



OTTAWA-CARLETON  
DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

## MEMORANDUM

**Memo No. 15-102**

**TO:** Committee of the Whole (Budget)

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

**DATE:** 5 June 2015

**RE: 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget  
Questions and Answers**

---

The attached document contains the questions received following the presentation of the 2015-2016 staff recommended budget at Committee of the Whole (Budget) on 12 May 2015. Responses have been provided for all questions.

Please direct questions or comments to Kevin Gardner, Manager of Financial Services, at 613-596-8211 extension 8350 or by email at [kevin.gardner@ocdsb.ca](mailto:kevin.gardner@ocdsb.ca).

Attach.

cc Senior Staff  
Monica Ceschia, Manager of Board Services  
Kevin Gardner, Manager of Financial Services  
Corporate Records



OTTAWA-CARLETON  
DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

## **2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers**

---

This document consolidates the responses to all questions received regarding the 2015-2016 staff recommended budget. Questions that have not yet been answered are noted as *Response Pending*.

- Release of 22 May 2015 - questions 1 to 65
- Release of 2 June 2015 - questions 66 to 98
- Release of 5 June 2015 - questions 99 to 106

## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

---

**1. We have I believe 13 identified exceptionalities. What are the legislated class sizes and staff component of System Classes for each exceptionality?**

The following is an extract of *Ontario Regulation 298* regarding class sizes from students with exceptionalities.

The maximum enrolment in a special education class shall depend upon the extent of the exceptionalities of the pupils in the class and the special education services that are available to the teacher, but in no case shall the enrolment in a self-contained class exceed,

- (a) in a class for pupils who are emotionally disturbed or socially maladjusted, for pupils who have severe learning disabilities, or for pupils who are younger than compulsory school age and have impaired hearing, eight pupils;
- (b) in a class for pupils who are blind, for pupils who are deaf, for pupils who have developmental disabilities, or for pupils with speech and language disorders, ten pupils;
- (c) in a class for pupils who are hard of hearing, for pupils with limited vision, or for pupils with orthopedic or other physical handicaps, twelve pupils;
- (d) in a class for pupils who have mild intellectual disabilities, twelve pupils in the primary division and sixteen pupils in the junior and intermediate divisions;
- (e) in an elementary school class for pupils who are gifted,
  - (i) twenty pupils, if the class consists only of pupils in the primary division,
  - (ii) twenty-three pupils, if the class includes at least one pupil in the primary division and at least one pupil in the junior division or intermediate division, and
  - (iii) twenty-five pupils, if the class consists only of pupils in the junior division or intermediate division;
- (f) in a class for aphasic or autistic pupils, or for pupils with multiple handicaps for whom no one handicap is dominant, six pupils; and
- (g) on and after the 1st day of September, 1982, in a class for exceptional pupils consisting of pupils with different exceptionalities, sixteen pupils.

## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

- 2. Do we follow the above legislated system class size and staff requirements or do we over-staff or have smaller enrolments? If so, what are they by exceptionality?**

The District is guided by legislation which dictates the maximum number of students in a class. Staff is assigned to congregated classes based on the established ratios for the programs. An example of the additional support that is provided and assists the classroom teacher are the two educational assistants (EA) that are assigned to each Autism Program class. The Dual Support Program, Behaviour Intervention Program and General Learning Program each have one EA. In addition to the noted EA support, other support is provided based on specific needs of the students.

Some congregated classes may have smaller enrolment than that legislated based on student needs and program location.

- 3. I see we have 156 staff in congregated system classes – could you give me the breakdown of the classes (i.e. 14 elementary ASD classes, 1 teacher, 2 EAs per class). What makes up the 156 staff. If for instance EAs are not part of the 156 staff, please indicate that.**

The District has 152 elementary and 78 secondary congregated classes. Each class is led by a teacher and some are assigned educational assistants (EA). The following table shows the number of classes for each program and the number of dedicated EAs based on established staffing ratios. Note that the secondary sections (or courses) have been converted to show the estimated number of classes assuming one class is eight sections.

Abbr.	Program	Elementary		Secondary		
		classes	EA	sections	classes <sup>(2)</sup>	EA
AUT	Autism	23	46.0	24	3	6.0
ASD	Autism - Secondary Credit Program	-	-	72	9	per student need
BIP	Behaviour Intervention	9	9.0	32	4	4.0
D/HH	Deaf and Hard of Hearing	1	-	-	-	-
DD	Developmentally Delayed (includes CB sites)	34	80.5	96	12	12.0
DSP	Dual Support	3	6.0	32	4	8.0
GLP	General Learning	12	12.0	104	13	13.0
Gifted	Gifted <sup>(1)</sup>	30	-	156	20	-
LD	Learning Disability <sup>(1)</sup>	16	-	79	10	-
LLD	Language Learning Disability <sup>(1)</sup>	11	-	-	-	-
PSN	Primary Special Needs	11	11.0	-	-	-
PSP	Physical Support	2	8.5	32	3	17.5
		152	173	627	78	60.5

1. Schools may assign EAs from general school allocation to these program classes based on need  
2. Secondary sections have been converted to classes by dividing by eight.

Additional staff support is provided based on the specific needs of a student.

## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

---

4. **Why is all the Spec Ed staff per Report 15-045 Appendix A for elementary “Subject to Board Decision”. If we have Spec Ed children that need to be served why is it “discretionary”.**

Report 15-045 details the District’s academic staffing requirements based on projected enrolment. Academic positions that are not based on legislated teacher-student ratios and/or subject to collective agreement provisions are termed ‘discretionary’ because the Board has the ability to approve the staffing levels in alignment with the Board’s strategic plan and available financial resources after accounting for mandatory staffing.

5. **Same concern for the majority of the Secondary Spec Ed staff. Why is only LST “Required by Contract or Legislation”.**

In some school districts the roles of a learning support teacher and that of a learning resource teacher are merged; however, the District separates the positions and has been doing so since 2004 when the Special Education Learning Consultant model was modified to have a more inclusive approach. A description of the roles assigned to each position is provided in Appendix A to this document.

6. **In my mind all the congregated gifted (CG) classes at the Secondary level do not have a smaller teacher/student ratio than a regular class, do not need/nor receive special equipment and do not have staff that by their qualifications are paid a higher rate? Tell me where I am wrong.**

The description of congregated gifted classes at the secondary level is correct.

7. **In my mind I also think the same as above, is true for elementary congregated gifted classes. Tell me where I am wrong.**

### Updated Response

*Ontario Regulation 298* limits the elementary school class size for pupils who are gifted to:

- twenty pupils, if the class consists only of pupils in the primary division;
- twenty-three pupils, if the class includes at least one pupil in the primary division and at least one pupil in the junior division or intermediate division; and
- twenty-five pupils, if the class consists only of pupils in the junior division or intermediate division.

It should be noted that the cap of 25 for gifted intermediate is lower than our intermediate classes which do not have a cap.

8. **I do understand some gifted children have dual exceptionalities, but what % of CG students are dual?**

Approximately 13% of our students currently in congregated gifted classes have dual exceptionalities. The exceptionalities include behaviour, learning disabilities and autism.

## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

---

9. **How many of our CG classrooms have Spec Ed specific staff in the classroom in addition to the classroom teacher at both the elementary and secondary levels?**

Several congregated gifted classes receive school-based educational assistant (EA) support. The support varies by site and ranges up to 2/3 of a school's overall EA allocation. In addition, one class makes use of the support of Deaf & Hard of Hearing support staff. The majority of learning support teacher time at schools where there is a congregated gifted class is devoted to supporting gifted learners and their families. Gifted learners may also be supported by learning resource teachers, learning support consultants, psychologists and social workers.

10. **Do we have any "gifted" certified teachers at either ES or SS level? Is there such a thing anymore as a "gifted" certified teaching credential?**

There may be some "gifted" qualified teachers from a teacher's qualification system that is no longer in place. Currently, teachers may be qualified as Part I, II or III Special Education.

11. **Are the costs associated with staffing CG classes at elementary or secondary charged to the Spec Ed budget regardless of lack of any additional staffing or supports.**

The costs of elementary and secondary gifted classes are charged to the Learning Support Services special education budget. Some gifted classes receive additional support from other special education staff such as psychologists, social workers and educational assistants based on student needs. Costs relating to gifted classes are removed when determining the special education costs for Ministry reporting purposes.

12. **Under legislation or elsewhere, are the costs for CG classes required to be allocated to the Spec Ed Budget?**

The Special Education Expenditure Reporting Instructions for district school boards (published in 2003-2004) dictates that congregated/self-contained classes must be fully charged to special education.

13. **Are the applications to the congregated gifted program this year relatively the same as the last couple of years? Do we know/think the new criteria sheet caused a change in the number of applications? (this question was previously numbered Q.25)**

Overall, the number of referrals from schools is down this year from previous years, across all of the exceptionalities. This may be attributed in part to the increased use of the tiered interventions.

## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

---

- 14. Are the costs associated with putting together an IEP charged to the Spec Ed Budget? If so, how?**

The cost of preparing a student's Individual Education Plan (IEP) is not tracked. Rather, any number of school team members in collaboration with District level staff with knowledge of the student will contribute to the development of an IEP. The school principal oversees and is responsible for the IEPs.

- 15. Is the administration (teacher, EA, LST etc. carrying out the Plan) of an IEP charged to the Spec Ed Budget? If so, how do we determine how much for each IEP to charge to Spec Ed?**

As noted above, the costs for preparing each Individual Education Plan (IEP) are not tracked and the District does not have an estimate of these costs. We do have approximately 12,000 IEPs in our District.

- 16. What is charged off to the Spec Ed budget line – high level breakdown?**

Details of what is charged to special education can be viewed on page 114 of the 2015-2016 staff recommended budget binder under the "2015-2016 Special Education Ministry Totals" column.

- 17. When did we move from carried forward waiting lists to annual waiting lists? I was certain during Superintendent Bennett's time, the children who had not been placed within the school year, rolled forward to the next school year without having to restart the whole process.**

Waiting lists have always been dealt with this way. Learning Support staff confirms that this has been the case for at least the last 15 years. There has been no change in the process during the current year.

- 18. Could I have a quick tutorial on how the waiting list is administered? What I mean is once a child is placed on the list, is their place on the waiting list static (they are 4th on the list and only move up the list if the 1st, 2nd or 3rd in line is placed or removed and never move down the list), or might they be bumped up or down based on their need relative to others on the list?**

Access to specialized classes has always been determined based on need. On a yearly basis, students' needs are triaged to determine best suitability for specialized program classes or support at Tier 3. Historically, access to the gifted specialized classes was determined by a ranked score on a cognitive test. As of 2014-2015, additional factors have been used to determine the need for gifted learners, as well as for all other exceptionalities.

## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

---

**19. How do Instructional Coaches benefit Spec Ed children?**

Instructional coaches provide support to teachers through job-embedded professional learning on site in schools, as well as system-wide professional learning networks across subject areas, throughout the school year. The focus of these professional learning opportunities is to enhance/develop/implement effective instructional practices for the benefit of all students, including students with special needs. Further, the instructional coaches work collaboratively with learning support consultants to assist teachers in meeting the specific needs of students where appropriate.

**20. Are any of the costs of Central Instructional Coaches allocated to the Spec Ed bucket?**

There are no central instructional coaches allocated to special education; however, there are 14 learning support consultants within Learning Support Services.

**21. How many IPRCs do we do now annually?**

The responsibility for identifying a student with special needs is generally assigned to an Identification, Placement and Review Committee (IPRC) which operates at the school level. The District processes approximately 7,000 IPRCs annually.

**22. Under paragraph 10 of Report 15-046, it says we anticipate 800-900 IPRCs annually when the Geo Model is fully rolled out. What is the basis for that number? What % more uptakes in congregated classes are we anticipating.**

The basis for the predicted annual 800-900 new IPRCs for specialized classes is historical data and projections. Some exceptionalities show more of an increase in demand than others.

**23. Do we know what % or dollars of LSS Budget goes to support non- Spec Ed children? I am thinking of things like social workers, SSTs, TERT etc.**

Approximately 10% of the time of our psychologists, social workers and speech language pathologists (PSSP, total of 6.5 FTE) is estimated to support non-special education children. These positions are reported as general instruction and not special education. This information is based on a recommendation and Board approval of a Special Education Ad-Hoc Committee (comprised of staff, PSSPs, trustees and SEAC members) in April 2005.

**24. Is the whole LSS Budget charged to the Spec Ed Budget Line?**

As indicated above, approximately 10% of our PSSP staff is charged to general instruction. In addition, we have allocated the time of 21.0 FTE educational assistants, 1.8 FTE psychologists and 3.0 FTE social workers as supporting all students as well as initiatives under Safe Schools and Urban Priorities. These positions are not charged to special education



**2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget  
Questions and Answers**

---

- 25. What is the definition of a Spec Ed child? For instance, is a child on an IEP regardless of the reason considered a Spec Ed child and therefore all the pupil costs for that child charged off to the LSS/Spec Ed Budget?**

Any student receiving special education services is considered to be a student with special needs. Staff often refer to children with IEPs as receiving special education services, but our central Learning Support Services staff, as well as school learning support and learning resource teachers, also respond to students who do not have IEPs. Sometimes the creation of an IEP follows at the next level of intervention, but not necessarily.

Not all costs for special education students are charged to Learning Support Services' special education budget. Special education students also receive support from other departments such as Inclusive, Safe and Caring, Early Years and Curriculum Services.

- 26. Autism Class Costs: The expectations of the Ad-Hoc Committee were that, while there would be additional costs involved in having new congregated classes, there would also be cost off-sets in terms of less support required on the regular classroom for these severely affected children (e.g. EAs in regular classroom, LST's, and perhaps fewer of other resources required there), transportation, and other.**

- a. What are the elements that go into the \$250,000?**

The following costs comprise the amount for an autism class.

Description	FTE	Amount
Teacher (includes 19% preparation time)	1.19	\$117,000
Educational Assistant	2.00	105,000
Start-up Costs and Supplies	-	28,000
	3.19	\$250,000

- b. Should it not be the case (statistically) that if 66 placement in 11 classrooms are made available, 2 - 3 classroom teachers will no longer be required as these children are removed from the regular classroom. (This is a statistical estimate but is it not precisely how number of teachers required is decided in the first place: no. Of students/maximum classroom size).**

Technically yes, fewer teachers would be required in the system overall.

## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

---

- c. If all children who are accepted to a specialized classroom were previously attending a regular classroom in which a full-time EA is available, then is there not a considerable saving in EA's? (My assumption is that, since the children being offered placements are the most severely affected autistic children, that there is at least one EA available at all times in the (regular) classroom to which they were assigned. Granted that EAs may be helping other children in that classroom as well when they are available to do so, how often would these EAs be re-assigned to other classroom, at least on a part-time basis?

### Updated Response

The EAs for the additional autism classes have been reassigned from the general staffing complement previously assigned to schools.

- d. One aspect of the geographic model is to have children attending specialized classes closer to their home, thus resulting in a shorter bus ride. Has this proven to be the case? And if so, what are the savings in transportation costs that have resulted from this?

Savings in transportation costs have not yet been determined

- e. There is a reference to resources needed for the new classroom. Are these not off-set by not being needed in other locations? i.e. If fewer regular classes, a shift of resources; are there special resources provided for congregated autistic classes that are then not provided for autistic students in the regular classroom.

Some resources can be reallocated while others need to be added to support new specialized program classes.

27. **Reduction of Elementary Learning Consultant: what work will be impacted by this?**

There has been no reduction.

28. **In terms of LST/LRTs: at Elementary:**

- How will this be allocated across the different schools?**
- Is there a formula for deciding how much of this resource each school gets?**
- How will this formula change in order to account for the lesser level of resource?**
- Since the teachers who may actually lose a job will be the ones with the least seniority, will the OCDSB not be losing its investment in training done for future teachers of our students?**

This is done in consideration of overall school needs.

**2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget  
Questions and Answers**

---

- 29. In terms of LST reduction at Secondary, is the decrease in the number of LST'S consistent with:**
- a. The % age decrease in the population at Secondary,**
  - b. Number of students in special education in Secondary?**

The reduction of 1.0 FTE learning support teacher is distributed across a number of secondary schools for a balanced approach.

- 30. Decrease in P.D. opportunities: There is a paradox here. It is a common belief that many classroom teachers do not have the knowledge they need in order to support special education students in the regular classroom. Amongst the skills and knowledge required are:**

- a. Differentiated instruction and universal design,**
- b. Developing an effective IEP,**
- c. Effectiveness with computers and software in general and for specific software for exceptional children,**
- d. Specific understanding of each exceptionality, and**
- e. Specific pedagogy for their specific needs as a group and individually.**

Professional development will be job-embedded and supported by collaboration among departments.

- 31. Director Adams reported that there have been many applications for access to the Autism program from people newly moving into the district to gain access, and/or from children transferring from the Catholic school board (and perhaps others?). For the Autism program placements made in 2015-16, what would be the %age of these?**

There have been 25 applications from external sources as referenced in memo 15-099 dated 22 May 2015.

- 32. On page 4 of Section 1 (Letter of Transmittal & Board Motion for Approval), there is mention of "Accumulated Surplus Available for Compliance". Is there such a thing as accumulated surplus that is not available for compliance? If so, please explain the difference in outcomes of these kinds of surplus.**

The Ministry of Education's method for accounting for minor capital purchases is that the District must set aside the full amount in the year it's acquired, even though its cost will be amortized over a number of years. The result is we pay up front, and that is used to offset future depreciation costs. That amount represents the bulk of the amount "not available for compliance".

**2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget  
Questions and Answers**

- 33. Last paragraph at the bottom of page 6 (same section): Does this mean that bell times will not be an issue for the Board since bell times are intricately tied to transportation costs?**

The bell times were approved in January by our Board based on recommendations from Ottawa Student Transportation Authority (OSTA). The current practice is any future time changes of less than 10 minutes can be approved by the OSTA Board. Changes exceeding 10 minutes require the approval from the OCDSB.

- 34. Page 8, re the discussion on Academic Staffing: What is the difference between "net reduction" and "reduction" in this context? The figures are very different (23.5 FTE and 30.5 FTE, respectively).**

The net reduction of 23.55 FTE academic staff is the result of both reductions and increases in staff. The reductions total 30.50 FTE while the increases total 6.95 FTE. The following chart, which is based on Appendix A included in the 2015-2016 staff recommended budget (page 22), summarizes the changes in academic staffing and differentiates the changes between those required based on regulation and collective agreements from those decisions approved by the Board.

	<b>Net</b>	<b>Gross</b>
<b>Regulations and or Collective Agreements</b>		
Elementary Teaching Staff	1.19	
Secondary Teaching Staff	(10.00)	(10.00)
<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>(8.81)</b>	<b>(10.00)</b>
<b>Approved By Board:</b>		
Decrease in Elementary Instructional Coaches	(8.00)	(8.00)
Decrease in Secondary Instructional Coaches	(1.00)	(1.00)
Decrease in Elementary Needs Allocation Teachers	(5.00)	(5.00)
Decrease in Secondary Focus Program Teacher	(0.50)	(0.50)
Decrease in Central Principals	(2.00)	(2.00)
Decrease in Elementary Learning Resource Teachers	(2.00)	(2.00)
Decrease in Elementary Learning Support Teachers	(2.00)	(2.00)
Increase of one Elementary Principal for schools opening in September 2016	1.00	
Increase System Classes for Special Education (Including Preparation Time)	4.76	
<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>(14.74)</b>	<b>(20.50)</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>(23.55)</b>	<b>(30.50)</b>

## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

---

- 35. In this same section, regarding "Increases in staffing were limited to "...", Is the 1.2 FTE a part of the 4.7 FTE?**

The 1.2 FTE identified as elementary teacher staffing is based on regulation and collective agreement. It is additional to the 4.8 FTE approved by the Board for special education classes. Added together, the increased staffing is 7.0 FTE.

- 36. Are there multi-year financial commitments from prior years included in the 2015-2016 Recommended Budget? If so, please provide details/narratives.**

Multi-year financial commitments are included in the budget. Aside from costs incurred pursuant to collective agreements, the cost of multi-year contracts for services and equipment are reflected in the budget estimates. Examples include the cost of leases of vehicles and equipment, external audit fees and amortization costs. Other costs do not necessarily constitute a multi-year financial commitment; however, there is limited capacity to reduce or eliminate these. Examples include the cost of utilities, software licences and insurance premiums.

- 37. Page 11 of Report 15-067 makes reference to Employee Future Benefits / Public Sector Account Board. How is this benefit calculated, what is the projected cost for future years and how many years are remaining?**

Employee future benefits (EFB) are benefits to be provided at a future date to current and retired employees. In 2012, the Public Sector Accounting Board (PSAB) required that the District adopt accrual accounting methodology for reporting costs attributable to EFB. A cash basis of accounting for the benefits was used for years prior to 2012-2013. The liability that existed as at August 31, 2012 is being amortized into expense over a period of four to twelve years.

The accrual methodology requires that costs relating to employee future benefits be recorded as an expense in the year in which the liability for the benefit accrues. Retirement gratuities are a component of expenses considered to be EFB. Costs relating to retiree health and dental plans, compensated absences relating to the District's short term disability program and the waiver of benefit premiums for employees on long term disability represent the other EFB components. Retirement gratuities represent the largest component of EFB costs.

The accumulated surplus appropriated for EFB is being used to manage the incremental cost of transitioning from the cash basis to the accrual basis of accounting.

**2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget  
Questions and Answers**

---

**38. Can staff provide the amount of Special Education funding shortfall for past years.**

A summary of the funding shortfall attributed to special education for the past 5 years is shown below.

	<b>2009-2010 Year End Results</b>	<b>2010-2011 Year End Results</b>	<b>2011-2012 Year End Results</b>	<b>2012-2013 Year End Results</b>	<b>2013-2014 Year End Results</b>
Revenues	\$ 84,404,163	\$ 87,580,967	\$ 96,470,134	\$ 96,808,232	\$ 100,558,235
Expenditures	85,898,123	91,177,968	96,911,897	99,343,839	103,372,391
<b>Total Shortfall</b>	<b>\$ (1,493,960)</b>	<b>\$ (3,597,001)</b>	<b>\$ (441,763)</b>	<b>\$ (2,535,607)</b>	<b>\$ (2,814,156)</b>

Note that 2013-2014 revenue includes an adjustment relating to funding provided for the implementation of full-day kindergarten (FDK). A review of program costs allowed for full recognition of the deferred revenue attributable to the special education needs of kindergarten students. Commencing 2014-2015, the funding of FDK is part of the grant for student needs.

**39. Please provide details on Budget link to the strategic plan. Narratives should include: contingencies, budget changes, service delivery and key message(s).**

The 2015-2015 staff recommended budget is focused primarily on managing expenditure reductions. Staff believe the plans as presented allow for the approval of a budget in compliance with Ministry timelines and requirements while demonstrating a continued commitment to learning and the learning environment. Staff efforts to articulate the effect of the budget plan is ongoing.

## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

---

- 40. The Recommended 2015-2016 budget includes a \$1.8M reduction in professional development. What will no longer be done and what are the consequences of this reduction?**

The 2015-2016 staff recommended budget includes a decrease in amounts targeted for professional development (PD). The majority of this amount (\$1.75 million) relates to release time for teachers and other school staff to participate in various learning opportunities. Additional savings will be achieved through the elimination of ancillary costs such as meals, supplies and services. In addition to the reduced allocation for instructional PD, significant reductions to central PD-related budgets are reflected most notably in the Leadership Conference budget which shows a \$50,000 decrease in proposed support.

The reduction in PD spending will be balanced across job-embedded professional learning in schools to match the complementary reduction in instructional coach support. There will also be system-wide adjustments with fewer PD sessions per subject area; however, no area of learning will be eliminated.

Although allocations for PD are decreasing, it is important to recognize that the District will continue to have significant investment in PD activities and these will be supported by both Board allocated funds and through the receipt of targeted grants from the Ministry of Education.

- 41. Can staff provide an overview of the roles and responsibilities of OCDSB staff such as Central Principals, Coaches and Itinerant Educational Assistants. Information can be provided in the form of glossaries/descriptions**

Details are provided as Appendix A within this document.

**2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget  
Questions and Answers**

**42. Looking for information to bridge the projected deficit discussed at the COW /Budget meeting of 14 April 2015 to the projected deficit included in the Staff Recommended Budget of 12 May 2015.**

At the 14 April 2015 meeting of Committee of the Whole (Budget), staff presented the projected deficit of \$16.8 million that had been reported in the 2014-2015 updated financial forecast (February). The following table summarizes the significant adjustments to this amount which result in the proposed deficit of \$12.7 million as shown in the 2015-2016 staff recommended budget.

<b>Analysis of Changes in Revenues and Expenses</b>		
<b>2014-2015 Updated Financial Forecast to 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget</b>		
(\$ in Millions)		
	\$	\$
<b>2014-2015 Updated Financial Forecast Projected Deficit</b>		16.8
Add:		
Increments, Fringe & Statutory Benefits		5.3
		22.1
Impact of (Increased) Decreased Grants		
Qualifications and Experience Grant	2.6	
Language Grants	0.6	
Transportation Grant	0.5	
Other Grants	(2.8)	
		0.9
Preliminary 2015-2016 Projected Deficit		23.0
Deduct:		
Reductions in Staffing:	FTE	
Enrolment and Collective Agreements	(8.81)	(0.9)
Net Academic Staffing Approved by Board	(14.74)	(1.4)
Special Education	(4.00)	(0.3)
Facilities / Learning Environment	(23.00)	(1.0)
	<u>(50.55)</u>	(3.6)
Reductions in Operations:		
Schools		(0.6)
Special Education		(0.1)
Facilities / Learning Environment		(1.2)
Central		(2.1)
Transportation Contracts		(2.1)
Other Net Budget Adjustments		(0.6)
		(6.7)
Total Reductions		(10.3)
<b>2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Projected Deficit</b>		<b>12.7</b>



## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

---

**43. Provide details on the increases in salaries and benefits described as budget pressures totaling \$5.3M on page 13 of Report 15-067.**

Compensation cost increases attributed to changes in salaries and benefits are estimated to be \$5.3 million and are grouped into three categories.

- Increased salary costs resulting from movement on the District's various salary grids account for \$3.7 million.
- Employer costs incurred based on statute for employment insurance, Canada Pension Plan, employer health tax and Workplace Safety Insurance Board account for \$1.1 million.
- Employer costs incurred based on collective agreements provisions for health, dental and group life insurance premiums and for matching contributions to the Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System (the pension administrator for eligible non-teaching staff) amount to \$0.5 million.

Note that academic staff participate in the Ontario Teachers' Pension Plan. Matching pension contributions for academic staff are paid directly to the Plan by the Ministry of Education.

**44. What strategy that will be used to balance the budget for Year 1, Year 2 and Year 3.**

As previously discussed, staff has proposed across the board reductions in operating costs, but was required to recommend some staffing reductions in both academic and administration and support staff.

Staff anticipates a significant revenue increase relating to transportation services which are coordinated by Ottawa Student Transportation Authority (OSTA). The Ministry will review the administrative practices of OSTA during 2015-2016. A finding that confirms the practices are efficient will result in a funding adjustment for 2015-2016 and subsequent years. The adjustment is expected to substantially offset the transportation funding shortfall.

Staff has already begun discussions around increasing revenues from fees for 2015-2016. Early discussion will provide an opportunity for community input and allow adequate time to prepare for implementation should they be approved.

If funding continues to be reduced, the District will have no choice but to look again at all areas of our operations and prioritize the work in alignment with the Board's strategic goals. Further cost reductions will necessarily have to include additional decreases in staffing.

## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

---

**45. Clarify what is included in the Special Education versus Learning Support on page 114 of the Recommended Budget binder.**

The Learning Support Services (LSS) financial summary shown on page 114 of the 2015-2016 staff recommended budget includes the costs of salaries and operating expenses for special education (\$ column 1), central and school-based cost adjustments necessary for Ministry reporting of special education (\$ column 2), and salaries funded by the Safe Schools/Urban Priority grant as are applicable to special education (\$ column 4).

The summary does not include the salary and operating expenses of the superintendent of LSS. A notation to this effect will be added to the schedule.

**46. Please provide details on the Board Amortization. More specifically, the increases / decreases and remaining years.**

Funding received from the Ministry for the purpose of acquiring or developing a depreciable tangible capital asset is termed a deferred capital contribution. Such contributions are recognized as revenue at the same rate as the related tangible capital asset is amortized into expense. Amortization is based on the expected useful life of the asset. These are referred to as Ministry supported investments.

In addition to the contributions discussed above, certain capital projects are supported internally through the use of the District's accumulated surplus and are referred to as Board-supported. An example is the WIFI project undertaken several years ago. Board supported tangible capital assets are amortized in the same manner as those supported by contributions from the Ministry; however, there is no related revenue but rather a draw against the accumulated surplus.

The following table shows the planned amortizations in 2015-2016. Assets are capitalized and amortized based on Ministry guidelines.



OTTAWA-CARLETON  
DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

**2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget  
Questions and Answers**

**Board Supported Capital Projects Funded from Accumulated Surplus**

<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Projected Accumulated Surplus Committed 1 Sep 2015</b>	<b>Remaining Service Life</b>	<b>Amortization</b>	<b>Projected Accumulated Surplus Committed 31 Aug 2016</b>
WIFI Project	\$1,217,058	0	\$938,427	\$278,631
Energy Performance Contract	3,135,438	16	193,546	2,941,892
Administrative Office Renewal	925,023	27	35,141	889,882
Barrhaven PS	49,065	15	3,251	45,814
Farley Mowatt PS	14,690	31	480	14,210
Forest Valley ES	52,597	29	1,808	50,789
Greely ES	30,358	17	1,776	28,582
Orleans Wood ES	25,854	15	1,713	24,141
Riverview PS	17,013	11	1,533	15,480
Roland Michener PS	26,287	15	1,742	24,545
Sir Winston Churchill PS	36,320	14	2,577	33,743
Stittsville Depot	24,589	29	845	23,744
Stittsville PS	49,964	30	1,689	48,275
Minor Projects (various service life)	868,471	0	66,878	801,593
Telephone & Computer Networks	1,344,000	9	232,000	1,112,000
<b>Total Board Supported</b>	<b>\$7,816,727</b>		<b>\$1,483,406</b>	<b>\$6,333,321</b>

**2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget  
Questions and Answers**

47. **Please explain why the enveloped amounts shown on page 11 of the Power Point presented at the 12 May 2015 meeting differ from the enveloping numbers displayed on page 19 of the staff recommended budget binder.**

**Updated Response - Table Added**

Enveloping is the assignment of revenues to related expenses. Most revenue is enveloped in line with Ministry funding and the remaining amounts, such as user fees and interest earnings, are assigned to the related program area. A review of the enveloping chart published in the 2015-2016 staff recommended budget identified the need to realign certain expenses and revenues. The realigned amounts were available for inclusion in the presentation, but the schedule shown in the staff recommended budget had not been updated prior to printing. The budget document will be updated to reflect the enveloping shown below.

Envelope	Projected Expenses	Grants and Other Revenues	Difference
Instruction	522,198,768	520,355,757	(1,843,011)
Instruction-Special Education	107,730,588	102,771,719	(4,958,869)
Continuing Education	9,730,459	12,391,655	2,661,196
Transportation	36,735,691	31,928,536	(4,807,155)
Central Administration	19,671,714	19,868,358	196,644
School Facilities	90,465,614	87,954,344	(2,511,270)
Amortization	38,595,727	37,112,321	(1,483,406)
Capital Financing and Other	16,688,383	16,688,383	-
Extended Day & Child Care Centres Programs	14,132,143	14,132,143	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>855,949,087</b>	<b>843,203,216</b>	<b>(12,745,871)</b>

48. **Page 2, table: What are the explanations for the rapid decline in committed reserves in each of the lines from 2014->2016? ... And a related question, since we can see important changes in committed reserves, to what extent are they actually immune from planned and budgeted changes by the BoT?**

Table 1 shows the District's accumulated surplus that is available for use in preparing a budget that is compliant with Ministry of Education requirements. The amounts shown as at 31 August 2014 are the actual amounts published in the District's financial statements and the other years are based on projections.

The previous Board approved staff's recommended strategy to aggressively use the accumulated surplus and this has allowed the District to make important investments to support student success and to respond to the objectives noted in the strategic plan.

The internally appropriated amounts are subject to Board decisions with the exception of amounts designated as committed capital. The District is required to identify the committed capital which is used to support amortization expenses relating to Board approved capital projects.

## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

---

49. **Page 2, table: How can unappropriated reserves ever be less than zero dollars? Is this effectively the amount that the District anticipates recouping from improved mid-year transportation funding?**

The negative balance of unappropriated reserves reflects an accounting adjustment within the accumulated surplus available for compliance. An in-year funding adjustment resulting from the planned effectiveness and efficiency review of Ottawa Student Transportation Authority should result in enhanced funding that will significantly reduce the deficit attributable to transportation costs. Although the potential additional revenue relating to transportation is not reflected in the staff recommended budget, any funding adjustments would commence in 2015-2016 and this would impact the projected balance of the unappropriated accumulated surplus.

50. **Paragraph 3, last para, section 5: Staff has identified possible future savings to look at smallest classes for xday. This may be necessary but staff also has a max cap on class sizes lower than what is required by the province. The max cap should be looked at very hard before eliminating X-day at some schools due to a min requirement. Further, there are other ways to look at smallest classes, including charging all for care at levels which allow for some smallest classes, and also consolidating smallest classes along with the provision of bussing.**

Staff regularly considers opportunities to deliver District services in a more efficient and effective manner and in response to evolving operational needs. The suggestion will be shared with District staff for further consideration.

51. **Page 4, paragraph 4: Did this \$6.4m provide for related admin costs also? If so, do we not then expect increased upwards costs on remaining admin costs due to decline in efficiency and, if not, then do we not expect some savings in admin?**

The District has administered the costs of transporting students to provincial schools on the Ministry's behalf. This was done on a cost recovery basis and included administrative costs of staff involved in coordinating transportation. Effective 2015-2016, the Ministry will assume direct responsibility for costs incurred to transport students to provincial schools. The administrative costs incurred by the District are reflected in reduced expenses.

## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

---

52. **Paragraph 4: Last para It is noted that childcare revenues will go up but that they are 100% offset by increased related costs. It is noted that OCENET revenue will go up but implicitly it seems to be asserted that OCDSB costs will not go up at all in any sort of offset. Can this be right? What is over all OCENET net revenue expected to be (costs all in on the same accounting basis as for regular students re staffing #s planning, etc.) and what is the marginal increase in net revenue being reported now?**

The District's extended day and child care programs are offered to parents/guardians of the District's students on a cost recovery basis. The fees established for the services are developed with a view to offsetting the costs which are primarily staff compensation costs.

The Ottawa-Carleton Education Network (OCENET) is an independent, but related organization, which provides international students with opportunities to study at District schools. OCENET transfers tuition fees to the District in line with the approved fee structure and international student enrolment. The staff recommended budget estimates that revenue from international students will exceed the base tuition fee calculated by the Ministry by \$800,000.

53. **Page 8, section 10 paragraph 1: What cost overage on transport, funded from operations, is in effect now? If staff are anticipating funding which should appear, then is the overall budget overly restricted, or is this anticipated gain already priced in in terms of multi-year budgeting needs, next year's budget and so pressures indirectly on the 2015-16 budget year?**

Commencing 2014-2015, the Board approved extending transportation services to secondary students residing in the urban transit area. The decision was made to ensure that the District's students were provided transportation services similar to that of the coterminous English board. The funding shortfall for 2015-2016 attributed to transportation is estimated at \$4.8 million.

Transportation services are coordinated by the Ottawa Student Transportation Authority (OSTA). The Ministry will be reviewing the administrative practices of OSTA during 2015-2016. A finding that confirms the practices are efficient will result in a funding adjustment for 2015-2016 and subsequent years which, staff believe, will significantly offset the funding shortfall.

## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

---

- 54. Page 8, section 11: Given that the proposed budget focuses in detail only on marginal changes in revenue and costs, And on marginal impacts on staffing and services, and does not break out in detail all current discretionary spending in detail, then how could the BoT and stakeholders credibly analyze existing spending and come up with additional ideas for savings, apart from simply notional uncosted and unimpacted ideas?**

The governance structure adopted by the Board provides the basis for establishing policies and programs aligned with its strategic objectives. Staff works collaboratively with the Board to ensure that planned spending aligns with the Board's goals. Significant reductions in discretionary costs are proposed in the 2015-2016 staff recommended budget and further information is shared in response to questions posed at public meetings. In addition, responses to questions submitted in writing are provided in this Q&A document.

- 55. Page 9, Recommendation C: Does not identify the character of the surplus or which budget(s) it is to be applied against (operating or capital).**

The staff recommended budget proposes using \$12.7 million of the District's accumulated surplus to offset the revenue shortfall. The amounts were summarized in Appendix C to Report 15-067 and enhanced detail was shown in the 2015-2016 staff recommended budget which was released on 12 May 2015.

- 56. Appendix C, Non grant Rev: What is the specialized program funding which has grown so much and given this funding, can the Board draw down other regularly funded related services or supports?**

Specialized program funding represents contributions from the Ottawa-Carleton Education Network as approved by its Board of Directors. The funding enhances the District's capacity to deliver services supporting both international students and students of the board.

- 57. Appendix C, Non grant Rev: What is the \$1m increase in other ministry of education grants for and given this increase can the Board offset by reducing regular funding in related areas?**

The Ministry announces special purpose grants throughout the year. The grants are targeted to support Ministry priorities and are termed educational program grants-other (EPO). These grants augment the District's budget; however, funding is tied to actual spending for the specified purpose. Amounts not spent are recovered by the Ministry or, if the funding agreements permit, are carried forward for use in the subsequent year.

The Ministry has advanced the announcement of some of the EPO grants. This has allowed staff to reflect the additional revenue and planned spending in the 2015-2016 staff recommended budget.



## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

---

- 58. Appendix D, expenses summary: Why is there a need to have more occasional teachers? What has changed or what is driving this? Could the Board not plan on holding the line on this item and increasing focus on employee wellness and perhaps on accepting a slight increase system wide in HS library study as an option?**

Occasional teachers (OTs) provide coverage when teachers are absent due to illness and to attend medical appointments. In addition, OTs provide coverage when teachers are attending certain professional development and student support activities on a school day. Trends in OT usage observed for the past few years show that additional financial support for these needs is required.

Note that practices prior to 2013-2014 included providing secondary students with a study period rather than teacher-led instruction. Staff believe that a focus on student learning includes teacher-led instruction.

- 59. In the past, the District has released impact statements describing how each spending cut or spending increase would impact services. As well, in the past, a list of cuts considered by staff and rejected has been provided. Will this other material be provided to the public and to the BoT for their consideration as well? If not, why not?**

The 2015-2016 staff recommended budget is focused primarily on managing expenditure reductions. Staff believe the plans as presented allow for the approval of a budget in compliance with Ministry timelines and requirements while demonstrating a continued commitment to learning and the learning environment. Staff efforts to articulate the effect of the budget plan is ongoing.

- 60. Has the district considered reducing the number of HS teachers by reducing the number of marginal courses offered and/or consolidating some courses across HS sites and providing incidental bus tickets or even cab fares (cheap relative to staffing costs!), or even offset using an increased e-courses focus where student numbers for a course don't exist at any given school, in order to offset the reduction in marginal small classes at various schools?**

Staff regularly considers opportunities to deliver District services in a more efficient and effective manner and in response to evolving needs. The suggestion will be shared with District staff for further consideration.



## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

---

- 61. Will Continuing Education be cost neutral including the grant for it? And, if Continuing Education were to eliminate courses not covering their costs (including admin overhead) then could we generate more of a surplus from Continuing Education?**

Continuing Education offers a variety of learning opportunities throughout the year. Most instructional programs are offered in accordance with Ministry of Education requirements and funding is received based on enrolment and participation. Examples of these programs are high school credit courses offered during the evening or summer months, assistance for students in grades 7 through 12 to further their literacy and numeracy skills, and international languages programs which provide instruction in languages other than English or French. Some programs are offered on a cost recovery basis with funding provided by other provincial ministries (English as a Second Language, Literacy and Basic Skills) or the federal government (Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada).

The District also offers general interest and extracurricular arts programs. The revenue generated from these programs doesn't cover the direct cost; however, they continue to be offered because they support the well-being of the entire community and promote the concept of lifelong learning. Moreover, these programs also enhance the community's use of the school spaces including priority schools, as supported by the Ministry of Education. That said, an assessment of the fee structure and participation levels will be undertaken in 2015-2016 to more accurately align revenues and expenses.

- 62. Will staff conferencing costs be driven down or will the conference costs and focus remain unaffected relative to previous years? So, for example, if the system, leadership activities were reduced in budget and in overall length, some meal costs recovered, maybe other conferencing restricted also, apart from whether this would be pleasant or not (it would not) would there actually be a tangible reduction in the quality of education offered to students?**

The 2015-2016 staff recommended budget includes a decrease in amounts targeted for professional development (PD). The majority of this amount (\$1.75 million) relates to release time for teachers and other school staff to participate in various learning opportunities. Additional savings will be achieved through the elimination of ancillary costs such as meals, supplies and services. In addition to the reduced allocation for instructional PD, significant reductions to central PD-related budgets are reflected most notably in the Leadership Conference budget which shows a \$50,000 decrease in proposed support.

Although allocations for PD are decreasing, it is important to recognize that the District will continue to have significant investment in PD activities and these will be supported by both Board allocated funds and through the receipt of targeted grants from the Ministry of Education.

## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

---

63. **Students and staff - NB: an analysis by Zone of communication costs (what it would cost to have a regular Trustee column in each major community paper varies enormously from \$0 dollars in Kanata to many thousands elsewhere but would likely result in overall savings and also greater equity in Trustee personal budgets).**

Staff regularly considers opportunities to deliver District services in a more efficient and effective manner and in response to evolving needs. The suggestion will be shared with District staff for further consideration.

64. **The Board determines what the staffing ratio is for X-day (in that it is currently well below the Ministry max ratio). Now with a larger X-day program over all, what savings might accrue by letting the average ratio float up 1-2 students overall And, if strategic school-school transport crucially were provided for equity purpose, what net savings might accrue to consolidating marginal X-day programs staffing costs (along with improved X-day experience and services)?**

Staff regularly considers opportunities to deliver District services in a more efficient and effective manner and in response to evolving needs. The suggestion will be shared with District staff for further consideration.

65. **It states in the proposed budget report that public input through the web is solicited. However, input to the budget does not appear under the main list of current OCDSB consultations or input opportunities and, further, the web page dedicated to the budget development (<http://www.ocdsb.ca/ab-ocdsb/ob/Pages/CurrentBudget.aspx>) does not solicit input or indicate how this should best be provided. Apart from a limited characters tweet or a Facebook post, indeed exactly how is a member of the public supposed to find any way to contact the District or send in an e-mail? Only the web page serving media outlets has good OCDSB contact info it seems?**

The 2015-2016 Budget Guide posted on the District's website at <http://www.ocdsb.ca/ab-ocdsb/ob/Pages/CurrentBudget.aspx> provided background information about education funding in Ontario and elaborated on the District's budget development process. The guide also encouraged community input by email submission to [budgetinfo@ocdsb.ca](mailto:budgetinfo@ocdsb.ca).

In response to this question, a link to the District's budget webpage has been added to the District's homepage. In addition, the budget webpage has been updated with the following statement:

Questions and comments can be sent by e-mail to [budgetinfo@ocdsb.ca](mailto:budgetinfo@ocdsb.ca). Questions will be responded to as part of a Question and Answer document prepared in support of the 2015-2016 budget. Comments will be shared with senior staff.



OTTAWA-CARLETON  
DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

---

**66. Please provide information on the trustee spending for the past several years.**

An annual budget of \$8,500 per trustee is reflected in the 2015-2016 staff recommended budget. The allocation is provided to cover costs relating to communications with constituents, the costs of telecommunications and office supplies, and costs of relevant professional development opportunities.

The following chart summarizes trustee budget activity for the three year period commencing 2011-2012. Section A shows the unspent balance of a trustee's budget based on the average spending of all trustees. Section B shows the total unspent base allocation for all trustees. Note that Board policy permits a trustee to carry over budget amounts not spent in a year to the subsequent year, thereby augmenting the base budget allocation. Amounts carried forward are shown in Section C.

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
	\$	\$	\$
<b>Section A - Per Trustee</b>			
Budget	8,500	8,500	8,500
Average Expenses	5,100	6,000	6,500
Average Unspent	3,400	2,500	2,000
<b>Section B - All Trustees</b>			
Budget	102,000	102,000	102,000
Total Expenses	61,700	71,600	77,500
Total Unspent	40,300	30,400	24,500
<b>Section C - Amounts Carried Forward from Previous Year</b>			
	24,700	43,300	65,300

**2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget  
Questions and Answers**

**67. Please provide additional detail regarding instructional coach FTEs.**

Report 15-045 Academic Staffing detailed the changes in academic staffing levels. The report, as amended, was approved by the Board on 31 March 2015. The recommended budget reflects these staffing decisions which resulted in the reduction of 9.0 FTE instructional coaches (8.0 FTE elementary and 1.0 FTE secondary). Instructional coach staffing now sits at 37.0 FTE as detailed below.

Department/Program	Elementary (FTE)	Secondary (FTE)	Total (FTE)
Business and Learning Technologies	3.00	-	3.00
Aboriginal/Native Studies	1.00	-	1.00
Early Learning	2.00	-	2.00
Curriculum Services	16.00	9.67	25.67
Continuing Education	-	1.00	1.00
Quality Assurance	-	1.00	1.00
Equity and Safe Schools	-	1.00	1.00
Athletics	-	1.00	1.00
Student Success	-	1.33	1.33
	22.00	15.00	37.00

**68. Please provide additional detail regarding First Nations, Metis and Inuit learning including**

- **Number of self-identified students and distribution;**
- **Geographic distribution of FNMI students across the District;**
- **Details of funding specifically provided to support FNMI students over and above the per pupil amount; and**
- **Specific initiatives supported by this funding.**

The District has 1,505 students who have self-identified as being a member of the First Nations, Metis or Inuit. The following table shows the students by zone and panel.

Zone	Elementary	Secondary	Total
1	112	43	155
2	89	37	126
3	92	72	164
4	63	22	85
5	107	18	125
6	96	102	198
7	94	24	118
8	75	60	135
9	80	18	98
10	55	73	128
11	41	14	55
12	73	45	118
Total	977	528	1,505

## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

The First Nations, Metis and Inuit Education (FNMI) Supplement Grant supports programs designed for Aboriginal students. The Supplement has 3 allocations:

- Native Language;
- Native Studies; and
- Per-Pupil Amount.

The funding benchmark for the Native Studies and Native Language allocations reflects a reduced average class size of 12. The reduced average class size provides enhanced funding to allow for programs to be offered despite limited enrolment.

Although the District does not qualify for the Native Language allocation, the Native Studies component for 2015-2016 is estimated to be \$391,000 based on 348 pupil credits and a funding benchmark of \$1,123. The Per-Pupil Amount is estimated to be \$595,000 for 2015-2016 and is based on the District's average daily enrolment as adjusted for the First Nations, Metis and Inuit population, as estimated by the Ministry using 2006 census data.

The total amount of the grant is \$986,000 and is shown on page 38 in the staff recommended budget.

The Native Studies program is offered in 9 secondary schools and 4 alternate program sites. Support for the program is provided by four FNMI secondary teachers, one instructional coach supporting FNMI programs and one Inuit class early childhood educator. Additional central support, as well as operating supplies and services, is provided to the program.

The following table reflects funding and use of the FNMI Supplement Grant as presented in the 2015-2016 staff recommended budget.

### **First Nation, Metis & Inuit (FNMI) Education Supplemental Grant and Expenses**

<u>Grant Revenue</u>		\$
Native Studies		390,821
Aboriginal Support		594,852
		985,673
<u>Expenses</u>	FTE	\$
Native Studies – Teacher – FNMI/Inuit Centre	4.00	395,310
Instructional Coach supporting FNMI Programs	1.00	93,982
Native Studies – Early Childhood Educator – Inuit Centre	1.00	46,035
	6.00	535,327
Supplies, Services and Release Time	-	451,154
	6.00	986,481

In addition to the amounts shown above, additional school-based support is provided.

**2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget  
Questions and Answers**

---

- 69. Please provide additional detail regarding the proposed reduction in contracts with external partners as shown on page 23 of the budget binder.**

External partners have been used in the past to provide introductory sessions for academic staff on strategies for effective instruction. Curriculum Services' work with schools has progressed to a point where there is less need to bring in this external support and, accordingly, a reduction of \$160,000 for this purpose is reflected in the staff recommended budget.

- 70. Please provide a reconciliation of the net school-based reductions grouping shown on page 14 of the 25 May 2015 presentation with the information shown in the appendices included with the budget binder.**

The Appendices shown in the binder were regrouped to highlight changes in the expenses that were:

- based on legislation and contracts;
- supported by direct revenue; or
- based on staff recommendations.

Page 14 of the presentation shows an increase of \$100,000 in net school-based budgets. This amount is comprised of the following amounts.

Description	Amount (\$)
Reduction Impact of Average Daily Enrolment Budgets	(132,000)
Reduction in Overtime	(57,640)
Reduction in School Budgets	(312,000)
Reduction in Contracts for External Partners	(160,000)
Reduction in Switches, Servers, Licenses & Release Time	(191,366)
Increase in Occasional Teacher Budgets	1,000,000
	146,994

Note that for the 25 May 2015 presentation, the proposed \$875,000 reduction in school-based professional development shown on page 23 of the budget binder was added to the equivalent central portion shown on page 25. The full amount is administered by Curriculum Services.

**2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget  
Questions and Answers**

71. **Please provide for data showing the District's student enrolment of 10 and 20 years ago and the number of administration personnel with a comparison to the current numbers.**

The following tables provide District staffing and enrolment levels at three points:

- 1998-1999 which coincides with the amalgamation of the Ottawa and Carleton boards of education;
- 2005-2006 which followed the Ministry's initiative to place limits on class sizes; and
- 2015-2016 as proposed in the staff recommended budget which reflects the effects of implementation of full-day kindergarten and the addition of the extended day program in compliance with Ministry directives.

**Comparative Staffing Stated in Full Time Equivalents**

	1998-1999	2005-2006	2015-2016
<u>Elementary schools</u>			
Principals	121.00	118.00	117.00
Vice-principals	48.25	52.25	47.00
Regular day school teachers	2,359.06	2,242.67	2,584.14
Special education teachers	493.46	471.39	486.60
	3,021.77	2,884.31	3,234.74
<u>Secondary schools</u>			
Principals	27.00	25.00	26.00
Vice-principals	52.00	44.00	50.67
Regular day school teachers	1,687.42	1,538.75	1,491.76
Special education teachers	114.60	105.08	110.57
	1,881.02	1,712.83	1,679.00
<u>Administration &amp; Support</u>			
Educational assistants	539.50	615.00	670.00
Early childhood educators	-	-	373.00
Special education support	84.50	72.80	75.90
Custodial and maintenance	656.00	715.45	761.24
In-school support staff	507.51	429.00	325.30
Instruction support and other	185.20	163.30	244.80
Extended day & child care programs	-	-	264.03
Central administration	158.10	170.00	168.48
	2,130.81	2,165.55	2,882.75
<b>Total staffing</b>	<b>7,033.60</b>	<b>6,762.69</b>	<b>7,796.49</b>
*Staffing does not include trustees and staff seconded to other organizations			

**Comparative Enrolment Stated as Average Daily Enrolment**

	1998-1999	2005-2006	2015-2016
Elementary	47,148.00	43,602.97	47,986.50
Secondary	26,376.78	25,275.62	23,394.11
	73,524.78	68,878.59	71,380.61



**2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget  
Questions and Answers**

**72. Why can't I map the dollar values on page 18 with the dollar values on p 19, one for one by category?**

The comparative budget summary shown on page 18 of the staff recommended budget presents a different view of the information shown on page 19. Some of the more significant differences include the consolidation of the special education line with instruction costs for page 18 presentation purposes, the assignment of Board-supported amortization expense envelopes, and the isolation of costs relating to employee future benefits and staff on loan.

Note that a review of the enveloping chart published in the 2015-2016 staff recommended budget identified the need to realign certain expenses and revenues. The realigned amounts were available for inclusion in the presentation made at the 12 May 2015 meeting, but the schedule shown in the staff recommended budget had not been updated prior to printing. The budget document will be updated to reflect the enveloping shown below.

Envelope	Projected Expenses	Grants and Other Revenues	Surplus (Shortfall)
Instruction	522,198,768	520,355,757	(1,843,011)
Instruction-Special Education	107,730,588	102,771,719	(4,958,869)
Continuing Education	9,730,459	12,391,655	2,661,196
Transportation	36,735,691	31,928,536	(4,807,155)
Central Administration	19,671,714	19,868,358	196,644
School Facilities	90,465,614	87,954,344	(2,511,270)
Amortization	38,595,727	37,112,321	(1,483,406)
Capital Financing and Other	16,688,383	16,688,383	-
Extended Day & Child Care Centres Programs	14,132,143	14,132,143	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>855,949,087</b>	<b>843,203,216</b>	<b>(12,745,871)</b>

**73. Page 19 indicates we are under spending in Instruction by \$1.6M – where is the under spend or what are the new Revenues. Is the \$1.6M part of a sweated amount that is subject to Ministry claw back if unused?**

Enveloping is the assignment of revenues to related expenses. Most revenue is enveloped in line with Ministry funding and the remaining amounts, such as user fees and interest earnings, are assigned to the related program area. A review of the enveloping chart published in the 2015-2016 staff recommended budget identified the need to realign certain expenses and revenues.

The updated enveloping, which is presented in the response to question 72, shows that the instruction line has a shortfall of over \$1.8 million. This is generally attributable to the amortization of employee future benefit expenses as required by the Ministry. The costs had been enveloped in the capital financing line on the table shown in the binder.



## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

---

- 74. Why doesn't the Ministry fund transportation at 100%? If we reduce costs in this area we will still have to find 10% of the Transportation line item (assuming we achieve a high rating in Jan 2016), is that correct?**

The Grants for Student Needs includes an amount that provides the District with funding to transport students to and from home and school, including transporting students with special needs. The majority of the allocation is based on historical spending with adjustments to reflect enrolment changes, cost increases including transportation services contracts, an adjustment to address the variability in fuel costs and grant enhancements resulting from effectiveness and efficiency reviews of transportation consortia. The District's transportation services are coordinated by the Ottawa Student Transportation Authority (OSTA).

The Ministry will review the administrative practices of OSTA during 2015-2016. A finding that confirms the practices are efficient and effective will result in a funding adjustment for 2015-2016 and subsequent years and the adjustment is expected to substantially offset the transportation funding shortfall. Note that a similar review completed in 2012-2013 resulted in increased revenue of \$3.0 million which, in the absence of changes that provided transportation for secondary students residing in the urban transit area, have substantially addressed the funding shortfall that existed at that time.

- 75. Since Amortization and Capital Financing are essentially flow through dollars (fully funded by the Ministry) and really only have a deficit or surplus based on timing of the offsetting debit or credit – why must they be counted in our annual budget bottom line? Please correct my thinking.**

Accounting principles require that revenues and expenses be presented to allow users of the District's financial information a more informed view of its activities and obligations. With the exception of Board supported amortization which is supported through the use of the District's accumulated surplus, the expenses relating to asset amortization and capital financing are matched by revenues. The latter amounts have a neutral effect on the District's net financial results.

- 76. Page 24 – What is turf management? Can we not recoup all of these costs through rental fees for the fields?**

Turf management refers to expenses incurred to maintain the playing surfaces at District schools. Students and the community both benefit from well-maintained instructional facilities that may also serve as recreational facilities for the community outside of the school day. One could say that some turf management costs are offset through rental fees.

## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

---

**77. Page 25 – Central OT, what are the total dollars for Central OT and what % of total dollars is OT?**

Central overtime costs are those costs incurred by central administrative and support staff in accordance with collective agreements and employment terms and conditions. The budgeted central overtime cost is \$189,000. The proposed decrease of \$32,000 is a 17% reduction in the allocation.

**78. Page 25 – What is Reduction in Supplies & Startup for new schools? Is this not funded through the Ministry funding for new schools?**

The funding provided for the construction of new schools and school additions would ideally support both the cost of the building and required furnishings; however, experience shows that additional costs to acquire new desks and equipment are commonly incurred. Staff believe the provision remaining after the reduction will allow for the reasonable accommodation of such requests.

**79. Page 25 – What is included in the Audit Committee Budget? Do we have similar budgets for all of our committees?**

The budget categorized as Audit Committee is a provision used by the District to fund contracted studies with a focus on enhancing internal control processes. The provision is being reduced in recognition of the complementary work performed by the Regional Internal Audit Manager (RIAM). The latter work is performed using RIAM resources and there is no cost to the District.

**80. Page 26- What is Statutory Benefit Cost Increases, Salary Differential and Increments of \$5.3M. Why is this not included in Grant dollars? Is this all non-teaching staff, central staff?**

Compensation cost increases attributed to changes in salaries and benefits are estimated to be \$5.3 million and are grouped into three categories.

- Increased salary costs resulting from movement on the District's various salary grids account for \$3.7 million.
- Employer costs incurred based on statute for employment insurance, Canada Pension Plan, employer health tax and Workplace Safety Insurance Board account for \$1.1 million.
- Employer costs incurred based on collective agreements provisions for health, dental and group life insurance premiums and for matching contributions to the Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System (the pension administrator for eligible non-teaching staff) amount to \$0.5 million.

Note that academic staff participate in the Ontario Teachers' Pension Plan (OTPP). Matching pension contributions for academic staff are paid directly to the OTPP by the Ministry of Education.

## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

---

Movement on teacher and early childhood educator salary grids is supported by specific grants for qualifications and experience for teachers and early childhood educators. The movement of other staff must be accommodated using established benchmark funding.

**81. Page 26 – Why is Staff on Loan not net 0 dollars to us?**

Staff on loan refers to the compensation costs of District staff that have been seconded to other organizations. The amounts shown on page 26 of the staff recommended budget focus on changes in expenses rather than the net financial changes in the programs. Costs attributed to staff on loan generally align with amounts the District recovers from those organizations. The Ministry requires these recoveries to be reported as revenue.

**82. Page 26 – Why are EDP and Child Care Centres not net 0 dollars to us?**

The amounts shown on page 26 of the staff recommended budget focus on changes in expenses rather than the net financial changes in the programs. The cost increases of the extended day and child care programs are offset by related increases in revenues.

Revenues identified for the extended day and child care centre programs are combined as one line in the summary shown on page 18, but are presented as two lines in the detailed schedule shown on page 39.

**83. Page 27 – under Expenditure Assumptions – Budgets have been adjusted to reflect the projected impact of Ontario Regulation 2/13 – I thought all the costs associated with B115 were to be covered by the Ministry. What is the dollar value of this assumption? Over how many years is this paid out?**

Ontario Regulation 2/13 implements provisions of the *Putting Students First Act, 2012*. Funding of changes imposed by the Act and supporting Regulations was provided, but certain aspects of the changes are applicable to the coming year including the continued prohibition of gratuity payments and restrictions on staff advancement on salary grids that recognize qualifications and experience.

Funding adjustments continue to be provided through the qualification and education grants included as part of the Grants for Student Needs.

**2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget  
Questions and Answers**

---

**84. Page 33 – what is included in the Total Other School Support Programs of 14 FTEs?**

The staffing chart shown on page 33 of the 2015-2016 staff recommended budget identifies 14.0 FTEs in the line entitled Total Other School Support Programs. The positions are shown below.

Description	FTE
Native Studies – Early Childhood Educator – Inuit Centre	1.0
Native Studies – Elementary Teacher – Inuit Centre	1.0
Native Studies – Secondary Teacher – FNMI	3.0
Instructional Coach supporting FNMI Programs	1.0
Principal of Leadership	1.0
Outdoor Education Program	7.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>14.0</b>

**85. Why don't amounts on page 18 and pages 38 and 39 match? For instance one has to add Total GSN for Operating and Capital Purposes on page 38 to Deferred Capital Contributions on page 39 to get the GSN amount on page 18. In order to reconcile EPO and Other from page 18, one has to subtract \$14M EDP from Total Non-Grant Revenue from page 38. However the line item within Non Grant Revenue page 38 says EDP is \$12M. Why doesn't the detail match the Summary on page 18 by description?**

Page 18 of the staff recommended budget presents highly summarized information comparing the approved 2014-2015 revenues and expense with those proposed for 2015-2016. For the summary, the amount shown as Grants for Student Needs includes deferred capital contributions. Pages 38 and 39 provide enhanced detail on the different types of revenue and isolates deferred capital contributions from the grants received for operating and capital purposes.

Revenues identified for the extended day and child care centre programs are combined as one line in the summary, but are presented as two lines in the detailed schedule.

**86. Under Operating Budget Details pages, what is Pupil Accommodation?**

Pupil Accommodation is the formal term used by the Ministry to account for costs incurred to operate the District's schools. The expenses include compensation costs of school maintenance staff and the costs of services, supplies, rental fees and utilities. Capital debt interest and amortization expense are also reported as a pupil accommodation cost.

The enveloping section of the budget detail pages identifies the general alignment of expenses to the enveloping schedule shown on page 19 of the staff recommended budget. Note that amortization expense and capital financing costs have been isolated in the net enveloping table.

**2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget  
Questions and Answers**

---

**87. Under Operating Budget Details pages, what does Fee and Contractual consist of?**

The fees and contractual category shown on the budget details pages include fees for licenses and copyright agreements, service and maintenance contracts, legal fees and audit fees.

**88. Pages 42 and 43, Elementary Staff Development is 1.6% of salary, Secondary is .02% of salary. Why the huge difference?**

Most Ministry funding is provided through the Grants for Student Needs, but the District also receives grants targeted to support Ministry priorities. This funding is termed educational program grants-other (EPO). The grants augment the District's budget; however, funding is tied to actual spending for the specified purpose. Amounts not spent are recovered by the Ministry or, if the funding agreements permit, are carried forward for use in the subsequent year.

The \$4.3 million shown as staff development on page 42 of the recommended budget includes the 2015-2016 EPO grants that had been announced as at 12 May 2015. Although the amounts of these grants were available, direction on how the funds are to be used had not been provided to the District. Consistent with past practice, the budgeted amount will be distributed once the Ministry provides additional detail. Some of the funds will be directed to the secondary panel.

**89. Page 44 School Programs and Support – that Staff Development is 7.6% of salary. What is this due to?**

The majority of the staff development budget relates to professional development transfers to the teachers' federation pursuant to collective agreements. The employee induction program for early childhood educators is also represented in the amount.

**90. Page 47 – Elementary Special Education. I don't see an amount for Staff Development. Is it elsewhere in the Budget? Same question for EAs page 49**

The staff development budget for elementary instructional staff is displayed on page 42 of the staff recommended budget. Whenever possible, the budgets and related expenditures are redirected to the special education envelope in compliance with Ministry reporting rules. An amount of \$43,600 for special education purposes which is shown on page 113 of the staff recommended budget is in addition to the redirected amounts.

**91. Page 67 – What are the Fees and Contractual for this Superintendency- Curriculum Services?**

The fees and contractual amount of \$380,000 shown on page 67 are used by Curriculum Services for costs incurred for multi-cultural liaison officers and consulting service (e.g. home schooling).

## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

---

**92. Page 82 - What are the Fees and Contractual for this Superintendency- HR?**

The fees and contractual amount of \$190,000 shown on page 82 is used by Human Resources to pay for costs relating to the District's employee assistance program.

**93. Page 83 – Staff Development \$610K, which departments is that Staff Development for? The last 2 years it has been significantly underspent. Why is it not budgeted closer to the actual spends of around \$200K?**

The budgeted amounts for staff development that are shown on page 83 of the staff recommended budget are the gross amounts set aside primarily for costs relating to the New Teacher Induction Program. Consistent with past practice, the budgeted amount will be redistributed throughout the year based on identified training needs.

**94. Page 86 – Staff Development is 56% of salary. Why so high?**

The staff development amount of \$230,000 shown on page 86 is used by Human Resources for mandated or desirable health and safety initiatives. The budget provides for costs of the Joint Occupation Health & Safety Committee, District-wide workplace inspections and health and safety training.

**95. Page 88 – Continuing Ed Supplies and Services – What is included in the \$643K?**

The supplies and services amount of \$643,000 shown on page 88 is used in various continuing education programs including credit programs, general interest courses and international languages programs. Of the amount shown, \$165,000 is funded by the federal government or other provincial ministries (e.g. Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada, Ontario Works).

**96. Page 114 – Spec Ed column- why is total of \$45M for the 464.10 Elementary Teachers different than the total for same on page 45? Also about \$300K discrepancy between amounts for Secondary teachers on pages 114 and 45.**

Page 114 of the staff recommended budget is a supplemental schedule showing special education costs. The compensation costs shown on this page reflect the incremental compensation paid to special education qualified teachers. The provision was inadvertently assigned to general instruction during the preparation of the budget document. Page 45 will be updated to reflect the correct experience and qualifications.

**97. Page 120 – what is the total cost of our salary differential?**

The salary differential schedule shown on page 120 of the staff recommended budget presents the District's average compensation costs of various classroom staff as compared to Ministry benchmarks shown in the foundation and qualifications and experience grants for the same positions. The estimated cost of the salary differential for the positions shown on the page is estimated to be \$14.0 million. Additional funding is provided by other grants and this would reduce the differential amount.

**2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget  
Questions and Answers**

---

- 98. What exactly is the role of the Safe Schools EA? (i.e how is it different from that of guidance counsellor, VP, social worker, spec ed EA, teacher, etc). Why are 21 needed (not fewer and not more), and what would need to change or improve before these numbers could be drawn down?**

The District has assigned an educational assistant (EAs) to each of the three classes operated under the Safe Schools program. These EAs support the students, monitor the completion of the SAP and liaise with families and home schools.

- 99. When we have staff on loan, does the revenue we get for these staff fully cover as well the prorated portion of all aspects of the administration of the staff on loan (in addition to full coverage of benefits, experience, etc)? If not, can we increase our margins so that we are fully cost neutral? NB: If we are not fully covering, then we are losing on this program, and should curtail it or increase revenue for it.**

Staff on loan refers to the compensation costs of District staff that have been seconded to other organizations. These costs generally align with amounts the District recovered from those organizations. Recoveries are reported as revenue as required by the Ministry.

- 100. The Net Enveloping Summary on Page 19 of the 2015 -16 Staff Recommended Budget short a project surplus of \$2,661,198. For 2014 - 15 the projected surplus was \$2, 590, 931. Can you please provide the actual budget surpluses for the 2010-11, 2011 - 12, 2012 - 13 and 2013 - 14 budget years? Could you please also provide a breakdown of where those surpluses went and how the surpluses were spent by the board?**

In addition to the continuing education grant received as part of the Grants for Student Needs, the District allocates portions of other grants to meet the management reporting needs as they relate to continuing education programs. The following table shows the actual results attributed to continuing education programs for the years 2010-2011 through 2013-2014.

Year	Revenues \$	Expenses \$	Net Revenue \$
2010-2011	11,531,569	10,094,660	1,436,908
2011-2012	12,215,563	10,290,975	1,924,588
2012-2013	12,469,481	10,251,907	2,217,574
2013-2014	12,197,082	10,743,582	1,453,500

The surplus identified as being attributed to continuing education for each of the years shown are not specifically designated to offset other costs. Rather, the amounts form part of the District's net financial position.





## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

---

- 101. On Page 19 of the 2015 -16 Staff Recommended Budget (Net Enveloping Summary - Table) Continuing Education is shown with projected expenditures in 2015 -16 of \$9.7 million, revenues of \$12.4 million and a surplus of over \$2.66 million. Can you please provide a breakdown of the revenue figures for the 2014 – 15 Continuing Education budget with projected revenues by grant/funding source ie. Citizenship and Immigration Canada - Contribution Agreement; Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration – Non-credit Adult ESL Grants for Student Needs; Ministry of Colleges, Training and Universities, etc.? That is to say, 2015 - 16 budgeted revenues and expenses directly attributable to programs administered by the Continuing Education Department. Please also provide this information for the following previous budget years 2011-12; 2012-13; 2013-14.**

The requested detailed information is presented in Appendix B within this document.

- 102. The budget shows cuts in the number of staff assigned to facilities maintenance. How will the changes be implemented so as not to affect the health and safety of the District's students and why weren't there cuts to management?**

Staff considered reductions in all District operations. For the first year of a three year plan, reductions have been recommended in areas where changes can be implemented commencing with the start of the 2015-2016 school year. One strategy that will be employed is to reduce the maintenance time required for unused or underused areas of the District's facilities. To do this, rooms will be closed and locked to prevent unauthorized use.

Staff will be looking at other alternatives to achieve savings and efficiencies over the next two years.

- 103. The reply provided to date is appreciated, however further clarification re Q52 seems needed ... It is clear certainly that the fees charged international students is higher than what the Ministry might charge. However, if the international students we host have a higher than average language support or spec ed support or other support needs from OCDSB resources than the OCDSB student population average, then presumably an increase in their numbers increases our costs also (more than head count grant). Undoubtedly this is still a profit centre even so, but perhaps less of one than is reported. Do we have a handle on the OCENET student profile relative to OCDSB average in this way?**

In addition to the tuition fees that the Ottawa-Carleton Education Network (OCENET) transfers to the District, additional amounts are provided to offset costs incurred to provide English as a Second Language support to international students. OCENET provides funding for 4.5 FTE teaching positions.





## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

---

**104. Can you let me know the amount and in what budget line I can find the OCDSB costs for participation in OPSBA?**

The District is a member of the Ontario Public School Boards Association (OPSBA). OPSBA represents and advocates on behalf of public school boards and authorities in matters relating to public education. The 2014-2015 membership cost net of the HST rebate was \$119,400. The budget for the anticipated 2015-2016 membership fee is included on page 42 of the staff recommended budget.

**105. Can you explain what happens to money allotted to schools for daily OTs, when not all of that money is used? Is that budget line enveloped or do some schools benefit by being able to spend that money to enhance other undefined items in the school budget?**

The District's current practice is to carry forward a school's year end net operating budget balance to the subsequent school year. The operating budget includes the provision for occasional teacher costs, but not the compensation budget of contracted teaching and support staff. The effect of the carry forward is to either augment or reduce a school's budget in the subsequent year.

**106. Please explain what budget is used to cover OT costs for a school, after the allotted OT budget has been exhausted. Is the school still responsible for the OT costs and, if so, is there a negative impact the other school budget lines?**

A school may potentially overspend its budget for occasional teacher (OT) costs. Overspending on any operating budget line would impact the overall operating budget that is available to the school. Note that OT costs refers to absences of short duration. Absences longer than ten consecutive days are borne by centrally managed budgets.

Staff recognize that OT-related overspending may have an adverse impact on school resources in the subsequent year as a result of the carry forward process. Staff reviews OT spending as part of the year end process and provides additional support within available resources to minimize the adverse effect.

## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

---

Appendix A
------------

### **Description of Key Student Focused Positions**

#### **Educational Assistant (EA):**

The educational assistant is responsible for the provision of support to students with exceptional needs within the school. The position involves dealing with confidential information and requires ongoing flexibility and variability. The responsibilities are many and varied in support of teaching and other professional staff including instructing individual or groups of students in academic and/or integrated classes, implementing special programs, physiotherapy exercises and stretches, behaviour management programs, supervising students, dealing with behaviour problems, signing, interpreting, braille, life skills, academic support, work experience and aquatics, where required.

#### **Itinerant Educational Assistant (IEA)**

Itinerant education assistants are located centrally at the school board and are part of the Behaviour Support Team. They are directed to different school locations for a period of time. The IEA provides behaviour management and support to elementary students across the Board. The IEA observes the student(s) in the school, and works with them for a limited time, in order to provide the school with behaviour management suggestions for helping the student function in the classroom.

#### **Itinerant Emergency Educational Assistant (IEEA)**

The itinerant emergency education assistant (IEEA) provides follow up support in implementing strategies for behavioural programs. The IEEA models effective techniques to assist students. They are directed to different school locations when a school has a child with immediate needs.

#### **Emergency Educational Assistant Allocation (Time)**

This is time that is allocated for support to a school in the short term i.e. up to 10 days for safety, medical and/or behaviour concerns.

#### **Early Childhood Educator (Registered)**

The early childhood educator works with the classroom teacher to provide high quality and effective play-based education to support enhanced learning and cognitive, emotional and social development for junior and senior kindergarten students in a full-day Early Learning Program. The early childhood educator may also lead an extended day program (before and/or after school) at designated sites, under the direction of the manager of Early Learning.

#### **Psychologist**

The psychologist fulfills professional and legal responsibilities concerning the provision of psychological services; responds to the needs of students, families and school personnel for consultative and direct services i.e., full range of diagnostic services, individual and group therapy along with providing support for system needs; promotes understanding of exceptional and non-exceptional students; acts as a resource to school staff with respect to modifying academic programs, developing IEP's, and in determining eligibility for exceptionality designation and specialized-class placement; performs administrative tasks and other related duties as assigned.



## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

---

### **Social Worker**

The social worker carries out the duties of attendance counsellor as mandated by the Education Act; responds to the needs of school personnel and students and families for direct and consultative services by providing assessments of students social/emotional functioning; provides counselling for students and parents; provides therapeutic and crisis intervention in areas such as high risk behaviours, depression, suicide, substance abuse, physical and sexual abuse; acts as liaison between family and school and/or community resources. Performs administrative tasks and other related duties as assigned.

### **Learning Resource Teacher**

In collaboration with the teacher in the classroom, the learning resource teacher provides assessment and instruction for students who need additional support; suggests instructional and/or assessment strategies that meet the needs of students with special education needs and/or students of concern; follows the tiered approach when monitoring student progress, differentiating instruction and assessment; development of individual education plans, and provides feedback on student progress; participates in the development and implementation of Transition plans for students; assists with the completion of report cards based on the accommodations and/or modifications as outlined in the individual education plan; participates in in-school team meetings as needed.

### **Learning Support Consultant**

The learning support consultant develops and delivers special education in service opportunities for staff; assists teachers with all aspects of special education program and service delivery; promotes current teaching methodologies and instructional practices which reflect the Ontario curriculum and Ministry documents; identifies and supports best practices in all specialized classes and provides program support; facilitates placements in specialized classes; and informs and advises schools regarding special education initiatives.

### **Learning Support Teachers**

A learning support teacher performs the same duties as a learning resource teacher and additionally; communicates and oversees the identification, tracking and programming for students with special education needs; prioritizes, administers and provides feedback on the results of individual educational assessments; coordinates and participates in regular in-school team meetings and multidisciplinary meetings; prepares student referrals for OCDSB, and/or outside agency supports based upon recommendations from the in-school and/or multidisciplinary team, in consultation with parents/guardians; coordinates and participates in IPRC meetings; prepares SEA applications and coordinates equipment and training; assists principals in the completion of Ministry and central Learning Support Services requests (e.g. ABA survey, waitlists, educational assistant allocation request).

### **Central Principal**

The central principal (or system principal) of Curriculum Services will assist in the review, development and implementation of the Ontario Ministry of Education's curriculum policy documentation. The central principal will also assist in developing, implementing and evaluation the district's programs and initiatives in support of effective instructional practice, as aligned to the OCDSB Strategic Plan and the district's annual Board Improvement Plan for Student Achievement (BIPSA).



## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

---

### **Instructional Coach**

The instructional coach will fulfill both central and school-based responsibilities. Centrally, the instructional coach will perform curriculum review and implementation, assist in research and implementation of the Ontario Ministry of Education's initiatives, and assist in developing professional learning resources. Under the direction of superintendents and principals of schools, the instructional coach will be responsible for developing, coordinating and coaching instructional strategies in schools. The instructional coach will also facilitate curriculum planning among teachers and support professional learning teams, make presentations and facilitate professional learning in schools, among schools and centrally. Additionally, the instructional coach will promote current teaching methodologies and instructional strategies which reflect the direction of Ministry documents and initiatives.

### **Principal**

The principal of a school, subject to the authority of the appropriate supervisory officer, is in charge of, the instruction and the discipline of pupils in the school; and the organization and management of the school. In addition to the duties under the Education Act and those assigned by the board, the principal of a school shall, except where the principal has arranged otherwise; supervise the instruction in the school and advise and assist any teacher in co-operation with the teacher in charge of an organizational unit or program; assign duties to vice-principals and to teachers in charge of organizational units or programs.

### **Vice-Principal**

A vice-principal performs duties that are assigned by the principal. In the absence of the principal of a school, a vice-principal, where a vice-principal has been appointed for the school, shall be in charge of the school and shall perform the duties of the principal.

### **Teacher**

Teach diligently and faithfully the classes or subjects assigned to the teacher by the principal; to encourage the pupils in the pursuit of learning; to assist in developing co-operation and co-ordination of effort among the members of the staff of the school; to maintain, under the direction of the principal, proper order and discipline in the teacher's classroom and while on duty in the school and on the school ground.

In addition to the duties assigned to the teacher under the Education Act and by the board, a teacher shall be responsible for effective instruction, training and evaluation of the progress of pupils in the subjects assigned to the teacher and for the management of the class or classes, and report to the principal on the progress of pupils on request.

### **Occasional Teacher**

An occasional teacher has the same duties as a teacher; however, they work on a temporary basis to fill a vacant teaching position or an absent teacher. Occasional teachers can be reassigned by the principal subject to unexpected circumstances arising at the school.



OTTAWA-CARLETON  
DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

**2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget  
Questions and Answers**

Appendix B

**Continuing Education Programs Revenues and Expenses for Selected Years**

Table 1 – 2015-2016 Continuing Education Programs

Program Name	Budgeted Revenues \$	Budgeted Expenses \$	Net Revenue (Expenses) \$
<b>Funded by Grants for Student Needs</b>			
Literacy and Numeracy	2,830,041	609,320	2,220,721
Credit Program	1,024,586	675,600	348,986
Summer School Secondary	1,335,367	1,124,231	211,136
Prior Learning Assessment	25,560	15,000	10,560
International Language Elementary	1,250,048	1,069,839	180,209
International Language Secondary	-	374,200	(374,200)
	<u>6,465,602</u>	<u>3,868,190</u>	<u>2,597,412</u>
<b>Funded by General Interest Registrations</b>			
General Interest	453,366	705,948	(252,582)
Extra-Curricular Creative Arts	151,122	233,252	(82,130)
	<u>604,488</u>	<u>939,200</u>	<u>(334,712)</u>
<b>Funded by Other Sources</b>			
English as a Second Language (ESL)	1,658,107	1,360,035	298,072
Language Instruction for Newcomers	1,875,000	1,880,516	(5,516)
Literacy and Basic Skills (LBS)	728,361	721,800	6561
Adaptive Learning	68,959	68,959	-
Ontario Works Child Care	550,000	517,500	32500
	<u>4,880,427</u>	<u>4,548,810</u>	<u>331,617</u>
<b>Continuing Education Administration</b>	231,041	374,260	(143,219)
<b>Total</b>	<u>12,181,558</u>	<u>97,30,460</u>	<u>2,451,098</u>



OTTAWA-CARLETON  
DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

**2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget  
Questions and Answers**

Table 2 – 2014-2015 Continuing Education Programs

Program Name	Budgeted Revenues \$	Budgeted Expenses \$	Net Revenue (Expenses) \$
<b>Funded by Grants for Student Needs</b>			
Literacy and Numeracy	3,269,024	611,543	2,657,481
Credit Program	884,864	677,565	207,299
Summer School Secondary	1,475,722	1,126,564	349,158
Prior Learning Assessment	25,560	15,000	10,560
International Language Elementary	1,149,115	1,073,664	75,451
International Language Secondary	-	378,022	(378,022)
	<u>6,804,285</u>	<u>3,882,358</u>	<u>2,921,927</u>
<b>Funded by General Interest Registrations</b>			
General Interest	453,366	713,492	(260,126)
Extra-Curricular Creative Arts	151,122	234,508	(83,386)
	<u>604,488</u>	<u>948,000</u>	<u>(343,512)</u>
<b>Funded by Other Sources</b>			
English as a Second Language (ESL)	1,471,360	1,358,319	113,041
Language Instruction for Newcomers	1,875,000	1,872,719	2,281
Literacy and Basic Skills (LBS)	729,527	721,680	7,847
Adaptive Learning	68,959	68,959	-
Ontario Works Child Care	550,000	517,500	32,500
	<u>4,694,846</u>	<u>4,539,177</u>	<u>155,669</u>
<b>Continuing Education Administration</b>	231,041	374,197	(143,156)
<b>Total</b>	<u>12,334,660</u>	<u>9,743,732</u>	<u>2,590,928</u>



OTTAWA-CARLETON  
DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

**2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget  
Questions and Answers**

Table 3 – 2013-2014 Continuing Education Programs

Program Name	Actual Revenue \$	Actual Expenses \$	Net Revenue (Expenses) \$
<b>Funded by Grants for Student Needs</b>			
Literacy and Numeracy	2,814,809	758,662	2,056,147
Credit Program	828,774	805,372	23,402
Summer School Secondary	1,488,825	1,499,165	(10,340)
Prior Learning Assessment	25,347	-	25,347
International Language Elementary	1,342,690	1,153,353	189,337
International Language Secondary	229,439	373,897	(144,458)
	<u>6,729,884</u>	<u>4,590,449</u>	<u>2,139,435</u>
<b>Funded by General Interest Registrations</b>			
General Interest	468,476	691,534	(223,058)
Extra-Curricular Creative Arts	172,022	220,473	(48,451)
	<u>640,498</u>	<u>912,007</u>	<u>(271,509)</u>
<b>Funded by Other Sources</b>			
English as a Second Language (ESL)	1,658,107	1,658,107	-
Language Instruction for Newcomers	1,831,690	1,863,337	(31,647)
Literacy and Basic Skills (LBS)	728,361	728,361	-
Adaptive Learning	44,653	72,219	(27,566)
Ontario Works Child Care	563,131	563,131	-
	<u>4,825,942</u>	<u>4,885,155</u>	<u>(59,213)</u>
<b>Continuing Education Administration</b>	758	355,971	(355,213)
<b>Total</b>	<u>12,197,082</u>	<u>10,743,582</u>	<u>1,453,500</u>



OTTAWA-CARLETON  
DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

## 2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget Questions and Answers

Table 4 – 2012-2013 Continuing Education Programs

Program Name	Actual Revenues \$	Actual Expenses \$	Net Revenue (Expenses) \$
<b>Funded by Grants for Student Needs</b>			
Literacy and Numeracy	3,287,713	652,957	2,634,756
Credit Program	921,509	882,181	39,328
Summer School Secondary	1,463,380	1,288,662	174,718
Prior Learning Assessment	25,560	11,384	14,176
International Language Elementary	1,265,511	1,122,448	143,063
International Language Secondary	11,325	304,103	(292,778)
	<u>6,974,998</u>	<u>4,261,735</u>	<u>2,713,263</u>
<b>Funded by General Interest Registrations</b>			
General Interest	467,837	680,632	(212,795)
Extra-Curricular Creative Arts	155,614	202,451	(46,837)
	<u>623,451</u>	<u>883,083</u>	<u>(259,632)</u>
<b>Funded by Other Sources</b>			
English as a Second Language (ESL)	1,689,836	1,608,035	81,801
Language Instruction for Newcomers	1,823,986	1,823,986	-
Literacy and Basic Skills (LBS)	674,608	674,608	-
Adaptive Learning	80,476	72,211	8,265
Ontario Works Child Care	601,400	601,400	-
	<u>4,870,306</u>	<u>4,780,240</u>	<u>90,066</u>
<b>Continuing Education Administration</b>	726	326,849	(326,123)
<b>Total</b>	<u>12,469,481</u>	<u>10,251,907</u>	<u>2,217,574</u>





OTTAWA-CARLETON  
DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

**2015-2016 Staff Recommended Budget  
Questions and Answers**

Table 5 – 2011-2012 Continuing Education Programs

Program Name	Actual Revenues \$	Actual Expenses \$	Net Revenue (Expenses) \$
<b>Funded by Grants for Student Needs</b>			
Literacy and Numeracy	2,764,853	661,856	2,102,997
Credit Program	973,595	863,331	110,264
Summer School Secondary	1,480,774	1,304,710	176,064
Prior Learning Assessment	39,600	12,759	26,841
International Language Elementary	1,383,485	1,152,278	231,207
International Language Secondary	17,516	325,014	(307,498)
	<u>6,659,823</u>	<u>4,319,948</u>	<u>2,339,875</u>
<b>Funded by General Interest Registrations</b>			
General Interest	454,595	659,431	(204,836)
Extra-Curricular Creative Arts	146,786	198,927	(52,141)
	<u>601,381</u>	<u>858,358</u>	<u>(256,977)</u>
<b>Funded by Other Sources</b>			
English as a Second Language (ESL)	1,503,174	1,503,174	-
Language Instruction for Newcomers	2,083,698	1,959,594	124,104
Literacy and Basic Skills (LBS)	785,365	785,365	-
Adaptive Learning	70,048	69,767	281
Ontario Works Child Care	510,895	510,895	0
	<u>4,953,180</u>	<u>4,828,795</u>	<u>124,385</u>
<b>Continuing Education Administration</b>	1,179	283,874	(282,695)
<b>Total</b>	<u>12,215,563</u>	<u>10,290,975</u>	<u>1,924,588</u>