012 Staffing	Reinstatements Included in 2011- 2012 Proposed Staffing
<b>Budget Year:</b>					
<b>Academic Elementary</b>					
<b>School Administration:</b>					
Principals (excluding central)	115.00	1.00	0.00	116.00	0.00
Vice-Principals (excluding central)	41.00	2.00	0.00	43.00	0.00
<b>Elementary Principals/Vice-Principals</b>	<b>156.00</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>159.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Teachers:</b>					
Regular Day School	2,236.97	58.92	4.00	2,299.89	5.00
Additional Primary Class Size Teachers	163.80	0.00	0.00	163.80	0.00
Special Education	446.78	0.41	0.00	447.19	5.00
<b>Elementary Academic</b>	<b>2,847.55</b>	<b>59.33</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>2,910.88</b>	<b>10.00</b>
<b>Academic Secondary</b>					
<b>School Administration:</b>					
Principals (excluding central)	26.00	0.00	0.00	26.00	0.00
Vice-Principals (excluding central)	48.67	2.00	0.00	50.67	0.00
<b>Secondary Principals/Vice-Principals</b>	<b>74.67</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>76.67</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Teachers:</b>					
Regular Day School	1,512.54	7.84	0.00	1,520.38	1.00
Special Education	102.29	(4.17)	0.00	98.12	0.00
<b>Secondary Academic</b>	<b>1,614.83</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>1,618.50</b>	<b>1.00</b>
<b>Non Academic</b>					
Educational Assistants	599.00	12.00	8.00	619.00	12.00
Early Childhood Educators	58.00	20.00	4.00	82.00	0.00
Special Education Support (PSSPs)	62.90	0.00	5.50	68.40	0.00
Custodial and Maintenance *	730.24	(11.50)	21.00	739.74	0.00
In School Support Staff	322.10	(0.50)	2.50	324.10	0.00
Instruction Support/Other (including 9.0 central Principals / VPs)	251.60	0.50	2.00	254.10	11.00
Central Administration	155.28	(0.50)	0.50	155.28	3.50
<b>Non Academic</b>	<b>2,191.12</b>	<b>20.00</b>	<b>43.50</b>	<b>2,254.62</b>	<b>26.50</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,884.17</b>	<b>88.00</b>	<b>47.50</b>	<b>7,019.67</b>	<b>37.50</b>

\* Staffing decisions include a reduction of 15.0 FTE for part-time weekend custodial staff (Community Use) re-classified as casuals (budget \$ remain, FTE's were removed)

68. Absentee rates for Floater Custodians are higher than forecasted. Is this item an acknowledgement that Attendance Management is not achieving its objective? (16 May Budget Cte. meeting)

*Our attention to the Attendance Management program has proven dividends as the FTE & RPT sick leave usage average is less than other groups. However, since 2004, 10 Floater positions had been eliminated through budget deliberations. Facilities staff are of the opinion that this has negatively impacted service levels and ultimately schools. The budget initiative is to help reverse this trend.*

69. a) With respect to the proposed increase in Operating Budget for Schools in the amount of \$1.5M, will expenditures and will school superintendents receive funds proportionally or compete for their projects? (16 May Budget Cte. meeting)

*The funds will be allocated to schools based on demonstrated need.*

*For the \$700,000 in elementary school supplies funding, elementary principals will be asked to track the number of students whose parents voluntarily choose to provide the recommended personal use items. Schools with a high participation rate will receive a smaller proportion of the funds. All schools will receive some funding because the newly developed common list of school supplies is significantly smaller than lists that have been provided to parents in many OCDSB schools in the past.*

*As to the \$300,000 Curriculum Services has developed a base list of instruments that will be provided to all schools offering instrumental music in grades 7 and 8. Curriculum Services has surveyed elementary principals to determine need. Some schools already have many of the instruments. Others will need a complete class set. Instruments will be allocated based on school need. All elementary schools offering instrumental music will be allocated base funding to pay for individual mouth pieces, ongoing repairs and maintenance for the instruments, and music books. Based on the new provincial guidelines, parents can no longer be asked to purchase these materials if the instrumental music program is the only music program available to the students.*

*The \$500,000 will be allocated to secondary schools to transition towards compliance with the new provincial guidelines. Secondary courses for September 2011 were developed and advertised last December. Staff has gathered information from secondary schools regarding the fees attached for each course. A small committee has been established to develop guidelines for secondary schools for the use of the first year's funding. Because teachers have not had time to rework their courses or to communicate this information to students and parents, this interim funding will be used to defray some of the costs for materials that can no longer be charged to the student. Significant work will take place next fall to restructure courses to be compliant for September 2012. It is understood that secondary schools will need ongoing funding to enable some of the specialized programming to continue in our secondary schools. Potentially ongoing budget allocations will be based on types of courses offered at each school.*

b) The proposed elementary allocation of \$700,000 equates to approximately \$10 per student. Is this a wise use of funds for one-time consumables?

*The practice in the district has been to ask parents to provide personal use items for their children. The new provincial policy allows schools to ask parents to voluntarily provide enhanced items provided that schools provide base items to ensure that all students can access the curriculum. If parents choose not to provide the enhanced items, funds for the base items will be required. Note that the \$1.5 million is intended to be on-going funding. (See answer in part (a))*

c) Now that grades seven and eight can access \$0.3M for musical instruments, who will teach the music program?

*Almost all 50 schools with grade 7 and 8 students in the OCDSB offer some type of instrumental music program. The vast majority offer a traditional instrumental music program. Some schools have chosen to offer different types of instrumental music, e.g. drums, strings. In all of these cases, the schools currently have staff to teach the program. The funds are required to be compliant with the new provincial guidelines on what equipment/supplies must be provided to students in credit courses. Students*



*in an instrumental music course must have access to an instrument provided by the school. Students/parents may choose to rent or buy their own instrument.*

70. Drug counseling and mental health are services for the whole population of students, and not just those who are special education students and should therefore be funded out of the instructional (non Special Education) programs. Why is this item charged to Special Education, when all students benefit? *(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*Drug counseling (Harvest House) services are charged to general instruction, not Special Education.*

*As to children's mental health, if the majority of students receiving this support are Special Education students, or appear to be likely to be designated as Special Education students in the future, then the costs are part of the Special Education envelope, as defined by the Ministry of Education.*

*If additional funding is received for Children's Mental Health programs, it would also be included in the Special Education Envelope.*

71. Page 88 of the Budget Binder makes reference to the WIFI project in the amount of \$2.5 M, while page 92 makes reference to the WIFI project in the amount of \$5.5M. Please explain the variance? *(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

*Reference Board Meeting, 26 April 2011 Minutes:*

5. *Approval of Financing Strategy for Wireless Local Area Network*

*Moved by Trustee Curry, seconded by Trustee Holtzhauer,*

*THAT the Board approve the use of \$1 million from the existing specific reserve for computer system replacement, up to \$2.5 million from the 2010-2011 year-end surplus, and \$2 million from the existing operating reserve/designated surplus as a funding source of the wireless project and repayment plan.*

*The Board approved the following financing of the \$5.5M capital cost of the WIFE project:*

*The \$2.5M on Page 88 shows the portion financed from the expected 2010-2011 year end surplus.*

*Page 92 shows the entire \$5.5 M in place for 31 August 2011.*

72. Provide a summary of staffing numbers by category that are mandated by legislation and or by collective agreements. *(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)*

**2011-2012 Staffing by Category**

By Full Time Equivalent

	<b>Total Staff</b>	<b>Mandated by Legislation or Collective Agreement</b>	<b>Not mandated by Legislation or Collective Agreement</b>	<b>Less: Special Education</b>	<b>Balance</b>
Elementary Teachers	2910.9	2334.9	575.9	(447.2)	128.7
Secondary Teachers	1621.0	1461.5	159.5	(98.1)	61.4
Principals and Vice Principals	244.7		244.7	(2.0)	242.7
Facilities Staff	685.1	333.5	351.6		351.6
Education Support Professionals	633.6		633.6		633.6
Educational Assistants	619.0		619.0	(600.0)	19.0
Early Childhood Educators	82.0	82.0			
Professional Services Student Personnel	68.4		68.4	(56.6)	11.8
Union Exempt	143.0	1.0	142.0		142.0
Trustees	12.0	12.0			
<b>Total</b>	<b>7019.7</b>	<b>4224.9</b>	<b>2794.7</b>	<b>(1203.9)</b>	<b>1590.9</b>

*While the Board has the discretion to change Special Education staffing, it must spend on Special Education funding in Special Education services. This means employing staff of some type.*

73. Please provide the history of transportation spending and funding for multiple years.  
(16 May Budget Cte. meeting)

**TRANSPORTATION**

(in \$million)

				<b>Fav. (Unfav.)</b>
	<b>Exp.</b>	<b>Grant</b>	<b>Other Rev.</b>	<b>Difference</b>
11-02 Recommended Budget	37.9	34.2	0.1	(3.6)
10-11 Budget	37.4	33.7	0.2	(3.5)
09-10 Actual	36.2	32.5	0.1	(3.5)
08-09 Actual	34.2	32.5	0.3	(1.4)
07-08 Actual	32.4	31.2	0.9	(0.4)
06-07 Actual	32.1	31.1	0.6	(0.4)

Expense and Grant include provincial school numbers (no impact on funding shortfall).

74. Could you please indicate where the Provincial Discussion Table funding for PSSP staff is located in the budget? (Email – 23 May)

*The Provincial Discussion Table (PDT) funding is not displayed separately in the 2011-2012 Budget Presentation. A summary of all funding sources can be viewed on pages 38 and 39 of the budget binder. A reminder that a portion of the PDT funding allocated to the PSSP group is used to fund Professional College Fees.*

*None of the Ministry grants are designated by collective bargaining group. PDT funding is not a separate grant. It is included in the grant benchmarks.*

75. On Page 44, under the Professionals and Paraprofessionals, there is an increase of 8.5 FTE. Are the 5.5 FTE PSSP staff mentioned on p. 32 & on appendix C, H, I, included here? (Email – 23 May)

*Yes, the Professionals, Paraprofessionals and Technicians group includes all PSSP staff. This includes those funded from Special Education, Safe Schools, Urban*

*Priorities and Full Day Kindergarten. The FTE number also includes the PSSP staff members that are allocated to General Instruction.*

76. The calculations of the projected salaries for PSSP staff appear to be in error. In one case the benefits are almost 24% of salary while elsewhere the benefits seem to amount to only 14% (assuming the Sept 2011 pay grid). Could you explain these differences? *(Email – 23 May)*

*Your average salary / benefit calculations for the Social Workers are correct. However the average salary for the Psychologists used in your calculation is much higher than in the budget working papers. A salary of \$92,838 is assuming that everyone in this staff group is made up of Psychologists (salary group PS5) at maximum level 7 salary. In fact, our average salary for the Psychologist staff group also includes Associate Psychologists (PS4) who are at a lower salary range.*

*When building the budget, staff looks at the current level of each staff member (using staffing data as at December 2010) and ages it by one year. Using this data, we have determined that in September 2011 only approximately 77% of the Psychologists group will be at the maximum salary level (as compared to approximately 92% for social workers). The average salary of the Psychologist group (PS4 and PS5) in the budget document is \$84,730 with benefits of \$21,123 or 24.9%. The total compensation cost of a psychologist is \$105,853.*

77. If I calculate OCDSB SEA Amount of  $\$33.39 * ADE$  (as provided on slide 35) =  $\$33.39 * 66,719$  (leaving out tuition paying and Over 21(?)) =  $\$2,227,747$  which is  $\$177,747 >$  amount shown in spec.ed. revenues ( $\$2,050,000$ ). Even recognizing that Kindergarten may not factor in the same way, this represents the SEA for 5,323 pupils which is higher than the Kindergarten ADE. *(Email – 30 May)*

*See answer to question #44.*

78. If I calculate SEPPA amount (RATE var. by grade) \* 66,719 (leaving out tuition paying and Over 21(?)) =  $\$46,656,741$  which is  $\$604,333 >$  amount shown in Special Education revenues ( $\$46,052,308$ ). Would represent the portion of Kindergarten students funded through EPO? (which I calculate to be 1809 1/2 days). Note: If there is a simpler way of explaining this, please do so and don't worry about trying to untangle my laborious calculations. *(Email – 30 May)*

*The SEPPA calculation based on our preliminary / adjusted ADE numbers is as follows:*

ADE Category	ADE	SEPPA	Total Grant
JK to Gr. 3	19,737.50	\$916.98	\$18,098,893
Gr. 4 to 8	24,120.00	\$704.33	\$16,988,440
Secondary	23,072.50	\$475.24	\$10,964,975
Total	66,930.00		\$46,052,308