



OTTAWA-CARLETON
DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

MEMORANDUM

Memo No. 18-091

TO: Committee of the Whole (Budget)

FROM: Jennifer Adams, Director of Education and Secretary of the Board
Mike Carson, Chief Financial Officer

DATE: 8 June 2018

**RE: 2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget
Questions and Answers**

The attached document contains the questions received regarding the 2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget that was presented to Committee of the Whole (Budget) on 30 May 2018. Responses have been provided for all questions.

Please direct questions or comments to Kevin Gardner, Manager of Financial Services, at kevin.gardner@ocdsb.ca or at 613-596-8211, ext 8350.

Attach.

cc Senior Staff
Manager of Board Services
Manager of Financial Services
Corporate Records



2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

This document consolidates the responses to all questions received regarding the development of the 2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget.

Release of 30 May 2018 - questions 1 to 24

Release of 4 June 2018 - questions 25 to 37

Release of 8 June 2018 - questions 38 to 44

2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

1. Please provide more information regarding the District’s accumulated surplus.

An accumulated surplus is the excess of revenues over expenses that has resulted over time. The *Education Act* allows the Board to use its accumulated surplus to balance its operating budget, but it also restricts the use in any school year to 1% of the operating grants provided by the Ministry of Education. For the 2017-2018 Revised Estimates, this amount is \$8.2 million. Approval to use accumulated surplus in excess of this amount must be obtained from the Ministry. The District’s 2017-2018 Budget was essentially a balanced budget that provided for a small surplus of \$4,000, meaning that there was no reliance on the accumulated surplus beyond that which is used to support amortization costs relating to past capital spending.

Table 1 presents the components of accumulated surplus and shows the anticipated increase resulting from the 2017-2018 operating surplus of \$4.3 million based on the most recent forecast reported in Report 18-039, 2017-2018 Updated Financial Forecast (February).

Table 1 – Accumulated Surplus Available for Compliance

	Projected as at 31 Aug 2018	Actual as at 31 Aug 2017	Change increase (decrease)
	\$	\$	\$
Available for compliance			
Restricted-committed capital	472,000	513,000	(41,000)
Internally appropriated			
Extended Day Program	426,000	213,000	213,000
Budgets carried forward	1,700,000	2,212,000	(512,000)
Contingencies	16,400,000	16,000,000	400,000
Unappropriated	5,013,000	794,000	4,219,000
	24,011,000	19,732,000	4,279,000

The \$16.4 million internal appropriation noted as “Contingencies” has been identified to respond to revenue shortfalls or increased expenses relative to the budget. The amount is aligned with the Ministry recommendation that a provision equal to 2% of the annual operating allocation be established. Of the amount, \$5.0 million has been identified for potential costs relating to gratuity payments and WSIB claims and \$1.0 million has been provisioned for the replacement of business systems. The remainder has not been assigned to a specific need.

Staff recommends that a contingency amount of between 2% and 3% of the District’s annual operating grant be targeted as an internal appropriation of the accumulated surplus balance. The target amount for 2017-2018 would be between \$16.4 million and \$24.6 million. The recommendation recognizes that certain grant funding is time-limited. This is particularly relevant for the Local Priorities and Mental Health Worker funding of \$8.7 million which will be used in the upcoming year to support 93 FTE positions through to 31 August 2019. The Ministry has not committed to further funding in subsequent years and the contingency amount would provide the District an opportunity to manage the effects of funding changes over an extended period of time.



2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

2. Please provide further information on the Multi-Year Financial Recovery Plan as it relates to the 2018-2019 budget.

In June 2016, the Board approved the District's MYFRP. The plan was mandated by the Ministry, given its concerns that the District had what is termed a structural deficit. A structural deficit is a deficit that recurs each year in the absence of corrective measures. The key requirements of the plan were to eliminate structural issues that have contributed to deficits in past years and to establish an accumulated surplus balance by the end of 2017-2018 that was at least 0.5% of the operating allocation or which is \$4.1 million based on the 2017-2018 Revised Estimates.

On 6 April 2018, trustees were advised by Memo 18-058, Multi-Year Financial Recovery Plan that the Ministry considered the District to have successfully achieved the requirements of the MYFRP. The Ministry recognized the District's efforts to address past structural issues and encouraged close monitoring of emerging budget issues to ensure that a healthy and sustainable financial position is maintained. The Ministry also recommended that a provision of no less than 2% of the annual operating allocation be established using the District's accumulated surplus that could be used to address future contingencies.

As noted in the response to question 1, a contingency amount of between 2% and 3% of the District's annual operating grant is recommended as a targeted internal appropriation of the accumulated surplus balance. The target amount for 2017-2018 would be between \$16.4 million and \$24.6 million. The contingency would be available in 2018-2019 to support revenue shortfalls or increased expenses relative to the approved budget.

Internally appropriated amounts are confirmed with the Board's approval of the year-end financial statements.

3. How much money has been allocated in the 2018-2019 recommended budget for playground funding and where is it shown in the budget document?

The capital budget focuses on the acquisition of assets that will be used over an extended period of time. The assets acquired through the capital program include new schools, major retrofits of existing facilities and new equipment such as play structures. Costs are supported by Ministry capital grants provided under various programs including Capital Priorities, School Condition Improvement, Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund and the Facilities Renewal Program (FRP). Funding is augmented by other sources including money received from donations and community fundraising activities. Money not used during the current school year is carried forward for use in future years.

The acquisition of a new play structure is a capital project. Applications for the replacement of existing play structures are evaluated based on needs and incorporated into the overall capital spending plan which will be presented to Committee of the Whole early in the 2018-2019 school year. Similar to past years, an amount of \$300,000 may be needed to augment funds raised by the school community.



2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

Play structure funding is included in the “School Renewal” amount of \$6.7 million as shown in the capital section of the 2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget.

4. Please provide information on the cost associated with the Eastern Secondary and Western Area Pupil Accommodation Reviews including, the communication budget, legal fees and staff time.

Student learning and accommodation reviews look at schools, programs and student enrolment to ensure sustainable and vibrant learning environments are maintained. In September 2016, the District formally initiated two such reviews: the Western Area Review involved 26 schools in the Bell, Merivale, Sir Robert Borden and Woodroffe high schools “families of schools” while the Eastern Area Review focused on Rideau, Gloucester and Colonel By high schools. The purpose of the reviews was to improve student learning, enrich program offerings, reduce the amount of underutilized school space and allow resources to be more effectively deployed.

The reviews, which were conducted in accordance with Ministry requirements, looked at grade configurations, programs, school condition, student enrolment and excess pupil space. Both reviews resulted in program realignments and a number of schools closed at the end of the 2016-2017 school year. Significant investments in school facilities were made as a result of the changes, and additional work is planned. Examples of investments include reconfiguring Briargreen Public School, relocating portables at various sites and ensuring that staff at affected schools was supported during the school closure process. An example of future investments is the construction of gymnasiums at Bell, Merivale and Sir Robert Borden high schools.

Much of the administrative work supporting the reviews was conducted by staff as part of their regular duties. As such, formal time reporting of work effort on this initiative was not pursued and the related costs are not quantifiable. However, incremental operating costs of \$726,900 have been identified as summarized in the following table.

Incremental Operating Costs as at 18 May 2018

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18*	Total
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Consulting Services	10,400	84,900	97,000	15,000	207,300
OCDSB Printing Services	-	400	2,200	-	2,600
School Support-Casual Staffing	-	-	74,200	22,100	96,300
School Support-Supplies & Services	-	-	31,000	81,700	112,700
School Support-Moving Costs	-	-	96,400	133,400	229,800
School Support-Logistics Term Staff	-	-	21,800	56,400	78,200
Total	10,400	85,300	322,600	308,600	726,900

**2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget
Questions and Answers**

- 5. How much more funding is required to attract enough qualified EA/interpreters for Deaf and Hard of Hearing children. We are hearing the salary is not high enough for individuals to acquire the credentials and training.**

Although a higher rate of pay may attract and retain a skilled individual, the availability of trained interpreters is limited. George Brown College is the only Ontario college graduating interpreters at this time.

- 6. Did the GSNs provide any additional funding for teachers to take the \$685 AQ courses to advance the teaching of the new TRC curriculum?**

GSNs do not provide specific funding for teachers to take Additional Qualification (AQ) courses to advance the teaching of curriculum aligned with recommendations made by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada; however, the Indigenous Education AQ being offered this summer is 100% subsidized for teachers eligible to participate in the New Teacher Induction Program (NTIP). The District is also researching the various AQ courses to see to what degree they are taught by Indigenous educators and is assessing the feasibility of offering a subsidy to all teachers interested in such AQ, particularly those who are teaching the Indigenous Studies (NBE) English grade 11.

- 7. What if any changes have been made in the Special Education funding model?**

The Special Education Grant provides additional funding to school boards to support students who need special education programs, services and equipment. The Special Education Grant may only be used for special education purposes and any unspent funding must be treated as deferred revenue for special education. The District anticipates funding of \$97.2 million through five of the grant's allocations as shown in Table 2.

Table 2 – Comparative Special Education Grant Funding

	2018-2019 Recommended Budget	2017-2018 Approved Budget
	\$	\$
Special Education Per Pupil Amount (SEPPA) Allocation	54,461,700	52,322,400
Differentiated Special Education Needs Amount (DSENA) Allocation	36,640,900	34,473,200
Special Equipment Amount (SEA) Allocation	3,200,800	3,151,900
Special Incidence Portion (SIP) Allocation	2,500,000	1,799,400
Behaviour Expertise Amount (BEA) Allocation.	408,400	290,100
	97,211,800	92,037,000

Increases to the funding benchmarks, as well as an update to the Special Education Statistical Prediction Model which is used in determining the DSENA allocation, are reflected in the 2018-2019 funding. In addition, the following three changes are reflected in the 2018-2019 funding:

2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

- Increased funding of over \$1.1 million to support the creation of a multi-disciplinary team and other staffing resources which will help build Board capacity and help teachers, educational assistants, and other staff better understand and adapt to the unique needs of their students;
- An \$11,000 increase in the maximum SIP funding amount per eligible claim to support the staffing costs associated with addressing the health and safety needs of students and others in their school; and
- The inclusion of \$108,400 in the GSN to support Applied Behaviour Analysis (ABA) training. In past years, the funding was provided through Education Program - Other (EPO) funding and this is simply a change in how ABA training funding is provided to the District.

It should be noted that the per pupil amount of the SEA allocation is a specific funding envelope within the special education envelope. The funding can only be used to support qualifying expenses. Unspent funding cannot be used to support other special education spending; rather, it must be set aside as deferred revenue to support SEA spending in future years.

8. Has there been any movement in the Special Education grants to move towards funding following the needs of the child rather than a per student in a District funding model, with some exceptional funding?

Changes to the Special Education funding model are shown in the response to question 7. There are limited changes to support specific student needs, but the majority of the funding continues to be provided based on the District's overall average daily enrolment as influenced by the updated Special Education Statistical Prediction Model which is used in determining the DSENA allocation.

9. In Reference to Report No.18-039, Updated Financial Forecast (February), Folio 4 (page 4 of report) The 3rd paragraph under #7 says “. . . spending on equipment and supports funded using the Special Equipment Amount (SEA) allocation is expected to be \$320,000 lower than budgeted. These expenses are supported by a specific funding envelope within the special education envelope. Accordingly, related funding has been reduced by an equivalent amount.”

a. Does this mean that the uptake of SEA equipment has been less than could be supported by the amount of money provided by the Ministry?

There are two components of special equipment provided through SEA funding. The SEA Per Pupil Amount purchases computers, software and related equipment. The SEA Claims-Based funding covers non computer-based equipment such as sensory equipment, physical equipment, hearing and vision support. This equipment must be deemed essential to support students with special education needs where the need for specific equipment is recommended by a qualified professional. This equipment is to provide students with accommodations that are directly required and essential to access the Ontario curriculum and/or a Board determined alternative program and/or course and/or to attend school.

2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

Funding currently exceeds the direct cost of equipment and associated costs to support its use. Unused SEA funding is reported as deferred revenue.

- b. If so, what is the reason for lower uptake of equipment? Some of the possibilities that occur to me are:**

Equipment is allowed to be reallocated when it is no longer required by a student. In addition, over the last several years a shift from laptop-based computer technology to Chromebook technology has occurred and this has significantly reduced costs.

- c. Were there an insufficient number of students requiring computers to access the curriculum?**

The funding is based on actual claims for student needs. All students who are deemed to require SEA equipment receive it.

- d. At what tier are computers considered to be an intervention of choice?**

All students have access to computers in classrooms which provide students with the opportunity to use assistive platforms such as “Google Read and Write” to support the curriculum. When a strategy is accessible and available to all students in the classroom, this is a tier 1 strategy. In addition, students who specifically require SEA equipment would have experienced the involvement of qualified professionals within tier 2 and/or tier 3.

- e. If this is a tier 2 or 3 intervention, are there students who can benefit from computers who have not yet made it through the lower tier 1 intervention in order to have access to this intervention? Note that SEAC has expressed concern that children may not be moving as quickly as possible through lower level interventions (tiers) in order to access higher level accommodations which will better meet their needs.**

Since there are computers in the classroom, there should be no delay in being able to access assistive technology. When a qualified professional determines that a student must have access to a computer, there should be no delays, apart from possible delivery delays by the supplier. Other than through a recommendation by a qualified professional, SEA equipment may not be assigned.

- f. Do students have to be identified (IPRC'd) before they get computers?**

No. There is a difference between accessing a computer for learning in the classroom and accessing specific other equipment through SEA as recommended by a professional. The need for SEA equipment would be reflected in a student's IEP, but the student does not also require an IPRC.

2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

g. Is waiting for an assessment a hold-up for some of them?

There may be a delay in accessing a qualified professional in order to make the recommendation. However, the impact on the student waiting for an assessment is minimized by the provision of loaner equipment to students as needed.

h. Is there adequate capacity to train teachers, parents and kids prior to their getting computers? If this constitutes a delay in the child accessing this intervention what is causing the delay (e.g. lack of availability of the classroom teacher, lack of ITAT availability)?

Yes, there is adequate capacity with the current staff. Teachers are now more comfortable supporting students with assistive technology within their classrooms (tier 1). In addition, our itinerant teachers of assistive technology (ITATs) support the system as needed. They are requested by school staff to support specific training for students and staff. Although they are not typically used to train parents they have invited parents to training sessions so that they could receive the same message as their child(ren). ITATs have also made presentations at the Parent Conference on a number of occasions. As in all areas of large-scale professional development, there have been limits to the release of teachers in the current year.

i. Is there delay from the time the need for the equipment is recognized and having the student fully functional on the computer? What causes this delay?

The time it takes for a student to be fully functional on a computer depends on the individual student. Like all skills, computer skills are developmental. Some students may take longer to become proficient enough to use the technology fully. ITATS provide developmentally appropriate support as required. For example a student in grade 2 may require a longer period of time and different supports to be fully functional than a student in grade 5.

10. Section #8 re increased transportation costs: Last sentence is: “The additional costs related to increased enrolment and more complex transportation needs”. Are the more complex transportation needs related to Spec.Ed., and if so, in what way?

The majority of the cost increase is attributable to costs of large vehicles and public transit. The more complex transportation needs generally relate to special education and the use of specialized transportation services, but transportation services to students in a joint custody arrangement and who have two homes also influences actual costs.



2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

11. In reference to Ministry of Education Memo 2018:SB10 SPECIAL EDUCATION Funding for 2018-19, under the Special Education Statistical Prediction Model information on page 3:

- a. Am I wrong in thinking that the Ministry is using population data that is older than 2011 in its prediction model?**

The model uses data that is older than that collected during the 2011 National House Survey. It is our understanding that the information collected during 2011 was not as reliable as the earlier survey and the Ministry opted to use the historical data.

- b. If so, how does this impact the OCDSB?**

The impact of using the historical survey results is unclear because the funding calculations using the 2011 National House Survey data is not readily available. Once the Ministry commences the use of more current data, it may be possible to infer an effect that use of historical data has had on District funding.

- c. Does the Ministry compare their prediction as produced by the above model to the actual data as submitted by the district through Section J reporting?**

No. Section J data reported in the Ontario Student Information System (OnSIS) does not impact funding. There are many boards that do not formally identify students with exceptionalities. Funding is not based on the number of identified students.

12. Multi-Disciplinary Supports Amount (p.12): In the words of memo 2018:B06 this funding is to be used to “. . . build board capacity and help teachers, education assistants, and other staff better understand and adapt to the unique needs of their students.” What is the OCDSB vision for how this new funding can best be used to build board capacity through Multi-disciplinary teams?

The staff-recommended budget proposes to use the additional funding of \$394,300 to create a multi-disciplinary team comprised of psychologists (1.1 FTE), social workers (1.3 FTE) and speech language pathologists (1.5 FTE). This will complement supports that are already in place. The multi-disciplinary team will support schools in expanding an understanding of interventions that may be appropriate within each tier. Within tier 1 this would involve enhancing a foundational understanding around the conditions for improvement of learning and well-being. Within tier 2, this would involve supporting school staff to provide more personal and precise interventions. Within tier 3, this would involve in-depth training for those who work to support students with significant needs.

2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

- 13. Other Staffing Resources Component: In B Memo 2018:B06, it was noted that “This investment will provide for a total of approximately 600 additional FTEs in the province by 2019-20.” And that it could be used “to build capacity and provide direct support to students with special education needs in recognition of the increase in demand for services.” What will be the OCDSB amount for this component?**

The staff-recommended budget proposes that the additional special education funding provided for other staffing resources be used to help support overall special education staffing needs. The additional funding is \$752,000 and will support approximately 13 educational assistant FTEs.

- 14. Will a portion of this be used by the OCDSB to build capacity of teachers to manage increasing numbers of special education students in their classrooms through increased professional development opportunities?**

In addition to the capacity building support which will be provided to staff through the additional multi-disciplinary teams, there will be some dedicated educational assistants with more specialized training who will support the learning of school teams in specific areas of need. Job-embedded learning is considered to be the most effective way for professionals to enhance practice.

- 15. What is the OCDSB plan for staffing this component of the funding?**

The funding will be used to support the additional staffing explained in the responses to questions 12 and 13.

- 16. Special Incident portion (SIP) Allocation (p13)**

- a. Will the OCDSB be receiving additional funding due to the increased SIP Allocation?**

Additional SIP funding is expected next year. The funding is based on estimates of student needs in combination with the \$11,000 increase in the maximum SIP funding amount per eligible claim. Actual funding will be confirmed by the Ministry during the 2018-2019 school year.

- b. Will this assist in such issues as behavioural issues for spec.ed. students?**

SIP supports are targeted to the needs of the students and may assist with behavioural issues as well as other needs. As per Ministry guidelines, SIP funding is provided based on students who require 2 or more additional Board support staff (e.g., EAs) for at least 10% of the school week.

2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

- c. **Can it be used to support return to full day schooling for those students who are currently excluded from full day attendance at school under Section 265(1)(m) of The Education Act .**

SIP funding is not based on short-term needs. SIP funding looks at students' timetables to ensure students who require two or more additional supports for at least 10% of the week throughout the school year are identified. If students who are excluded require this long-term support then a SIP claim may be made to support them.

17. **In reference to the Behaviour Expertise amount (BEA Allocation) P13, the Ministry acknowledges that ABA Expertise can be of benefit “for student with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) and other students with special education needs” and that “The ministry Expect school boards to strengthen capacity to deliver ABA instructional methods to students with ASD and other students with special education needs”.**

- a. **To what extent are increasing behavioural issues in the district related to the need of ASD students, to what extent to other special education students, to what extent to issues related to mental health, and to what extent to other students for whom none of the categories apply?**

There are certainly a variety of students who require behaviour supports. Students often have complex profiles which make it difficult to know if their needs relate directly to their exceptionality and/or other concerns such as mental health or environmental changes. ABA strategies can help to support a wide variety of students with behavioural challenges, in addition to those who are diagnosed with autism. At times other interventions such as psychological supports are also required.

- b. **Should the Board be advocating for more general funding that would address behavioural issues without relating it to the special education budget?**

Behavioural concerns continue to exist and are being experienced province-wide. There are a number of initiatives currently underway within our Board to try to support this issue. For example, the use of the Social Emotional Learning Teachers (SELT) has been an effective strategy. The learning of staff experienced through the kindergarten pilot in conjunction with the Crossroads Children's Mental Health Centre, is showing promise. Last year, the District was chosen to participate in a Board Certified Behaviour Analyst (BCBA) and Registered Behavioural Technician (RBT) pilot. The pilots will continue to be funded into the 2018-2019 academic year. Through these pilots we hope to better understand the science of behaviour and how to continue to broaden our supports to all students requiring behavioural supports.

2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

- c. To what extent is professional development extended to principals, teachers and EAs whose main contact is with special education students in the regular classroom and to what extent are these resources being directed to principals, teachers and EAs who are mainly dealing with autistic students?**

Professional development is ongoing. The entire focus of the current school year was dedicated to supporting school leaders with the promotion of positive behaviour through their operations meetings. This was not limited to students with autism. Professional development for teachers and educational assistants is provided in a variety of ways, small group, one-on-one, online learning and, where applicable, larger groups (PD days, etc). Central Learning Support Services staff provides support and job-embedded professional development to schools, as needed, in support of all exceptionalities. Staff are often called upon to assist with interventions for all types of learners with single or multiple diagnoses. Specific autism PD was provided for principals during Autism Awareness Month. We further provide support to schools as needed throughout the year, through our ASD referral process and related autism supports and initiatives.

- 18. Given that this is a sweated amount for ABA training does the Board spend its total amount in each year, or is some held in deferred revenue?**

Prior to the change to provide ABA training funding through the GSN, funding of this initiative was provided by the Ministry using an Education Program - Other (EPO) grant. EPO grants are treated as deferred revenues and used to support eligible expenses. There is no specific requirement to separately envelope the unused ABA training funding provided through the GSN, however, the current level of training will continue and costs are expected to approximate the funding. The District reported ABA training expenses of \$98,500 in 2016-2017 and the 2017-2018 grant of \$105,700 will support a similar level of spending.

- 19. What Tier of intervention is ABA considered to be?**

ABA is a mandatory requirement through PPM 140, a directive issued by the Ontario Ministry of Education for all school boards to follow pertaining to the teaching of students with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) within any tier of support. The intensity, number, frequency of the interventions is determined by the individual need of the student.

- 20. EPO Funding page15: In terms of the EPO funding that is directed to address waitlists for special education professional assessments over the next three school years. What is the waitlist in the OCDSB for assessments?**

Our goal is to be responsive to the needs of students. When it is deemed necessary for a student to undergo a professional assessment, it is requested and prioritized to be undertaken as quickly as possible. Therefore the wait list is regularly adjusting to meet the demands of the most needy students. The revised system of tracking services through the IOL platform will provide system-wide information regarding wait lists at a given point in time.



2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

21. **The People for Education Report on Special Education 2017 reports that 83% of schools in Eastern Ontario have restrictions on the number of students who can be assessed in any given year. Does the OCDSB have such restrictions at either the elementary or secondary level?**

We do not have any imposed restrictions on the number of assessments. As stated above, we prioritize assessments based on need. The number of overall assessments completed in a given year is related to staff capacity.

22. **Assuming that the OCDSB is intending to use its share of this funding, what is the anticipated process by which students will be selected for assessments?**

The District will continue to prioritize students for assessments as needed following the tiered intervention model.

23. **Are there a set of goals which the OCDSB will attempt to fulfill allocating these resources. I appreciate that you will attempt to allocate this equitably, but I would appreciate more detail**

The main goal would be to provide information for the provision of learning supports that would best meet the needs of the students, that is, to provide the appropriate level of support for the student at a particular point in time. This would apply to all exceptionalities based on student need and not prioritized for one learning profile over another.

24. **Investments in Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) p. 16, After School Skill Development (ASSD) Programs for Students with Autism Spectrum Disorder. Although not specifically recognized here, ASD students are not the only special education students who lack social, communication, self-regulation and life-planning skills such as are addressed here. Does the OCDSB have a plan to leverage the professional knowledge developed through this funding in order to ensure that other special education students can also benefit from that knowledge so that their social, communication and self-regulation skills can be enhanced.**

Being chosen to pilot these After School Skills Development Programs has had many advantages. Although the pilot was funded to support ASD students we have included some non-ASD students in the sessions. We have further used our training and expertise gained through these pilots to expand our support to a variety of schools within the Board. We have trained school staff so that they may implement the programs into their schools. Many staff who were part of these pilots were school-based staff (i.e., teachers and educational assistants who work at a school full-time). Their training skills and expertise are now used to support this work for all students who need it within the school.

**2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget
Questions and Answers**

25. Please identify how the recommended initiatives shown on Appendices D and E align with the District's strategic priorities.

Appendices D and E to the 2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget present the recommended changes in staffing and operating budgets to meet the District's identified priorities. The recommendations have been shown by area of focus. A notation indicating each initiative's alignment with the District's strategic priorities has been added. Changes in staffing required by contract, legislation and agreement have been added to show the overall increase in the District's staff complement.

	FTE	\$	
Supports for students			
Discretionary Academic Staffing (<i>prev. approved</i>)	31.80	3,571,257	Learning, Well-Being
Educational Assistants	25.00	1,433,250	Learning, Well-Being
Psychologists	4.00	462,640	Learning, Well-Being
Social Workers	4.20	415,968	Learning, Well-Being
Speech Language Pathologists	1.50	149,475	Learning
Orientation and Mobility Support	0.50	35,453	Learning
Secondary Athletics	-	180,000	Equity
Elementary Athletics	-	80,000	Equity
ONFE-Volunteers in Education/Breakfast Program	-	70,000	Stewardship, Well-being
School Mobile Technology	-	600,000	Learning
	<u>67.00</u>	<u>6,998,043</u>	
Support for schools			
School office positions	2.50	121,375	Well-Being, Learning
Superintendency administrative assistants	1.50	124,905	Well-Being, Learning
Human Resources Casual/OT Staffing Support	1.00	98,541	Well-Being, Learning
Human Resources General Support	1.00	50,000	Well-Being, Stewardship
Financial Services School Support	1.00	50,000	Well-Being, Stewardship
Communications School Website Coordinator	1.00	91,272	Well-Being, Engagement
Facilities Trades Apprentices	2.00	98,830	Stewardship
Portal Enhancement	-	91,000	Engagement
Student Management System	-	400,000	Stewardship
Health and Safety Management	-	375,000	Stewardship, Well-being
Snow and Ice Safety	-	250,000	Stewardship, Well-being
	<u>10.00</u>	<u>1,750,923</u>	
Total Recommended Initiatives	<u>77.00</u>	<u>8,748,966</u>	
Other enrolment-based staffing changes			
Required Academic Staffing (<i>prev. approved</i>)	139.64	14,890,303	Learning
Extended Day Program Early Childhood Educators	14.08	711,808	Learning
Extended Day Program Early Learning Assistants	(3.45)	(125,245)	Learning
School office positions (staffing formula)	4.10	199,055	Well-Being, Learning
	<u>154.37</u>	<u>15,675,921</u>	
Net Increase in Staff Complement	231.37	24,424,887	

Additional staffing of 171.44 FTE teaching positions was approved through the academic staffing process. The staff-recommended budget seeks approval of 59.93 non-teaching positions (45.20 FTEs as recommended initiatives and 14.73 FTEs in response to enrolment growth).



2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

26. Please provide additional detail on the \$600,000 investment in mobile devices for students.

A \$600,000 investment to acquire mobile devices for schools has been identified in the staff-recommended budget. Mobile device types to be deployed vary by grade, but would include Chromebooks and iPads. The investment is an integral step towards establishing a sustainable technology renewal plan.

Business and Learning Technologies, Curriculum Services and Learning Support Services departments recommend that a baseline of mobile technology be provided in each school to support the equitable opportunity of access to devices that will further support student learning. In elementary schools, each homeroom would be provided with at least one tech tub (consisting of 5 devices) for student use. In secondary schools, the student use of devices will be facilitated through the Library Commons, speciality programs (e.g., Computer Science, Communication Technology) and tech tubs. The goal related to hardware is to have one device for every four students in each school.

Deployment will be prioritized based on the number of non-SEA mobile devices in each school, the age/condition of existing equipment, the RAISE index of the school, the percentage of English language learners, the school's achievement results in mathematics over the last five years and the readiness of the school to embrace the effective use of the devices.

27. Please provide details on the enrolment projections for kindergarten classes across the District.

The Board approved 2018-2019 academic staffing levels in alignment with the recommendations presented in Report 18-030, Academic Staffing for 2018-2019, as revised and approved at the 27 March 2018 Board meeting. The approved staffing reflected kindergarten average daily enrolment of 9,218 students and the need for 361 classes, and a total of 2,115 classes from JK to Grade 8. Since that time, the Planning department has increased the projected enrolment, generating an additional 5 classes, bringing the total to 2,120 classes.

Based on school by school projections and the class size cap of 29, a total of 370 kindergarten classes have been generated. Each kindergarten class is staffed by 1.0 FTE teacher and 1.0 FTE early childhood educator. Projected class sizes range from 16 to 29 students, with an average class size of 25.

The effect of changes in staffing and costs resulting from the additional enrolment, as well as those necessary to meet mandated class size maximums, will be reported in the 2018-2019 Revised Estimates and shared with Committee of the Whole in January 2019 as part of the financial forecast for the year.

**2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget
Questions and Answers**

- 28. Please explain the variance in costs reported for the Extended Day Program as shown in the 2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget binder on page 116 as compared to those shown on page 134.**

Extended Day Program (EDP) costs are comprised of both direct and indirect expenses. As noted in the narrative shown on page 116, the costs do not include central department salary allocations which total approximately \$576,000. Instead, these costs are reported in the respective department's operating budget as presented in the following table.

Central Department	Binder Page	Amount
		\$
Human Resources	107	198,443
Business and Learning Technologies	113	196,833
Finance	77	113,854
Payroll	78	67,289
		576,419

A supplemental schedule detailing EDP and the Infant, Toddler and Preschool Childcare program is shown on binder page 134. This schedule includes the central department salary allocations that weren't included on page 116. The information shown on binder page 134 equals the summarized amounts shown on binder page 22 entitled Comparative Budget Summary.

The budget pages relating to EDP costs will be reviewed with a goal of enhancing the clarity of the presentation.

- 29. Please provide additional information regarding the enveloping shown in the 2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget binder on page 119.**

The information shown on page 119 relates primarily to interest costs incurred on borrowing to fund the acquisition of District assets (e.g., school buildings, furniture and equipment) and the amortization into expense based on the expected useful life of the assets. The costs are supported by related revenues.

The enveloping shown in the schedule identifies how the costs are categorized for Ministry reporting. A review of the enveloping shown for 2016-2017 actual costs confirmed that amortization expenses were inadvertently shown in the "Other" category. Future budget documents will report close to \$44.2 million in the "Pupil Accommodation" category.

**2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget
Questions and Answers**

30. Please provide prior year comparative information for the District's capital budget.

The capital budget is shown on page 122 of the 2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget and presents, by funding source, a summary of the expected investments in various assets. Assets include land, new school buildings, major additions and refurbishments, and the acquisition of furniture and equipment. The following table compares the budgeted investments with those planned in the previous year.

Funding Source	2018-2019	2017-2018	Increase (Decrease)
	\$	\$	\$
Capital Priorities	19,321,225	4,446,556	14,874,669
Full-Day Kindergarten	1,000,000	-	1,000,000
Education Development Charges (Land)	13,800,000	8,000,000	5,800,000
Facilities Renewal Program (School Renewal)	6,654,521	8,421,996	(1,767,475)
School Condition Improvement	57,018,291	51,839,435	5,178,856
Greenhouse Gas Reduction	4,093,810	3,470,790	623,020
Community Hubs	567,162	-	567,162
	102,455,009	76,178,777	26,276,232
Furniture and Equipment ¹	3,029,085	832,075	2,197,010
	105,484,094	77,010,852	28,473,242

¹ Furniture and equipment are considered to be minor tangible capital assets. The assets are funded using an allocation provided by the Grants for Student Needs.

**2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget
Questions and Answers**

31. Please provide an outline of the District’s approach to asset management.

The District receives specific funding from the Ministry to maintain and renew school facilities. Planned investments in 2018-2019 using the three grants are shown in the following table.

Funding Source	2018-2019
	\$
Capital	
Facilities Renewal Program (FRP) (School Renewal)	6,654,521
School Condition Improvement (SCI)	57,018,291
Greenhouse Gas Reduction (GGR)	4,093,810
	67,766,622
Operating	
Facilities Renewal Program (FRP) (School Renewal)	5,693,776
	73,460,398

As shown in the table, FRP funding is split between capital and operating spending.

Many factors are considered when prioritizing investments in the District’s facilities such as

- long-range building envelope reports;
- mechanical and electrical needs forecasts;
- consultant reports;
- preventative maintenance reports;
- program requirements and accessibility needs; and
- Ministry-initiated independent audits of school facilities.

Planned projects are subject to change due to unforeseen building component failures and emerging needs that may arise during the school year.

**2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget
Questions and Answers**

32. Please provide a list of instructional coach assignments for 2018-2019.

Instructional coaches support teachers by sharing with them evidence-based teaching practices that are designed to enhance student engagement and learning outcomes. The 2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget identifies 39 instructional coach FTEs. The following table shows the planned area of focus of instructional coaches in 2018-2019.

Area of Focus	Elementary	Secondary	Total
Arts	1.00	1.00	2.00
French as a Second Language	2.00	1.00	3.00
Business and Learning Technologies	2.00	-	2.00
Early Years	3.00	-	3.00
English as a Second Language	3.00	-	3.00
Literacy and Numeracy	6.00	-	6.00
Intermediate Itinerants	6.00	-	6.00
Physical Literacy	1.00	-	1.00
E-learning	-	1.00	1.00
Equity	-	1.00	1.00
Indigenous Education	-	1.00	1.00
Literacy	-	1.00	1.00
Numeracy	-	2.00	2.00
Science	-	1.00	1.00
Athletics (NCSSAA)	-	1.00	1.00
Pathways/Cooperative Program	-	2.00	2.00
Specialist High Skills Major	-	1.00	1.00
Trades and Technology	-	1.00	1.00
Continuing Education	-	1.00	1.00
	24.00	15.00	39.00

33. Please provide details on the investments to support secondary and elementary athletics.

The investment in athletics is recommended to support physical activity for both girls and boys at elementary and secondary. The funds would be used to assist with staff replacement costs, team transportation costs and registration fees relating to elementary and secondary athletics. At the elementary level, these funds would also support the enhancement of physical education/ activity opportunities at a school level to include equipment replacement to support daily physical activity and healthy active living. Funds will be allocated to schools based on a number of factors including school size, grade configuration, Raise level, and other factors relating to school and District need to support equity of access.

2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

34. It would be helpful to have more explanation as to the “dedicated educational assistants with more specialized training” mentioned in the response to Q14 in the Q&A document.

a. Is this new or does it happen already?

The District has educational assistants (EAs) with specialized knowledge in the areas of disability, autism, technology, behaviour and early learning. The additional EAs would add to the existing complement and would provide specific specialized support, as needed.

b. How many, how quickly, how will the EAs be chosen?

6.0 FTEs would be added to the complement of itinerant EAs. They would be hired as soon as the budget process and hiring process allows. As always, an applicant’s skillset in relation to the needs of the position is an important consideration.

c. How exactly will they provide this service?

The EAs will provide services to schools based on requests and the needs of the schools.

35. In reference to Q12, I would like more information on how the Multi-disciplinary team will function? I presume they go to schools to work with the staff at each school: will that be different schools in turn, or when they are called upon by a particular principal, or some other methodology.

The District already uses the multi-disciplinary team structure to provide support and services to students across all schools. These teams are comprised of social workers, psychology staff and speech & language pathologists. At the secondary level, an itinerant EA is also part of the multi-disciplinary team.

The new multi-disciplinary team positions will be used to augment existing multi-disciplinary team services to school teams across the District. The positions will not be used to create a new team. The multi-disciplinary team structure is also used with central teams (e.g., Autism Spectrum Disorder, Early Learning and Behaviour). The social work, psychology and speech & language staff work alongside educator staff to provide direct service to students as well as capacity building to help staff better understand and adapt to the unique needs of their students.



2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

- 36. Some of the new psychologists, social workers, are mental health people. Are they paid for out of the special education budget? If so, why since mental health is a general school issue and not a special education issue per se.**

The Ministry has provided the additional funding for multi-disciplinary teams as part of the special education envelope. Funding provided by other allocations that comprise the Grants for Student Needs is also used to support the special education needs of students.

- 37. I notice that for 2018-19 it is recommended that \$171,336 be allocated to Staff Development. This is higher than the amount in the budget for 2017-18. Will any of this be directed towards the tiering specific education that has been requested by SEAC?**

The additional budget within the staff development line covers a variety of needs related to students receiving supports within all tiers. The budget will support and enhance the operational training requirements of staff that support students with special education needs and would include training on the creation and implementation of Individual Education Plans.

- 38. Please provide information regarding the integration of extended day program staff with the kindergarten program.**

Early Childhood Educators (ECEs) and teachers collaborate to share knowledge, skills and experience to support student achievement and well-being in the Kindergarten program. As an educator team, they have complementary skills that enable them to create a nurturing and stimulating learning environment that supports the unique needs of each child. Together, they implement and assess the Kindergarten program by providing developmentally appropriate activities that engage learners in inquiry and play-based learning and promote the development of social and emotional skills for future success.

The work day for ECEs, as defined in the collective agreement is 7 hours plus 30 minutes for an unpaid lunch break.

In 2017-2018, 63 schools offered a District-run Extended Day Program (EDP). For 2018-2019, we anticipate operating the same number of programs but will increase programs should there be sufficient demand. In schools where the OCDSB provides an EDP, ECEs who are assigned to work in the EDP as well as the core day begin a morning shift at 6:45am and transition into the core day until 2:15pm. An afternoon shift ECE begins in the core day at 10:45am and transitions to the afternoon EDP until 6:15pm. This allows for 3.5 hours of overlap time during the core day between the morning and afternoon ECEs. There may also be ECEs in schools with EDP who are not assigned to work in the EDP and whose shift would cover the core instructional day.

2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

During the overlap time, ECEs provide coverage for one another to have their lunch (30 minutes) and a break period (15 minutes) which accounts for 90 minutes. The remaining 120 minutes of overlap time allows for shared instruction, planning for the EDP and core portions of the day, gathering resources/materials, and documenting learning. One hour of this time is funded through parent fees to allow ECEs time to prepare for activities and duties specifically related to the EDP.

In the 30 schools where a third party operator (TPO) provides the EDP or in the 14 schools where there is no EDP provided at the school, ECEs work their regular 7 hour shift (exclusive of a 30 minute lunch break) to cover the school core day of 5 hours. ECEs in the core day programs are not responsible for planning activities, gathering resources, or administrative tasks related to the EDP. ECEs in the core day have approximately 90 minutes outside of the core day to engage in activities such as planning and documenting learning and gathering resources.

Schools where the OCDSB does not provide the EDP are prioritized in the allocation of lunchtime monitors to assist with supervision during lunch and breaks.

39. Please provide information about the Resource Allocation Index based on Socio-economics (RAISE).

Underlying the use of the RAISE index is the concept of equity and resource allocation based on needs. The District uses the RAISE index as an indicator of school-level need relative to other schools within the District. The index incorporates various indicators from several data sources to identify where resources can be applied to enhance student success. The following table is an excerpt from Appendix A to [Report 17-048, Update to the Resource Allocation Index based on Socioeconomics \(RAISE\)](#).

Theme	Indicator	Data Source
Poverty	Income	Statistics Canada
	Social Assistance	Statistics Canada
	Low Income Measure After Tax	Statistics Canada
Family/Community	Single Parent Families	Trillium
	Students Living in Foster Care	Trillium
Mobility	Absenteeism	Trillium
	Entries/Withdrawals (Transience)	Trillium
	New Students (Transitions)	Trillium
Cultural/Linguistic	Needs ESL Support	Enrolment & Staffing Data
	New Immigrants	Trillium
	First Language other than English or French	Trillium
Readiness to Learn	Learning Skills and Work Habits	Trillium

Additional information regarding the index was provided in [Memo 17-103](#) which responded to questions asked during discussion of the report.



2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

The Finance department references the index as one element of the allocation formula used to provide operating budgets to schools to purchase supplies and services and to meet casual staffing needs. In addition, the Human Resources department uses the index in determining school staffing allocations where additional supports may be helpful in meeting the needs of students. The overall goal for using RAISE is to help mitigate the effects of socioeconomic or demographic barriers to learning.

Use of the Raise index resulted in priority schools receiving additional operating budgets of \$70,600 (\$9.35 per ADE) in 2017-2018 and a separate budget of \$252,500 is used to offset costs incurred by priority schools to provide enriched learning and engagement opportunities during the year. Schools that received a RAISE index-based budget allocation in 2017-2018 are shown in the following table. Additional Information on how the budgets are used will be summarized in a memo to trustees in June 2018.

Schools that received a RAISE index-based budget allocation in 2017-2018		
Arch Street PS	D. Roy Kennedy PS	Robert E. Wilson PS
Bayshore PS	Featherston Drive PS	Roberta Bondar PS
Blossom Park PS	Hawthorne PS	Sawmill Creek ES
Carleton Heights PS	Henry Munro MS	Vincent Massey PS
Carson Grove ES	Pinecrest PS	Viscount Alexander PS
Centennial PS	Queen Elizabeth PS	W.E. Gowling PS
Charles H. Hulse PS	Queen Mary Street PS	York Street PS

Five high schools have also been identified as priority schools; however, unlike the elementary schools, RAISE-based operating budget allocations are not provided. The five high schools are Gloucester HS, Ridgemont HS, Ottawa Technical SS, Woodroffe HS and Richard Pfaff SAP. They would be eligible for funding using the \$252,500 central budget allocation.

**2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget
Questions and Answers**

40. Please provide an outline of the Indigenous Education allocation of the Grants for Student Needs (GSNs).

The 2018-2019 GSNs provide total funding of \$1,265,160 through the Indigenous Education and Program Leadership allocations to support Indigenous education. The Indigenous Education allocation provides \$438,368 based on expected enrolment in Indigenous studies courses, \$126,240 to support work relating to the Board Action Plan (BAP) on Indigenous Education and \$606,441 as a “per pupil” amount based on the District’s overall average daily enrolment. Funding provided by the Program Leadership allocation is \$94,111. The Ministry of Education requires that unspent BAP, per pupil and program leadership funding be treated as deferred revenue for use in subsequent years; however, the 2018-2019 spending plan anticipates full use of the funds.

The District also receives funding through the Education Program-Other (EPO) grants. These grants, which may be provided in advance of or during the school year, are enveloped for specific purposes. A report confirming use of the funds must be provided to the Ministry. Two EPO grants that have been confirmed are included in the 2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget: \$100,000 for Indigenous support and engagement and \$15,370 for Indigenous student learning and leadership gatherings.

The following table presents the 2018-2019 spending plan.

	FTE	Budget (\$)
GSN Supported		
Vice-Principal (Program Leader)	1.00	129,119
Native Studies Sections Teachers	3.67	393,375
Urban Aboriginal High School Teacher	2.00	214,374
Instructional Coach-Elementary (Itinerant)	1.00	104,697
Instructional Coach-Secondary	1.00	108,280
Native Studies-Inuit Centre Teacher	1.00	104,697
Native Studies-Inuit Centre ECE	1.00	57,879
	10.67	1,112,421
Supplies, Services and Release Time	-	152,739
GSN Total	10.67	1,265,160
EPO Supported		
Indigenous Support and Engagement	1.00	100,000
Student Learning and Leadership Gatherings	-	15,370
EPO Total	1.00	115,370
Combined Total	11.67	1,380,530

A motion to amend the staff-recommended budget to add \$75,000 was approved by Committee of the Whole (Budget) on 4 June 2018. This amount, which is not included in the table shown above, will be used to support Indigenous education which may include additional staffing.

2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

41. Please provide suspension data for Carleton Heights Public School.

Based on the information to date, there does appear to be an increase in the number of incidents. It is important to note that there is a transition process when bringing two different school communities together and the establishment of a commonly understood set of behavioural norms across a school.

Multiple supports have been put in place to assist in this area led by Learning Support Services (LSS) as identified earlier. There will be continued support in 2018-2019 from LSS, including professional development (PD) for staff in the area of self-regulation and supporting the development of self-regulation skills and the establishment of a common school-wide approach to promoting positive behaviour. Specific sessions focusing on Collaborative Problem Solving (CPS) and Zones of Regulation are scheduled in the fall of 2018.

Of note, the school climate survey responses from families reported that the staff are welcoming, provide a safe environment for learning, and a varied and appropriate education for students.

42. What would be the effect of adding two Early Childhood Educators (ECEs) to support kindergarten classes at Carleton Heights Public School (PS)?

The additional ECEs would be assigned to provide support in the kindergarten classes, which are presently in the low 20s. Students would be well supported by the current ECEs and classroom teachers.

The allocation of additional Educational Assistants (EAs) would allow for greater support and flexibility in serving and supporting students across grades, and could be more responsive to ongoing needs throughout the school year, including, but not exclusively, in the kindergarten program, as required.

As part of the ongoing monitoring of enrolment and class sizes, staff would continue to monitor Carleton Heights PS and, where necessary, provide additional supports, as required. For example, this year (2017-2018), the initial staffing allocation for Carleton Heights PS was allocated in April 2017. This included an allocation of a 0.5 vice-principal, an increase to 3.0 English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers (from 1.0 the prior year), an increase of learning support teachers (LSTs) from 0.75 to 1.5, an increase in learning resource teachers (LRTs) from 1.5 to 2.5 and an increase in EA allocation from 3.0 to 5.5. In response to increased enrolment and class sizes through the year, the following in-year additional staffing supports were added:

- 1.0 primary homeroom added in October 2017;
- 1.0 ECE was added in March 2018 to support the kindergarten classes;
- 0.5 EA was added in March 2018 to support self-regulation and skill development; and
- 1.0 ESL/ English Language Development (ELD) teacher was added in March 2018 to support the ELD program students.

2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

In addition, the following supports were provided to support the staff and students as part of the transition:

- Pilot program coordinated by the Manager of Mental Health to provide professional development to staff focusing on self-regulation led by social worker and itinerant educational assistant (IEA). (Three sessions of 40 minutes PD to staff throughout the school year);
- The support of 2.0 IEAs through Learning Support Services (LSS) to support transitions, and the creation of a common school approach to support students and self-regulation; and
- The support of a retired administrator in the Spring of 2018 for one to two days a week for three months.

The initial staffing allocation for the 2018-2019 school year was allocated in April 2018 and included:

- 0.25 increase in vice-principal allocation from 0.5 to 0.75; and
- Junior ELD program class to support ELD program students.

Since April 2018, and as a result of additional ongoing enrolment, two additional homeroom classes have been added to the staffing at Carleton Heights PS:

- 1.0 kindergarten; and
- 1.0 primary homeroom.

In anticipation of increased ongoing enrolment, additional portables have been requested for the school site such that classes can be further added should enrolment numbers continue to grow.

43. Please provide a broader narrative of the investments within the 2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget detailing how each aligns with and supports the strategic plan.

For a detailed response please refer to trustee memo 18-094.

**2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget
Questions and Answers**

- 44. Please provide a list showing, by school, the number of anticipated kindergarten classes in 2018-2019 and indicate if the District operates an extended day program (EDP) at the school.**

The following table shows schools that have a kindergarten program. The projected number of classes for each school assumes a class size maximum of 29 students. Each class is staffed with one teacher and one early childhood educator. The operator of EDP at the school is shown, if applicable.

School	Enrol.	Classes	Average Class Size	EDP Operator
A. Lorne Cassidy	91	4	23	District
Adrienne Clarkson	90	4	23	Children's Village
Agincourt	135	5	27	District
Alta Vista	136	5	27	Andrew Fleck Child Care
Arch Street	39	2	20	None
Avalon	62	3	21	YMCA Child Care
Barrhaven	107	4	27	District
Bayshore	102	5	20	District
Bayview	146	5	29	District
Bells Corners	54	2	27	District
Berrigan	215	8	27	District
Blossom Park	60	3	20	None
Briargreen	52	2	26	District
Bridlewood	92	4	23	Children's Village
Broadview	163	6	27	District
Cambridge *	33	1	33	District
Carleton Heights	86	4	22	Andrew Fleck Child Care
Carson Grove	72	3	24	None
Castlefrank	130	5	26	District
Castor Valley	151	6	25	District
Centennial	48	2	24	Centretown Parent's Co-op
Chapman Mills	163	6	27	District
Charles H. Hulse	80	3	27	Andrew Fleck Child Care
Churchill	58	2	29	District
Connaught	109	4	27	District
Convent Glen	26	1	26	District
D. Roy Kennedy	48	2	24	Whitehaven Kindergarten SAC
Devonshire	107	4	27	Devonshire School Age
Dunlop	46	2	23	District
Dunning Foubert	83	3	28	District
Elgin Street	105	4	26	District
Elmdale	139	5	28	Canadian Mothercraft
Emily Carr	-	-	-	None
Fallingbrook	79	3	26	Global Child Care Services
Farley Mowat	123	5	25	Canadian Mothercraft

**2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget
Questions and Answers**

School	Enrol.	Classes	Average Class Size	EDP Operator
Featherston Drive	17	1	17	District
Fielding Drive	-	-	-	SportsCan Recreation Program
First Avenue	22	1	22	Glebe Parents Day Care
Forest Valley	98	4	25	Global Child Care Services
General Vanier	66	3	22	District
Glen Ogilvie	111	4	28	District
Goulbourn	-	-	-	None
Greely	21	1	21	District
Half Moon Bay	255	9	28	District
Hawthorne	27	1	27	Aladin Child Care
Henry Larsen	39	2	20	District
Henry Munro	-	-	-	None
Heritage	65	3	22	Children's Village
Hilson	46	2	23	The Children's Center Carleton Preschool (Rainbow Kidschool)
Hopewell	150	6	25	Kidschool)
Huntley Centennial	85	4	21	District
J.H. Putman	-	-	-	None
Jack Donohue *	89	3	30	District
Jockvale	80	3	27	District
John Young	210	8	26	District
Kanata Highlands	99	4	25	District
Kars on the Rideau	69	3	23	District
Katimavik	-	-	-	YMCA Recreation Program
Knoxdale	147	6	25	District Carleton Preschool (Rainbow Kidschool)
Lady Evelyn	20	1	20	Kidschool)
Lakeview	72	3	24	District
Le Phare	140	5	28	District
Manor Park	200	8	25	Manor Park Community Council
Manordale	71	3	24	District
Manotick *	60	2	30	District
Maple Ridge	105	4	26	District
Mary Honeywell	134	5	27	Barrhaven Child Care
Meadowlands	119	5	24	District
Metcalfe	34	2	17	District
Mutchmor	133	5	27	Glebe Parents Day Care
North Gower	32	2	16	District
Orleans Wood	91	4	23	District
Osgoode *	59	2	30	District
Pinecrest	60	3	20	District
Pleasant Park	160	6	27	Aladin Child Care
Queen Elizabeth	20	1	20	Ottawa Boys and Girls Club (bus)
Queen Mary	26	1	26	Andrew Fleck Child Care

**2018-2019 Staff-Recommended Budget
Questions and Answers**

School	Enrol.	Classes	Average Class Size	EDP Operator
Regina	46	2	23	REKSAP
Richmond	64	3	21	District
Riverview	44	2	22	Andrew Fleck Child Care
Robert Bateman	76	3	25	District
Robert E. Wilson	75	3	25	None
Robert Hopkins	75	3	25	District
Roberta Bondar	126	5	25	District
Roch Carrier	110	4	28	District
Rockcliffe Park	96	4	24	District
Roland Michener	40	2	20	None
Sawmill Creek	118	5	24	District
Severn	97	4	24	REKSAP
Sir Winston Churchill	137	5	27	District
South March	118	5	24	Children's Village
Stephen Leacock	114	4	29	District
Steve MacLean	154	6	26	District
Stittsville	154	6	26	Andrew Fleck Child Care
Stonecrest	105	4	26	District
Summerside	97	4	24	District
Terry Fox	-	-	-	YMCA Recreation Program
Trillium	54	2	27	Global Child Care Services
Vimy Ridge	176	7	25	District
Vincent Massey	119	5	24	District
Viscount Alexander	45	2	23	District
W.E. Gowling	118	5	24	District
W. Erskine Johnston	102	4	26	District
W.O. Mitchell	98	4	25	District
Westwind	97	4	24	District
Woodroffe Avenue	120	5	24	District
York Street	20	1	20	None
	<u>9,257</u>	<u>370</u>		

- * The Human Resources and Planning departments are monitoring enrolment at these sites. Additional classes will be added if current projections continue to ensure class sizes are at or below the cap of 29.