

OUR MISSION

The Toronto Catholic District School Board is an inclusive learning community uniting home, parish and school and rooted in the love of Christ.
We educate students to grow in grace and knowledge to lead lives of faith, hope and charity.

OUR VISION

At Toronto Catholic we transform the world
through witness, faith, innovation and action.



AGENDA ADDENDUM SPECIAL MEETING OF THE TORONTO CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD PUBLIC SESSION

Maria Rizzo, Chair

Michael Del Grande, Vice-Chair

Tuesday, January 6, 2015

7:00 P.M.

	Pages
5. Delegations	
5.a Andrea Higgins regarding Sibling Admissions Policy	1
5.b Michael Mahoney regarding reconsideration of Admissions Policy	2
5.c Jennifer Medland, regarding reconsideration of the Admissions Policy	3
5.d Christine Paterson, regarding reconsideration of the Admissions Policy	4
5.e Brenda Didyk regarding reconsideration of student registration policy	5
5.f Margaret Margossian, representing parents of children at OLPH School, regarding reconsideration of the Admissions Policy	6
5.g Kevin McSweeney, regarding Admissions Policy re Siblings	7 - 8
5.h Adrienne and Kevin Kirby, regarding Admission Policy effective December 2014	9
5.i Claire Gordon regarding reconsideration of sibling admission	10
5.j Susan O'Brien-Doty regarding the Admissions Policy	11 - 12

5.k	<i>Joe Ferraro representing CUPE 1280 regarding budget cuts</i>	13
7.	Reports Requiring Action	
7.d	<i>2014-2015 Revised Budget Estimates</i>	14 - 46
8.	Reports For Information	
8.a	<i>Additional Information on the Admissions and Placement Policy</i>	47 - 50
9.	Communications	
9.b	<i>From David Suda and Larissa Williamson regarding reconsideration of the Elementary Admissions Policy</i>	51 - 52
9.c	<i>From Margaret Margossian regarding reconsideration of the Elementary Admissions Policy</i>	53
9.d	<i>From Christine and Robert Patterson regarding the Elementary Admission Policy</i>	54
9.e	<i>From Claire Gordan regarding reconsideration of Elementary Admission Policy</i>	55 - 56
9.f	<i>From Bernardo Rincan, regarding reconsideration of the Elementary Admission Policy</i>	57
9.g	<i>From John Medland regarding the reconsideration of the Elementary Admission Policy</i>	58 - 61
9.h	<i>From Edward Rizk, regarding reconsideration of the Admissions Policy</i>	62
9.i	<i>From Manelli Badii regarding reconsideration of the Admissions Policy</i>	63
9.j	<i>From Chris Henstock and Carrie Gamache regarding reconsideration of the Admissions Policy</i>	64
9.k	<i>From Neil and Arlene FitzGerald, regarding reconsideration of the Admissions Policy</i>	65

9.1	<i>From Jaime McGrath regarding reconsideration of the Admissions Policy</i>	66
9.m	<i>From Vinay Metha and Halla Elias, regarding the Admissions Policy</i>	67
9.n	<i>From Michael and Joyce Mahoney regarding the Admissions Policy</i>	68 - 69
9.o	<i>From the Marchetti Family regarding the Admissions Policy</i>	70
9.p	<i>From Chris Henstock and Carrie Gamache OLPH Parents regarding the Admissions and Placement Policy</i>	71
9.q	<i>From Scott Kraag regarding reconsideration of the Admissions Policy</i>	72 - 73
9.r	<i>From Amy Finch regarding reconsideration of the Admissions Policy</i>	74
9.s	<i>From Nuala Ziestma, regarding reconsideration of the Admissions Policy</i>	75

Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)

From: Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)
Sent: Sunday, January 04, 2015 8:31 PM
To: achunt1@gmail.com
Cc: Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)
Subject: Delegation Registration Form submittal

**TORONTO CATHOLIC DISTRICT
SCHOOL BOARD****DELEGATION REGISTRATION FORM
FOR STANDING OR OTHER COMMITTEES**

PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT ALL STANDING
COMMITTEE MEETINGS ARE BEING
RECORDED

For Board Use
Only

Delegation No. _____

☐ Public Session
☐ Private Session
☐ Five (5)
Minutes

Name	Andrea Higgins
Committee	Regular / Special Board
Date of Presentation	1/6/2015
Topic of Presentation	Sibling Admission Policy
Topic or Issue	Respectfully objecting to proposed/ ammendment to the Sibling Admission Policy in the TCDSB
Details	2 Min Speech has been prepared
Action Requested	Requesting permission to speak at the Board meeting in defence of the need to KEEP families together within a given school (NOTE: Will be speaking as part of the OLPH contingent)

I am here as a delegation to speak only on my own behalf	Yes
I am an official representative of the Catholic School Advisory Committee (CSAC)	
I am an official representative of student government	
I am here as a spokesperson for another group or organization	

Submittal Date	1/4/2015
Address	

Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)

From: Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)
Sent: Friday, January 02, 2015 10:40 PM
To: michael.mahoney@cibc.com
Cc: Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)
Subject: Delegation Registration Form submittal

**TORONTO CATHOLIC DISTRICT
SCHOOL BOARD****DELEGATION REGISTRATION FORM
FOR STANDING OR OTHER COMMITTEES**

PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT ALL STANDING
COMMITTEE MEETINGS ARE BEING
RECORDED

For Board Use
Only

Delegation No. _____

☐ Public Session
☐ Private Session
☐ Five (5)
Minutes

Name	Michael Mahoney
Committee	Regular / Special Board
Date of Presentation	1/6/2015
Topic of Presentation	Reconsideration of Admissions Policy
Topic or Issue	The change to revoke grandfathering policy applicable for younger siblings of registered students.
Details	This policy is consistent with Catholic values and promotes community. It is logistically challenging for parents to have children attend different schools and sense of community is greater when they go to the same school.
Action Requested	No change be made to the current grandfathering policy which provides younger siblings an automatic spot in same school.

I am here as a delegation to speak only on m own behalf	Yes
I am an official representative of the Catholic School Advisory Committee (CSAC)	
I am an official representative of student government	
I am here as a spokesperson for another group or organization	

Submittal Date	1/2/2015
----------------	----------

Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)

From: Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)
Sent: Sunday, January 04, 2015 8:56 PM
To: jennifer_medland@rogers.com
Cc: Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)
Subject: Delegation Registration Form submittal

**TORONTO CATHOLIC DISTRICT
SCHOOL BOARD****DELEGATION REGISTRATION FORM
FOR STANDING OR OTHER COMMITTEES**

PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT ALL STANDING
COMMITTEE MEETINGS ARE BEING
RECORDED

For Board Use
Only

Delegation No. _____

☐ Public Session
☐ Private Session
☐ Five (5)
Minutes

Name	Jennifer Medland
Committee	Regular / Special Board
Date of Presentation	1/6/2015
Topic of Presentation	Reconsideration of Admissions Policy
Topic or Issue	Objection to admissions policy change to place siblings of current students at the same priority level as other children in the district without siblings in the school.
Details	This change to the admissions policy could result in there not being space for siblings of students at schools with capacity issues.
Action Requested	The admissions policy should assign siblings of current students first priority for spots, and other children in the district without siblings at the school second priority.

I am here a a delegation to speak only on my own behalf	
I am an official representative of the Catholic School Advisory Committee (CSAC)	
I am an official representative of student government	
I am here as a spokesperson for another group or organization	Yes Parents of Children at OLPH School

Submittal Date	1/4/2015
----------------	----------

Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)

From: Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)
Sent: Sunday, January 04, 2015 9:29 PM
To: patersoc@gmail.com
Cc: Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)
Subject: Delegation Registration Form submittal



TORONTO CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

DELEGATION REGISTRATION FORM FOR STANDING OR OTHER COMMITTEES

PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT ALL STANDING
COMMITTEE MEETINGS ARE BEING
RECORDED

For Board Use
Only

Delegation No. _____

☐ Public Session

☐ Private Session

☐ Five (5)

Minutes

Name	Christine Paterson
Committee	Regular / Special Board
Date of Presentation	1/6/2015
Topic of Presentation	Reconsideration of the admissions policy - 6 January agenda, 7pm
Topic or Issue	Reconsideration of the admissions policy
Details	The admissions policy was recently changed.
Action Requested	I would like the recent admissions policy change to be reconsidered.

I am here as a delegation to speak only on my own behalf	Yes
I am an official representative of the Catholic School Advisory Committee (CSAC)	
I am an official representative of student government	
I am here as a spokesperson for another group or organization	

Submittal Date	1/4/2015
Address	

Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)

From: Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)
Sent: Sunday, January 04, 2015 9:34 PM
To: brenda.didyk@gmail.com
Cc: Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)
Subject: Delegation Registration Form submittal

**TORONTO CATHOLIC DISTRICT
SCHOOL BOARD****DELEGATION REGISTRATION FORM
FOR STANDING OR OTHER COMMITTEES**

PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT ALL STANDING
COMMITTEE MEETINGS ARE BEING
RECORDED

For Board Use
Only

Delegation No. _____

☐ Public Session
☐ Private Session
☐ Five (5)
Minutes

Name	Brenda E Didyk
Committee	Regular / Special Board
Date of Presentation	1/6/2015
Topic of Presentation	Reconsideration of student registration policy
Topic or Issue	Objection to the recent amendment to the registration priority policy (i.e. that siblings of current students are now at the same level of priority as all other in-catchment area children).
Details	The recent policy change to no longer grant siblings of existing students a priority over other in-catchment area students has the serious potential consequence of denying registration to younger siblings of existing students, particularly in crowded schools.
Action Requested	The policy change should be reversed, and in-area siblings should be granted priority registration over other in-area students.

I am here as a delegation to speak only on my own behalf	Yes
I am an official representative of the Catholic School Advisory Committee (CSAC)	
I am an official representative of student government	
I am here as a spokesperson for another group or organization	Brenda E Didyk

Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)

From: Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)
Sent: Sunday, January 04, 2015 9:38 PM
To: margaretmargossian@yahoo.com
Cc: Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)
Subject: Delegation Registration Form submittal

**TORONTO CATHOLIC DISTRICT
SCHOOL BOARD****DELEGATION REGISTRATION FORM
FOR STANDING OR OTHER COMMITTEES**

PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT ALL STANDING
COMMITTEE MEETINGS ARE BEING
RECORDED

For Board Use
Only

Delegation No. _____

☐ Public Session
☐ Private Session
☐ Five (5)
Minutes

Name	Margaret Margossian
Committee	Regular / Special Board
Date of Presentation	1/6/2015
Topic of Presentation	Reconsideration of Admissions Policy
Topic or Issue	Objection to the TCDSB's policy change, which no longer gives siblings of current students first priority during the registration process.
Details	With this first priority revoked, siblings of current students may find themselves separated from their family in neighbourhoods with oversubscribed schools.
Action Requested	The policy change should be overturned so that siblings of current students maintain first priority when registering so as to ensure, as much as possible, that the family unit remains intact.

I am here as a delegation to speak only on my own behalf	
I am an official representative of the Catholic School Advisory Committee (CSAC)	
I am an official representative of student government	
I am here as a spokesperson for another group or organization	Yes Parents of Children at OLPH School

Submittal Date	1/4/2015
----------------	----------

Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)

From: Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)
Sent: Sunday, January 04, 2015 9:44 PM
To: Kmcsweeney@ci.com
Cc: Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)
Subject: Delegation Registration Form submittal

**TORONTO CATHOLIC DISTRICT
SCHOOL BOARD****DELEGATION REGISTRATION FORM
FOR STANDING OR OTHER COMMITTEES**

PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT ALL STANDING
COMMITTEE MEETINGS ARE BEING
RECORDED

For Board Use
Only

Delegation No. _____

☐ Public Session
☐ Private Session
☐ Five (5)
Minutes

Name	Kevin McSweeney
Committee	Regular / Special Board
Date of Presentation	1/7/2015
Topic of Presentation	Admissions Policy re Siblings
Topic or Issue	I have been informed that in-catchment siblings of existing students that are registering for JK in 2015 do not receive priority placement due to the interpretation of the new admission policy as passed in October. This does not seem congruent with overall support for families.
Details	As a parent of four children, two of whom (7, 5) are at St. Cecilia, and two of whom (3 years, and 9 months) are not yet of school age, I am concerned that the admission policy as it has been explained to me by the principal of the school, has a high risk of my children being split in the schools they attend. I believe that policy/procedures should provide greater support for keeping my family together at the same school. My third and fourth child's ability to attend the same school is dependent on me being able to be at the school, or fortunate online on the morning of registration. See "Admission and Placement of Elementary Pupils" sections 4 and 8, as passed on October 23, 2014. The policy references the intention of the Board to keep out of catchment siblings together without explicitly referencing in-catchment siblings for the same consideration.
Action Requested	Confirmation/resolution of in-catchment sibling priority for admissions.

I am here as a delegation to speak only on my own behalf	Yes
I am an official representative of the Catholic School Advisory Committee (CSAC)	
I am an official representative of student government	
I am here as a spokesperson for another group or organization	

Submittal Date	1/4/2015
Address	

Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)

From: Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)
Sent: Sunday, January 04, 2015 10:39 PM
To: Kkirby@freedom.ca
Cc: Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)
Subject: Delegation Registration Form submittal



TORONTO CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

DELEGATION REGISTRATION FORM FOR STANDING OR OTHER COMMITTEES

PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT ALL STANDING
COMMITTEE MEETINGS ARE BEING
RECORDED

For Board Use
Only

Delegation No. _____

☐ Public Session
☐ Private Session
☐ Five (5)
Minutes

Name	Adrienne and Kevin Kirby
Committee	Regular / Special Board
Date of Presentation	1/6/2015
Topic of Presentation	Admission / sibling policy effective December 2014
Topic or Issue	Allowance of siblings who are entering the school year 2015 to have a guaranteed spot.
Details	After being told there will be space for my child in October 2014, I was told there was no guarantee my child could attend OLPH with her brother. I had specifically asked in October because we needed to make application deadlines for other schools by December 5, 2015. Given I was told siblings were to have priority by our principal at OLPH. There has been no time given to families to make plans. Such a plan should be rolled out with much greater notice of 2 years. This doesn't support families. This policy needs to look at the stresses it places n existing school communities and working parents who have to be in multiple places at once now given the change.
Action Requested	Allow siblings to be given a spot for year 2015.

I am here as a delegation to speak only on my own behalf	Yes
I am an official representative of the Catholic School Advisory Committee (CSAC)	

Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)

From: Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)
Sent: Monday, January 05, 2015 10:52 AM
To: claire@findahomeintoronto.com
Cc: Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)
Subject: Delegation Registration Form submittal

**TORONTO CATHOLIC DISTRICT
SCHOOL BOARD****DELEGATION REGISTRATION FORM
FOR STANDING OR OTHER COMMITTEES**

PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT ALL STANDING
COMMITTEE MEETINGS ARE BEING
RECORDED

For Board Use
Only

Delegation No. _____

☐ Public Session
☐ Private Session
☐ Five (5)
Minutes

Name	Claire Gordon
Committee	Regular / Special Board
Date of Presentation	1/6/2015
Topic of Presentation	Reconsideration of sibling admission
Topic or Issue	Siblings no longer receive priority for kindergarten registration.
Details	In overcapacity schools such as OLPH, This new policy could force families with multiple children at the school to separate their children and or pull the entire family from the school.
Action Requested	The policy be changed back so that siblings of children in the school be given priority for kindergarten registration.

I am here as a delegation to speak only on my own behalf	Yes
I am an official representative of the Catholic School Advisory Committee (CSAC)	No Our Lady of Perpetual Help Catholic School
I am an official representative of student government	
I am here as a spokesperson for another group or organization	

Submittal Date	1/5/2015
Address	

Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)

From: Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)
Sent: Monday, January 05, 2015 12:57 PM
To: susanodoty@rogers.com
Cc: Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)
Subject: Delegation Registration Form submittal

**TORONTO CATHOLIC DISTRICT
SCHOOL BOARD****DELEGATION REGISTRATION FORM
FOR STANDING OR OTHER COMMITTEES**

PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT ALL STANDING
COMMITTEE MEETINGS ARE BEING
RECORDED

For Board Use
Only

Delegation No. _____

☐ Public Session
☐ Private Session
☐ Five (5)
Minutes

Name	Susan O'Brien-Doty
Committee	Regular / Special Board
Date of Presentation	1/6/2015
Topic of Presentation	Reconsideration of Admissions Policy
Topic or Issue	Objection to admissions policy change to place siblings of current students at the same priority level as other children in the district without siblings in the school.
Details	By providing same priority to children without siblings in the school, families who could have children together in one school could be broken up because we have an over-subscribed school district. As a parent trying to maintain a busy family life that includes a Catholic upbringing, this would create undue stress and a situation in which parents will have to choose between taking all kids out of OLPH, having some children in a Catholic school and some not, or trying to find another Catholic school for those that don't get in and having kids at different schools (and not in our Church district). If I was a new family applying, I would also find it very difficult to choose the Catholic School System due to the long-term uncertainty it would provide for future siblings. We are very devout Catholics and attend OLPH every week, volunteer on Church committees and take part in our Church and school community. It would be very devastating to have our children broken up.
Action Requested	Children with siblings in the school and in district should be given priority 1 status; children without siblings in the school but in district should be given priority 2 status. This would mean no applicants with

	siblings in the school currently would be without a spot before a child without siblings is given a spot.
--	---

I am here as a delegation to speak only on my own behalf	Yes
I am an official representative of the Catholic School Advisory Committee (CSAC)	No
I am an official representative of student government	
I am here as a spokesperson for another group or organization	Yes Parents of Children at OLPH School

Submittal Date	1/5/2015
Address	

Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)

From: Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)
Sent: Monday, January 05, 2015 7:04 AM
To: Ferraro, Joe (Warehouse Distribution)
Cc: Fernandes, Lalita (Corporate Services)
Subject: Delegation Registration Form submittal

**TORONTO CATHOLIC DISTRICT
SCHOOL BOARD****DELEGATION REGISTRATION FORM
FOR STANDING OR OTHER COMMITTEES**

PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT ALL STANDING
COMMITTEE MEETINGS ARE BEING
RECORDED

For Board Use
Only

Delegation No. _____

☐ Public Session
☐ Private Session
☐ Five (5)
Minutes

Name	cupe 1280
Committee	Budget
Date of Presentation	1/6/2015
Topic of Presentation	budget
Topic or Issue	cuts to the budget..impact on cupe 120
Details	union would like to discuss on the impact of cuts to our group
Action Requested	no action

I am here as a delegation to speak only on my own behalf	Yes
I am an official representative of the Catholic School Advisory Committee (CSAC)	No
I am an official representative of student government	
I am here as a spokesperson for another group or organization	Yes cupe 1280

Submittal Date	1/6/2015
Address	80 sheppard
Postal Code	l6t 1w7
Telephone	416 822 3255



REPORT TO

REGULAR BOARD

2014-2015 REVISED BUDGET ESTIMATES

Deuteronomy 15:10

Give generously to him and do so without a grudging heart; then because of this the LORD your God will bless you in all your work and in everything you put your hand to.

Created, Draft	First Tabling	Review
December 1, 2014	December 11, 2014	January 6, 2015
S. Chitapain, Coordinator of Budget Services, D. De Souza, Coordinator of Revenue, Grants and Ministry Reporting P. De Cock, Comptroller for Business Services & Finance		
RECOMMENDATION REPORT		

Vision:

At Toronto Catholic we transform the world through witness, faith, innovation and action.

Mission:

The Toronto Catholic District School Board is an inclusive learning community rooted in the love of Christ. We educate students to grow in grace and knowledge and to lead lives of faith, hope and charity.



G. Poole
Associate Director of Academic Affairs

A. Sangiorgio
Associate Director of Planning and Facilities

Angela Gauthier
Director of Education

A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the 2014-15 Revised Budget Estimates in the amount of \$1.2B. The recommended Revised Budget Estimates continues our commitment to achieve effective, efficient and equitable programs and services while better meeting the needs of all students. In order to maintain stability for the system and to ensure that student achievement is not compromised, the 2014-15 Revised Estimates will contain a number of necessary changes to improve our financial position as part of a deliberate path back to a positive financial position with a priority to ensure that the current deficit situation does not adversely impact students and staff in the classroom. The Revised Budget Estimates projects an in-year deficit in the amount of \$9.6M and an accumulated deficit of \$17.015M at the end of the fiscal year 2014-15 (Appendix A) assuming staff recommendations are approved.

B. PURPOSE

As part of the strategy to ensure financial stability and to provide effective stewardship of resources, we will continue to work to address the previous year's deficit and the in the in-year deficit without adversely impacting students and staff in the classroom. A multi-year deficit recovery plan will also be developed in collaboration with Ministry staff to address this deficit and enable the TCDSB to return to a positive financial position.

C. BACKGROUND

Alignment with TCDSB's multi-year strategic plan (MYSP) is a critical element of TCDSB's Revised Budget Estimates. In addition to aligning the budget with TCDSB's MYSP, is the on-going need to ensure long-term budget sustainability. In fact, the development of the board's annual budget is one of the most strategic, but also the most time consuming and labour intensive functions undertaken by TCDSB's business administration.

It is important that the budget be developed in a thoughtful manner and that decisions respecting the expenditure of funds carefully weigh the

impacts and benefits to all TCDSB stakeholders across the near and long term horizon.

For 2014-2015 Revised Budget Estimates, the Board continues to maintain many of its current programs. Due diligence in apportioning increasingly limited resources to fulfil its objectives will remain a critical component of the Board's planning for the school system moving forward into the future.

D. EVIDENCE/RESEARCH/ANALYSIS

1. Budget Estimates 2014-2015

The Budget Estimates 2014-15 was approved at the Special Board meeting held on June 16, 2014. The 2014-15 Operating and Capital Budget Estimates approved in the amount of \$1.2B projected an in-year surplus in the amount of \$0.198M and an accumulated surplus of \$5.638M by the fiscal year ending August 31, 2015.

2. 2014-2015 Revised Budget Estimates

When developing the 2014-15 Revised Budget Estimates, the Revised Budget Estimates need to be adjusted in order to align with the revised funding regulations, updated enrolment projections and the previous year's deficit. The resulting 2014-15 Grants for Student Needs (GSN) calculations in the provincial and the local context have changed, and consequently, the Revised Budget Estimates have been adjusted accordingly to address the shortfall in the previous fiscal year 2013-14.

As per the Education Act, School Boards are required to balance their budgets. This means that the projected in-year expenditures cannot exceed in-year revenues. In the current climate of financial constraints, TCDSB will submit a 2014-2015 Revised Estimates Budget with a projected in-year deficit with the Ministry's approval. Management has been working closely with staff from the Financial and Accountability Branch for the Ministry of Education and TCDSB has received an extension for submitting the Revised Budget Estimates 2014-15 by mid-January 2015.

3. A summary of adjustments required for the Revised Budget Estimates 2014-15 are as follows:

Description	Changes \$	Comments
Salaries and Benefits	12,700,012	Benefits expense budgets have been increased to reflect the actual Human Resource and Payroll data estimates submissions for statutory and other benefits, and the average salary has been increased due to projected movement of staff on the salary grid.
Supply Early Childhood Educators	713,851	Setting up an Early Childhood Educators supply budget.
School Block Budgets	3,033,250	Budget adjustment made in order to report revenues and expenses separately.
Other Budget Items	38,131	This includes a reduction in the School Block budget allocation (\$56,845) due to declining enrolment, an increase in teachers' mileage of \$70,000 to align with last year's actual expenditures, and an increase to membership fees for OCSTA and OCSOA of \$24,978
Transportation Expenditure Budget	(851,688)	Revised budget projects savings due to the full implementation of the Full Day Kindergarten Program.
Amortization	874,771	The amortization cost for enterprise information technology systems and other capital costs.
Non-Operating Expenditures	(2,021,472)	The expenditure budget associated in Education Programs Other (EPO) funded projects is projected to decline based on funding announcements to date.
Net Change in Capital Expenditures	135,116	Capital expenditures increase due to a forecasted increase in capital grants.
Total Adjustments	14,621,971	

The Revised Estimates 2014-15 also reviewed the benefits by employee group in order to ensure that a sufficient budget provision is made to cover all the benefits estimates provided by Human Resources and Payroll Services. A detailed analysis of the benefits computation can be viewed in Appendix B.

4. Enrolment

The key component to the development of the Revised Budget Estimates is projecting enrolment for 2014-15. In order to recalculate the Average Daily Enrolment (ADE), revisions to enrolment projections reflect the actual October 31, 2014 enrolments. The March 31, 2015 projected enrolment for Elementary has been projected at 100% retention and Secondary has been projected at 97.76% based on previous trends.

From the 2014-15 estimated ADE, elementary enrolment has decreased by 263 ADE, while the secondary enrolment decreased by 218 ADE for an overall decline in enrolment by 481 ADE.

Any decline in overall enrolment place pressure on both TCDSB's operating and capital budgets.

A comparative enrolment analysis appears in the following table:

ADE Comparison (2014-15 Revised Estimates to Budget Estimates 2014-15)

School Year	ADE		
	Elementary	Secondary	Total
2014-2015 Estimates	60,550	30,089	90,639
2014-2015 Revised Estimates	60,287	29,871	90,158
Increase/(Decrease)	(263)	(218)	(481)

5. School Operations and Maintenance

As enrolment declines, the school operations and maintenance grant has been reduced accordingly. The grant was reduced by \$145,000 and the expenditure budget needs to be adjusted to reflect the reduction in grant.

6. Transportation

The TCDSB continuously provides student transportation services for students who meet the conditions outlined in the Board's transportation policy. This includes students who are identified with special needs; students living more than 1.5 kilometres (km) from their local Catholic school (Grades JK-8) in a designated transportation area where more than 30 students reside, students attending Eastern Rite Catholic schools within designated catchment areas; students who reside within areas that must cross significant hazards to reach school; and students in designated areas as approved by the Board of Trustees.

With the full day implementation of the Full Day kindergarten there has been some savings realized in the transportation expenditures as fewer buses are projected to be used to the amount of \$851,687 and the grant allocation has also increased by \$406,244 (Appendix C).

7. Potential Savings recommended for inclusion in the 2014-2015 Revised Budget Estimates appear in the table below

The table below shows the financial risk and impact at a high level of the recommended savings strategy and more details can be viewed in Appendix D for replies to Trustees' questions after the Board meeting of December 11, 2014.

Potential Savings for 2014-15 Revised Budget Estimates					
	Description	FTE	Total \$	Risk (Low, Medium, High)	Impact
1	<p>Reduce Occasional Teacher Budget to reflect 3 year trend analysis.</p> <p>Actual Expenditures: 2011-12 : \$24.3M 2012-13 : \$25.7M 2013-14 : \$18.3M Sept-Nov 2014: \$5.7M Proj. 2014-15: \$19M</p> <p>3 Year Average Cost: 2011-14 : \$22.8M</p> <p>Budget Estimate: 2011-12 : \$20.5M 2012-13 : \$20.5M 2013-14 : \$22.1M 2014-15 : \$23.2M</p>		1,000,000	LOW	No operational change as Occasional Teachers will continue to be deployed as required consistent with past practice. The variable nature of this cost does create some financial risk, however, the proposed savings is a conservative estimate of the total savings projected in the range of \$1 to \$3M.
2	<p>Workplace Accommodation Provision</p> <p>Actual Expenditures: 2013-14 : \$ 224,143 Proj. 2014-15: \$219,312</p> <p>Budget Estimate: 2013-14 : \$ 946,820 2014-15 : \$ 946,820</p>		480,000	LOW	No impact on current staffing assigned to schools. Possible impact on future ability to address staffing accommodation needs in the classroom due to reduced funding provision.

	Description	FTE	Total \$	Risk (Low, Medium, High)	Impact
3	Academic Professional Development Reduction Actual Expenditures: 2011-12 : \$ 4.628M 2012-13 : \$ 1.727M 2013-14 : \$ 2.554M Sept-Nov 2014: \$ 1.358M Budget Estimate: 2011-12 : \$ 3.067M 2012-13 : \$ 3.067M 2013-14 : \$ 3.067M 2014-15 : \$ 2.968M		500,000	LOW	<p>Reduced investment in professional development opportunities for academic staff decreases opportunities to network with each other and colleagues from other school boards and professional associations.</p> <p>Required professional development activities will be funded from Education Payments Other (EPO) grants consistent with their respective agreements.</p>
4	Non-Academic Professional Development Reduction Actual Expenditures: 2011-12 : \$ 188,994 2012-13 : \$ 204,370 2013-14 : \$ 237,868 Sept-Nov 2014: \$ 20,437 Budget Estimate: 2011-12 : \$ 200,000 2012-13 : \$ 210,000 2013-14 : \$ 250,000 2014-15 : \$ 204,370		183,933	LOW	<p>Reduced investment in professional development opportunities for non-academic staff decreases opportunities to network with each other and colleagues from other school boards and professional associations.</p> <p>Required professional development activities will be funded from Education Payments Other (EPO) grants consistent with their respective agreements.</p>

5	Transfer Leased Schools' Operating Costs to Temporary Accommodation Grant Actual Expenditures: 2011-12 : \$1,148,700 2012-13 : \$1,167,774 2013-14 : \$1,171,576 Proj.2014-15 : \$1,158,000 Budget Estimate: 2011-12 : \$ 3,125,822 2012-13 : \$ 3,446,224 2013-14 : \$ 2,633,821 2014-15 : \$ 2,352,000		1,158,000	HIGH	The transfer of leased schools' operating costs the Temporary Accommodation Grant (TAG) increases the cost pressures in the School Renewal Grant for Portable related costs previously funded by TAG.
6	Director's Discretionary Budget Actual Expenditures: 2011-12 : \$ 91,057 2012-13 : \$ 100,000 2013-14 : \$ 33,411 2014-15 : \$ 6,926 Budget Estimate: 2011-12 : \$ 100,000 2012-13 : \$ 100,000 2013-14 : \$ 100,000 2014-15 : \$ 100,000		50,000	LOW	The 50% reduction to this provision impairs the Director's ability to fund unforeseen academic and professional activities and events as they arise throughout the year.

	Description	FTE	Total \$	Risk (Low, Medium, High)	Impact
7	Investment in Technology Actual Expenditures: 2011-12 : \$500,000 2012-13 : \$500,000 2013-14 : \$0 Sept-Nov 2014: \$0 Budget Estimate: 2011-12 : \$500,000 2012-13 : \$500,000 2013-14 : \$250,000 2014-15 : \$500,000		500,000	MEDIUM	The proposed reduction to this investment will delay the WIFI installation in Elementary Schools. IT is currently in the middle of an RFP which is expected to be awarded in Mar/Apr 2015 therefore the project would have been launched in May/June 2015. This delay would mean the project will not launch until the new budget year in Sept. 2015. The anticipated provincial investment in technology will offset this reduction and mitigate the estimated delay.
8	Negotiation Costs Actual Expenditures: 2011-12 : \$4,602 2012-13 : \$6,629 2013-14 : \$0 Sept-Nov 2014: \$0 Budget Estimate: 2011-12 : \$ 158,260 2012-13 : \$ 158,260 2013-14 : \$ 158,260 2014-15 : \$ 158,260		158,260	LOW	Labour negotiations will begin at the provincial level as soon as an agreement has been reached to determine what matters are negotiated provincially versus locally. There has been no negotiation costs incurred in 2014-15

	Description	FTE	Total \$	Risk (Low, Medium, High)	Impact
9	Summer Student Hiring Actual Expenditures: 2011-12 : \$ 100,000 2012-13 : \$ 100,000 2013-14 : \$ 100,000 Sept-Nov 2014: \$ 0 Budget Estimate: 2011-12 : \$ 100,000 2012-13 : \$ 100,000 2013-14 : \$ 100,000 2014-15 : \$ 85,000		85,000	LOW	There is an operational risk due to the reduced staff capacity during the summer months. Staff will have to arrange for summer coverage and may not cover all areas.
10	Central Department Budgets for Supplies & Services (10% Reduction) Actual Expenditures: 2011-12 : \$ 1,586,205 2012-13 : \$ 1,729,668 2013-14 : \$ 1,065,337 Sept-Nov 2014: \$ 328,702 Budget Estimate: 2011-12 : \$ 1,911,858 2012-13 : \$ 1,911,822 2013-14 : \$ 1,911,822 2014-15 : \$ 1,802,698		367,051	MEDIUM	The impact to central department budgets which includes office supplies, printing, fees & services, licenses and telephone will vary across functional areas, and the proposed 10% reduction is in addition to the 10% reduction approved in the 2014-15 Budget Estimates.
11	Deferral of Accounting Department Vacancy	1.0	62,515	MEDIUM	Impact will be mitigated by the implementation of an automated payment system for utilities invoices which was the primary responsibility for this position.

	Description	FTE	Total \$	Risk (Low, Medium, High)	Impact
12	Human Resources – Combine 2 positions into 1 position	1.0	106,174	HIGH	The inability to fully adjudicate the short term sick leave plan in a timely manner may result in increased sick leave costs.
13	Deferral of IT – Secretary Vacancy (Position to be vacant in December 2014)	1.0	41,677	MEDIUM	The workload such as answering phone calls, dealing with walk-ins for support and borrowing equipment and administrative work in tracking Purchase Orders etc. may take more time.
14	Deferral of Planning Supervisor Vacancy	1.0	106,174	HIGH	The resulting reduction to Planning Services' capacity will negatively impact upon the planned execution of work by Boundary Review Committees and School Accommodation Review Committees.
15	Deferral of 21C Team Position (Vacant since November 2014)	1.0	81,368	MEDIUM	A reduction to 21C staff capacity may delay in-servicing activities for schools.
16	Reduction of Contract Positions		140,625	LOW	This reduction reflects the actual reduction of Capital work realized by the substantial completion of Full Day Kindergarten Capital Projects
	Total Potential Savings	5.0	5,020,777		

Summary

For the 2014-15 Revised Budget Estimates, the in-year deficit is projected to be \$14.621M and with the proposed potential savings as mentioned above, it will reduce the in-year deficit to \$9.6M. The total accumulated deficit is projected to grow from \$ 7.415M to \$17.015M by the end of the fiscal year ending August 31, 2015.

Management is collaborating with the Ministry of Education to develop a multi-year deficit recovery plan which will take the TCDSB on a deliberate path back to a positive financial position.

E. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the Board approve the 2014-15 Revised Estimates and the proposed savings in the amount of \$5,020,777, therefore reducing the in-year deficit to \$9.6M and reducing the accumulated deficit to \$17.015M.

TCDSB 2014/15 Operating and Capital Revised Estimates (000's)

		2014/15 Estimates	2014/15 Revised Estimates	Variance Incr./ (Decr.)
	<u>Revenues</u>			
1	Pupil & School Foundation	541,752	538,355	(3,397)
2	Special Education	125,396	124,623	(773)
3	Language	34,868	34,424	(445)
4	Learning Opportunity	46,409	46,330	(79)
5	Continuing Education and Summer School	15,524	15,614	90
6	Teacher Qualification and Experience/NTIP	67,643	71,321	3,678
7	Transportation	23,497	23,904	406
8	Administration and Governance	22,215	22,082	(134)
9	School Operations	88,644	88,499	(145)
10	Community Use of Schools	1,225	1,225	0
11	Declining Enrolment Adjustment	2,214	3,377	1,163
12	Temporary Accommodation	2,352	2,249	(103)
13	First Nation, Métis and Inuit Education	2,735	2,882	147
14	Safe Schools	2,672	2,661	(11)
15	Total Operating Grants	977,146	977,545	399
16	Other Grants & Other Revenues	71,301	73,698	2,397
17	Subtotal Operating Grants and Other Revenues	1,048,447	1,051,243	2,796
18	Capital Grants	162,832	130,209	(32,622)
19	Total Operating and Capital Grants	1,211,278	1,181,453	(29,826)
	<u>Expenditure Categories</u>			
20	Classroom Teachers	580,815	590,554	9,739
21	Occasional Teachers	23,480	23,224	(255)
22	Education Assistants and Designated Early Childhood Educators	75,808	77,326	1,518
23	Professional & Para-professionals	50,344	51,191	847
24	Textbooks & Classroom Supplies	19,798	22,774	2,976
25	Computers	6,872	6,872	0
26	Staff Development	3,067	2,968	(99)

TCDSB 2014/15 Operating and Capital Revised Estimates (000's)

		2014/15 Estimates	2014/15 Revised Estimates	Variance Incr./ (Decr.)
27	Sub-total Classroom Instruction	760,184	774,909	14,726
28	In School Administration	66,725	67,302	577
29	Teacher Consultants & Coordinators	8,548	8,439	(109)
30	Administration and Governance	24,159	24,964	805
31	School Operations & Maintenance	89,046	90,237	1,191
32	Cont. Ed. (incl. International Language./Summer Schools.)	23,764	24,133	369
33	Transportation	29,026	28,174	(852)
34	Sub-total Non-Classroom	241,268	243,249	1,981
35	Operating Expenditures	1,001,452	1,018,158	16,707
36	School Renewal & School Condition Improvement	23,269	26,310	3,041
37	Temporary Accommodation - Relocation & Leasing	2,634	2,931	297
38	Debt Service and EDC	136,929	103,900	(33,029)
39	Sub-total Capital	162,832	133,141	(29,691)
40	Other Non-Operating Expenditures	46,796	44,775	(2,021)
41	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	1,211,079	1,196,074	(15,005)
42	In Year Surplus (Deficit) ***	198	(14,621)	(14,423)
43	Accumulated Surplus (Deficit) - Balance as at August 31, 2014	5,440	(7,415)	
44	Accumulated Surplus (Deficit) - Projected Balance as at August 31, 2015	5,638	(22,036)	***

***Note: The projected in-year deficit before any proposed savings could be reduced to \$9.6M, and the accumulated deficit could be reduced to \$17.015M if the proposed savings are approved.

TORONTO CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD
Comparative Analysis of Benefit Estimates by Category -2014-2015 Revised Estimates

APPENDIX B

	Salaries Actual 13/14	FS 2013-2014 Total Benefits Estimates		Salaries Revised Estimates 13/14	2014-2015 Total Benefits Estimates	
		\$ Actuals.	% of Sal.		\$ Est.	% of Sal.
CLASSROOM						
Classroom Teachers	481,332,728	66,857,101	13.9%	472,918,562	53,618,557	11.4%
Occasional Teachers	16,764,733	1,488,649	8.9%	18,131,081	3,542,507	19.0%
Educational Assistants	39,828,634	12,415,367	31.2%	40,486,079	12,568,476	29.0%
Early Childhood Educator					4,403,970	25.0%
Staff Development (Occasional Teachers)	1,727,664	340,779	19.7%		0	0.0%
Paraprofessionals	34,091,448	8,485,584	24.9%	34,548,095	8,184,457	23.7%
Library & Guidance	18,896,979	2,663,900	14.1%	18,166,083	2,062,480	11.4%
Subtotal - Classroom	592,642,186	92,251,380		584,249,900	84,380,447	
NON-CLASSROOM						
Principals & VPs	37,004,824	4,804,819	13.0%	36,906,226	4,494,272	12.2%
Coordinators & Consultants	7,050,237	1,116,523	15.8%	6,485,037	822,665	12.7%
School Office Secretarial	16,641,915	4,527,975	27.2%	17,836,916	4,819,528	27.0%
Cont.Ed. & Int'l Languages	19,135,064	3,118,127	16.3%	19,132,079	2,426,477	12.7%
Subtotal - Non Classroom	79,832,040	13,567,444	17.0%	80,360,258	12,562,942	
Administration						
Trustees	241,483	8,871	3.7%	237,930	10,773	4.5%
Directors & SOs	3,243,924	866,144	26.7%	3,358,617	421,431	12.5%
Board Administration	11,067,000	2,785,096	25.2%	11,890,839	3,299,857	27.8%
Subtotal - Administration	14,552,407	3,660,111		15,487,386	3,732,061	
Transportation	901,496	241,768	26.8%	892,777	235,535	26.4%
School Operations & Mtce.	42,577,256	12,569,783	29.5%	45,212,748	13,391,202	29.6%
Other Non- Operating	43,769,260	6,072,411	13.9%	29,322,979	5,688,658	19.4%
Subtotal - Other	87,248,012	18,883,962		75,428,504	19,315,395	
Grand Total	774,274,645	128,362,897		755,526,048	119,990,845	

Comparative Analysis of Benefit Estimates by Category -2014-2015 Revised Estimates

	Salaries Estimates 2014/15	2014-2015 Rev Est Total Benefits As per Payroll & HR Submission		2014-2015 Revised Estimates	2014-2015 Total Benefits Rev Est Prep File	
		\$ Est.	% of Sal.	Salary	\$ Est.	% of Sal.
CLASSROOM						
Classroom Teachers	502,393,194	69,655,696	13.9%	500,598,324	69,583,167	13.9%
Occasional Teachers	19,648,281	3,581,575	18.2%	19,648,281	3,575,987	18.2%
Educational Assistants	41,664,357	13,156,877	31.6%	41,347,852	13,065,921	31.6%
Early Childhood Educator	17,615,880	4,582,433	26.0%	18,329,731	4,582,433	25.0%
Staff Dev.(Occasional Tchrs)	1,959,356	310,251	15.8%	1,704,677	310,251	18.2%
Paraprofessionals	35,039,571	8,779,068	25.1%	35,039,571	8,794,932	25.1%
Library & Guidance	18,784,694	2,110,030	11.2%	17,350,382	2,411,703	13.9%
Subtotal - Classroom	637,105,333	102,175,930	16.0%	634,018,818	102,324,395	16.1%
NON-CLASSROOM						
Principals & VPs	36,656,595	4,883,140	13.3%	37,363,736	4,969,377	13.3%
Coordinators & Consultants	7,126,868	1,145,147	16.1%	7,126,868	1,147,426	16.1%
School Office Secretarial	18,017,311	5,061,559	28.1%	18,017,311	5,062,864	28.1%
Cont.Ed. & Int'l Languages	19,393,132	2,305,904	11.9%	19,126,414	3,098,479	16.2%
Subtotal - Non Classroom	81,193,906	13,395,750	16.5%	81,634,330	14,278,146	17.5%
Administration						
Trustees	237,931	10,773	4.5%	249,696	10,773	4.3%
Directors & SOs	3,048,487	900,358	29.5%	3,048,487	899,304	29.5%
Board Administration	12,092,540	3,398,088	28.1%	12,092,540	3,381,927	28.0%
Subtotal - Administration	15,378,958	4,309,219	28.0%	15,390,723	4,292,004	27.9%
Transportation	911,408	235,898	25.9%	911,408	250,645	27.5%
School Operations & Mtce.	45,145,575	13,693,410	30.3%	45,145,575	13,679,109	30.3%
Other Non- Operating	10,418,917	1,354,459	13.0%	8,591,120	1,187,712	13.8%
Subtotal - Other	56,475,900	15,283,768	27.1%	54,648,103	15,117,466	27.7%
Grand Total	790,154,097	135,164,667	17.1%	785,691,974	136,012,012	17.3%

**TORONTO CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD
TRANSPORTATION 2014/2015 REVISED ESTIMATES**

APPENDIX C

ACCOUNT NAME	2013/14 Actual Expenditures	2014/15 Estimates	2014/15 Revised Estimates	14/15 Rev Est. over Est.	% Chg
MUSIC	25,561	41,610	30,000	(11,610)	-38.7%
OUTDOOR EDUCATION	9,030	24,468	15,000	(9,468)	-63.1%
EXCURSION-HANDICAPPED	23,843	18,991	25,000	6,009	24.0%
REGULAR HOME TO SCHOOL	9,825,179	11,159,769	11,190,107	30,338	0.3%
STUDENT SAFETY	11,928	91,000	91,000	0	0.0%
SAFE SCHOOLS	22,518	15,156	15,490	334	2.2%
KINDERGARTEN	720,197			0	
REMEDIAL LANGUAGE	70,550	235,183	90,000	(145,183)	-161.3%
REGULAR TRANSIT FARES SCHOLARS & CHILDREN	49,812	56,400	56,400	0	0.0%
SAFE SCHOOLS TRANSIT FARES (SCHOLARS)		10,152	10,152	0	0.0%
TRANSIT FARES (ADULTS)		6,652	6,652	0	0.0%
BILINGUAL PROGRAM TRANSIT FARES (SCHOLARS) & CHILDREN	86,460	109,416	89,416	(20,000)	-22.4%
EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCE (TICKETS)	393,455	501,528	501,528	0	0.0%
FUEL ESCALATION	551,432	521,924	561,880	39,956	7.1%
REGULAR HOME TO SCHOOL NEW ROUTES	5,909	745,881	45,881	(700,000)	-1525.7%
SOFTWARE FEES AND LICENCES	92,932	105,000	104,334	(666)	-0.6%
PHYSICAL TRANSPORTATION		1,996	1,996	0	0.0%
SUB TOTAL	11,888,806	13,645,126	12,834,836	(810,290)	-6.3%
SPECIAL EDUCATION					
VISION, HEARING & SPEECH	1,948,772	1,996,354	2,040,473	44,119	2.2%
MEDICAL & HANDICAPPED	5,654,944	6,126,766	6,004,373	(122,393)	-2.0%
ONTARIO SCHOOLS DEAF & BLIND		26,988	0	(26,988)	

**TORONTO CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD
TRANSPORTATION 2014/2015 REVISED ESTIMATES**

APPENDIX C

ACCOUNT NAME	2013/14 Actual Expenditures	2014/15 Estimates	2014/15 Revised Estimates	14/15 Rev Est. over Est.	% Chg
SPECIAL EDUCATION TRANSIT FARES (ADULTS)		9,964	10,000	36	0.4%
DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED TRANSIT FARES (SCHOLARS)		3,384	3,384	0	0.0%
SPECIAL TRANSIT FARES SCHOLARS & CHILDREN	104,289	261,446	231,256	(30,190)	-13.1%
DEVELOPMENTALLY DISABLED	706,109	887,903	807,526	(80,377)	-10.0%
SECTION 23	511,065	439,989	515,000	75,011	14.6%
SPECIAL EDUCATION	3,044,647	3,133,273	3,202,518	69,245	2.2%
CO-OPERATIVE EDUCATION (SPE.ED.&W/C) & TRANSIT TICKETS	950,761	694,079	648,100	(45,979)	-7.1%
SUB TOTAL SPECIAL EDUCATION	12,920,587	13,580,146	13,462,631	(117,515)	-0.9%
SUB TOTAL SUPPLY AND SERVICE	24,809,393	27,225,272	26,297,467	(927,805)	-3.5%
ADMINISTRATIVE SALARY (INCLUDES 22% BENEFITS)	1,143,265	1,133,162	1,097,651	(35,511)	-3.2%
TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE		38,000	37,000	(1,000)	-2.7%
OFFICE SUPPLIES & SERVICES	39,676	98,316	93,316	(5,000)	-5.4%
SUB TOTAL ADMINISTRATION	1,182,941	1,269,478	1,227,967	(41,511)	-3.4%

**TORONTO CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD
TRANSPORTATION 2014/2015 REVISED ESTIMATES**

APPENDIX C

ACCOUNT NAME	2013/14 Actual Expenditures	2014/15 Estimates	2014/15 Revised Estimates	14/15 Rev Est. over Est.	% Chg
One Time Costs (13/14 DANTE SHUTTLE)	77,513	82,326	84,146	1,820	2.2%
One Time Costs - St. Cecillia St Rita Relocation		0	105,887	105,887	0.0%
One Time Costs - St. Michael (Sept.14 - Jun.15)	117,356	119,486	122,127	2,641	0.0%
One Time Costs - St. John the Evangelist Sep 13-June 14	313,855	329,449	336,730	7,281	2.2%
SUB TOTAL ONE TIME COSTS	508,725	531,261	648,889	117,628	18.1%
TOTAL INCLUDING ONE TIME COSTS	26,501,059	29,026,011	28,174,323	(851,687)	-3.0%
GRANT ALLOCATION (ESTIMATES)	23,366,338	23,497,397	23,903,641	406,244	1.7%
TDSB COST RECOVERY	235,822	270,785	270,785	0	0.0%
REVENUE REQUIRED FROM OTHER SOURCES	2,898,899	5,257,829	3,999,897	(1,257,931)	-31.4%

2014-15 Revised Budget Estimates

Questions and Answers regarding the 2014-15 Revised Budget Estimates

Trustee Maria Rizzo

1. **Question:** Who was involved in making recommendations on budget to board? What criteria and assessment was used? You have been involved in a budget process since election and the bottom line keeps changing. Why? If we waited another month would it change again?

Answer: Normally the Revised Budget Estimates does not require a lot of change as changes are only made to reflect the updated enrolment numbers which uses the actual October 2014 count and the forecasted March 2015 count. This year is an exception due to the need to find savings in order to mitigate the previous year's accumulated deficit and the projected 2014-15 in-year deficit. All the recommended changes were reviewed extensively by senior staff with the main criteria of not adversely impacting students and staff in the classroom.

The bottom line keeps changing as the previous year's audited financial statements changed the opening accumulated surplus/(deficit) position, and further changes to the 2014-15 Budget Revised Estimates will change the ending accumulated surplus/(deficit) position. The table below illustrates in a chronological order the major changes to the bottom line.

Events in Chronological Order	In-Year \$ Amount	Accumulated \$ Amount
2014-15 Budget Estimates approved June 16, 2014 projected an in-year surplus of \$198,087 and an accumulated surplus of \$5,638,087	198,087	5,638,087
2013-14 Audited Financial Statement Prior Period Accounting Adjustment reduces Opening Accumulated Surplus	(3,382,576)	2,255,424
2013-14 Audited Financial Statement Closing in-year Deficit reduces Accumulated Surplus	(9,670,154)	(7,414,730)
2014-15 Revised Budget Estimates projects an in-year Deficit of \$14,621,139 before any proposed savings which increases the Accumulated Deficit	(14,621,139)	(22,035,730)
2014-15 Proposed Savings amounting to \$5,020,777 will reduce the Accumulated Deficit	5,020,777	(17,014,953)

2. **Question:** Are there any positions that are not in schools (Caretaking, Clerical, Teaching, Education Assistants) that are not filled.

Answer: Positions continue to become vacant on an ongoing basis, however, collective agreements and Memorandum of Understandings' (MOU) job security clauses require that these positions be filled on a timely basis. The recommended potential savings identified in the report; list 5 vacant positions that can be deferred for the 2014-15 Revised Budget Estimates.

In addition to the positions identified in the report, there is a list of current non-school CUPE 1280 positions not filled at present but where bids have been closed:

Position	FTE	Location
General Maintenance	2	Warehouse
Truck Driver	1	Warehouse
Afternoon Assistant	1	Catholic Education Centre
General Maintenance	1	East Facilities
General Maintenance	1	West Facilities
Electrician	1	West Facilities

Other current vacancies in non-union and CUPE 1328 Positions at end of October 2014.

Position	FTE	Location
Supervisor Maintenance	1	Facilities
Service Quality Officer	1	Facilities
Short Term support Supervisor	1	Human Resources
Legal Counsel	1	Human Resources
SEMS Operator	1	Human Resources
Print Clerk	1	Printing/Mailroom

3. **Question:** How much money is used for consultants other than facilities?

Answer: The actual cost for 2013-14 was \$989, 212 and expenditures to date amounts to \$ 282,892.

Consulting for other than Facilities is utilized in a number of non-academic areas as detailed in the table below:

DEPARTMENT	SERVICE PROVIDED	2013-14	2014-15
		\$	Expenditure to Date
			\$
Finance	External Auditor	94,468	46,330
Finance/Plant Maintenance	SAP Application Support Services	65,156	11,232
Human Resources/Payroll	SAP Application Support Services	25,866	27,258
Computer/Technical Services	SharePoint & MS Exchange Services	134,972	38,155
Planning/Real Estate	Land Use Studies, Appraisals, Software Support Services	94,161	35,239
Legal Services	Opinions, Litigations, Contractual Matters	563,999	119,627
Arbitrators	Labour Relations Resolutions	10,589	5,051
Total		989,212	282,892

4. **Question:** What is the breakdown of facility consultants by category-architects, engineers, studies and for what?

Answer: The use of facility consultants such as architects, engineers and landscape architects are funded from capital funds and there is no impact nor is it germane to the operating budget.

5. **Question:** Have we ever asked our outside resources to reduce their fees? Architects as an example by 1% or more?

Answer: The Broader Public Sector Procurement Directive, and as part of our Purchasing Policy, TCDSB is required to have an open & fair competitive process to engage consultants, and furthermore, the cost of architects are funded from capital funds and there is no impact nor is it germane to the operating budget.

6. **Question:** Snow Removal, Landscaping?

Answer: In a recent approved report for snow and ice clearing contracts (September 2014), – there is a new approach to breakdown the areas into smaller geographical zones, to encourage small to medium-size firms to bid and increase competitive pricing, as explained below (excerpt from the report):

“The Board staff, who also prepared the tender documents for this project, evaluated all bids received. Bidders were informed that there was a limit of one area per contract, (or 5 part areas, whichever is less). Although more difficult to administer, distributing the work amongst a variety of small to medium sized companies has resulted in improved response time and competitive pricing. The tender documents did specify however that the Board had the right to award additional areas to an individual contractor, in the event there were no bids received for any of the areas or if there was a concern regarding the amount of work, either too large or too small an area (too many or too few schools for example). It is recommended that the low bidders meeting Board specifications be awarded the work as denoted in Appendix A except for Areas 1B, 1C and 3B which are recommended to be awarded to the second low bidders.”

Each contract period, snow and Ice control needs are reviewed and adjustments are made to areas serviced by the contract. This process was made more competitive when maximums were placed on the number of areas serviced, while marked improvements were evident in the service received by schools.

The following is a historical perspective of snow removal expenditures over the past few years:

Period	Cost \$
2010-11	1,386,693
2011-12	1,348,904

2012-13	1,402,321
2013-14	1,402,321
2014-15 (Projected)	1,552,607*
2015-16 (Projected)	1,552,607*

*Includes \$75,000 contingency for snow removal and net HST

The same approach has been followed with the grass cutting contract, as this work is divided into smaller geographical areas, so the small to medium firms can submit bids for the work.

7. **Question:** Renewal has been reduced. Are there emergency funds?

Answer: The 2014-2016 School Renewal Program carries a \$750,000 contingency allowance per year for emergencies and unforeseen additional work.

8. **Question:** How much money is being allocated for professional fees? Who do we pay these fees for?

Answer: Professional fees in accordance with contractual obligations amounted to \$39,208 in 2013-14. The fees included payments to Accountancy Professional Associations, Human Resources Professional Association, Law Society of Upper Canada, Supply Chain Management Association, Canadian Bar Society, Project Management Professionals and Ontario College of Social Workers.

9. **Question:** Other than Special Education and School Resources, if we reduced by 5% everything else how many funds might be generated?

Answer: A further reduction of 5% will generate \$183,525 which creates an additional pressure on top of the 10% already adjusted in 2014-15 Budget Estimates and the additional 10% proposed in the recommended potential savings for the 2014-15 Revised Budget Estimates.

10.**Question:** What does the Director use of the \$100,000 (that I didn't know about) discretionary fund for? What will Director spend \$50,000 for?

Answer: The director's discretionary funds included in the 2014-15 Budget Estimates as School Projects are used for any unforeseen events and initiatives that may arise during the school year. For 2013-14, the expenditures amounted to \$33,411 and included the following:

Student Support for Conference - Notre Dame	\$1,000
Canadian Coalition of Self-Directed Learning (CCDL) Conference - Don Bosco	\$6,723
College of Alberta School Superintendents Association (CASSA) 21 st Century Learning Conference (Staff presented at workshops)	\$2,462
eSCRIBE Customization request	\$3,061
Math AQ Course Reimbursements	\$20,165
	\$33,411

The 2014-15 Budget Estimates provision for the Director's discretionary budget amounts to \$100,000 and expenditures of \$6,926 for the CCDL conference – Don Bosco have been incurred to date. The proposed savings includes a recommended reduction of 50% (\$50,000) to this provision.

11.**Question:** Who is paid expenses like dinner and lunch? I know that staff work unusually long hours but do we pick up the tab for others? What rate is paid?

Answer: The meal re-imbursement rates are regulated by TCDSB's Policy F.M.01 (Employees Expenses) have been fixed for approximately 4 years consistent with the Broader Public Sector Expense Directive. After Hours meal re-imbursement rates are capped at \$17.00 including taxes and gratuities. Reimbursement for meal costs incurred only occurs when working at minimum 3 hours beyond the normal working day to attend meetings and/or complete required duties.

12.Question: I assume all travel is gone. Correct?

Answer: All the travelling to attend professional development has been suspended for 2014-15 unless there is a contractual obligation and/or where cancellation will result in a penalty being paid.

13.Question: Trustees did not approve \$100,000 to Angel Foundation. Are all of these funds going into nutrition programs?

Answer: The Board approved a budget provision of \$40,000 in 2012-13 and increased this support to \$100,000 in the 2013-14 Budget Estimates. The budget provision of \$100,000 has been maintained in the 2014-15 Budget Estimates.

14.Question: Are we purchasing cars, trucks?

Answer: Yes, the Board recently purchased five new vans for the Maintenance department and disposed of eight (8) older vans. There is an operational cost savings as the older vehicles were more expensive to operate (not as fuel efficient) and required significant cost-prohibitive repairs. The operational savings have offset the cost of the new vehicles.

15.Question: What are the printing costs internally and externally?

Answer: The Printing Department provides on demand print services. It offers flexibility and quick turnaround options for both the classroom and administrative departments throughout the Board. The Department is suited for short run (10 – 1,000 copies), quick turn, and convenience copying functions and operates on a cost recovery charge basis. Costs remain the same for small or larger volumes and most incoming print requests are in the range of 50 - 500 page small run jobs (10 – 100 copies). Users are charged 3 cents per impression for black and white and 15 cents for color. This is an all-inclusive cost for finishing, binding, various paper stocks and delivery directly to the school or department. These charges are considerably less than external print shops

External print shops will charge a variety of prices depending on volume per job. The cost for small volume quantities start at 0.08 cents per page for black and white and 0.49 cents per page for color on simple photocopying (8.5 x 11) paper.

All costs for finishing (folding, stapling, and binding), premium papers, card stock, 11x17 etc. are extra and will vary depending on the customer requirements. For larger jobs in the 1,000+ page range the price does reduce to 0.06 cents per page for black and white and 0.25 cents per page for color, plus the additional costs of finishing and premium papers

Based on a general comparison with external commercial printing services, the typical pricing for additional finishing costs (based on a 1000 page job) are outlined as follows:

·	Folding	\$0.03 cents per page
·	Stapling	\$0.02 cents per page
·	3-hole punch	\$0.01 cents per page
·	Pastel paper	\$0.02 cents per page
·	Bright paper	\$0.03 cents per page
·	Laser paper	\$0.05 cents per page
·	Card Stock	\$0.25 cents per page
·	Cerlox Bind	\$2.50 per book
·	Coil Bind	\$3.50 per book

Trustee Michael Del Grande

1. **Question:** Why the opening Balance is showing \$5.440M when it should show \$ 2.255M?

Answer: The 2014-15 Budget Estimates were prepared in June 2014 when the opening accumulated surplus had a balance of \$5.440M based on the 2013-14 Revised Estimates. The Opening Accumulated Surplus balance of \$5.440M was adjusted due to a prior year period accounting adjustment. This adjustment amounted to \$2.957M for 2011-12 & 2012-13 and a year-end adjustment of \$0.228M reduced the Opening Accumulated Surplus balance to \$2.255M.

Trustee Nancy Crawford

1. Proposal:

I would like staff to look into the logistics of a **voluntary** staff and trustee donation of pay program to reduce the deficit. You may remember “Rae Days”- this program, if it is adopted, would not be mandatory, but voluntary. Staff and trustees could donate a day, a week, etc. to go towards reducing the deficit. I’m asking for the logistics because I imagine it would require some creativity to implement within our current systems.

- **Answer:** The proposal has some potential to generate savings and staff will bring forward as part of the effort to address the structural deficit in the multi-year deficit recovery plan.

Trustee Jo-Ann Davis

1. **Question:** What other line items, other than Occasional Teachers have we significantly over budgeted given actuals for the last 5 years (include the past actuals please)? If you could please provide estimates and actuals for the last 5 years using the summary budget views provided in the appendices for the staff report for December.

Answer: The summary of Estimates and Actual for the last 4 years can be viewed in Appendix E. The items where budget provisions exceed actual expenditures based on a 4 years average are as follows:

• Professional & Para-professional	\$1.433M
• Staff Development	\$0.191M
• In School Administration	\$1.312M
• Transportation	\$0.530M

2. **Question:** Ministry does not fund bussing for students to an alternate school location during construction - what other one-time costs does the Ministry not cover during construction / consolidation work?

Answer: There are other one-time costs such as moving costs, Information Technology, data drops, and higher GTA construction costs etc. that are not funded by the Ministry. Funding is provided based on construction benchmarks developed by the Ministry, and the Board is required to identify and locate other appropriate funding sources.

3. **Question:** On slide 18 of the 2013 - 2014 budget presentation, staff note "Secondary Student Supervisors: In 2002, Secondary School Supervisors were hired to do supervision duties as teachers were required to teach 6.67 credits. The Ministry returned to 6 credits in 2008, but these Supervisor positions have been retained. In 2012 - 13 this was an unfunded cost of \$2.3M." Are these required positions? What is the risk / impact of removal?

Answer: Secondary Student Supervisors contribute towards maintaining a safe school environment with 80 FTE at a cost of \$2.3M. There is no corresponding funding under the safe schools grant or any other Ministry grant.

Secondary Teachers could resume the supervision duties that they used to do prior to 2002: (a) on call and supervision duties are still contained within the TSU agreement under article 6. "Teacher workload". (b) in semester schools, teachers may be assigned on call and supervision duties in a scheduled half period not to exceed 165 minutes per month, or 2 assignments per week. The equivalent thereof, shall apply in schools with different models of organization.

4. **Question:** In the June 2014 Board budget report on page 12, central temporary and summer student staffing is noted as \$200,000 (although in the appendix the estimate shows it at \$100K. What is the impact of bringing this to \$0?

Answer: The central temporary and summer student staffing has been reduced from \$200,000 to \$170,000 in the 2014-15 Budget Estimates. The central temporary staffing has already been used and/or committed, and there is only \$17,181 remaining for 2014-15 fiscal year. The summer student budget provision is not committed or spent yet as this is earmarked for the summer of 2015 and can be reduced by 100% as recommended in the potential savings section in the report. The risk is TCDSB will have a reduction in its capacity to provide summer

coverage for staff on vacation.

5. **Question:** In the same report in the Appendix: we have taken \$125,000 from the board approved Ombudsman budget and placed it in an 'Internal Auditor' position. What is the expected scope for the Internal Auditor - what work has been done to fill this position? What has been done to move forward on an Ombudsman position? Given the Bill currently before the legislature which would include school boards under the provincial Ombudsman - and therefore our process / policy issues will be reported on publicly in the legislature - moving ahead on having even a part-time Ombudsman position is critical to reduce the risk to our Board. As you know, the provincial Ombudsman is happy to talk with trustees and senior staff as he has done with universities etc. who will continue to have a local Ombudsman.

Answer: In the 2014-15 Budget Estimates, there is a Budget provision of \$150,000 earmarked for an Ombudsman and there is currently no provision for an Internal Auditor position. The Internal Auditor position is no longer required due to the roles and responsibilities of the Regional Internal Auditor Team (RIAT).

6. **Question:** In the same table, we note \$1.3M for 'overtime - permits cleaning'. Is this cost covered by our charge for the permits?

Answer: Permit charges do not cover all costs. Other Education Payments Other (EPO) funding is received to cover some of the permit costs, and Permit rates are currently under review.

**Toronto Catholic District School Board
5 Years Expense Comparison**

Appendix E

	2010/11 Revised Estimates	Variance	2010/11 Actuals	2011/12 Revised Estimates	Variance	2011/12 Actuals	2012/13 Revised Estimates
<u>Classroom Instruction</u>							
Professional & Para-professionals	46,113	876	45,237	45,835	(472)	46,307	48,435
Staff Development	3,017	473	2,544	3,067	(1,561)	4,628	3,067
In School Administration	64,004	1,948	62,056	65,308	68	65,240	65,194
Transportation	25,267	(47)	25,314	27,069	60	27,009	28,996

**Toronto Catholic District School Board
5 Years Expense Comparison**

Appendix E

	Variance	2012/13 Actuals	2013/14 Revised Estimates	Variance	2013/14 Actuals	2014/15 Revised Estimates	4 Year Average
							(excl. 2014-15)
<u>Classroom Instruction</u>							
Professional & Para-professionals	2,533	45,902	49,572	2,796	46,776	51,191	1,433
Staff Development	1,340	1,727	3,067	513	2,554	2,968	191
In School Administration	1,349	63,845	66,329	1,882	64,447	67,302	1,312
Transportation	465	28,531	28,118	1,643	26,475	28,174	530

2015-16 Application for Registration Process Timeline

Date(s)	Description of Item	All Schools (not deemed oversubscribed)	Oversubscribed Schools	
November-December 2014	School notifies parents of upcoming registration period and does a pre-enrolment survey to identify whether any current students have siblings who will be attending the school in the new academic year			
Early December 2014	School Newsletter regarding upcoming registration period	Distributed to communities and/or posted on school websites	Distributed to communities and/or posted on school websites	
Mid December	Registration Website updated and opened for viewing Registration directions and forms available for downloading	All schools websites link to registration ribbon on TCDSB site	All schools websites link to registration ribbon on TCDSB site	
January 8 th , 2015	Registration begins at 10:00 am Eastern Standard Time	Parents apply online or in-person at the school and are provided with a Date/Time Stamp	(Online) Parents apply on SOAR (electronic platform)	(In Person) Parents line up at the school and are given a time stamp label of one second increments at 10:00 am EST. After first line-up, time is recorded as parents submit applications
January 9 to January 30, 2015	Meetings take place with applicants	Schools verify the application for registration and documentation	Schools verify the application for registration and documentation	
January 30, 2015	Registration Documents Due		Last Day to accept delayed documents for registration purposes	
January 9 to 30, 2015	Parents are informed whether their child is admitted	School admits children on a Date/Time priority, provided all documentation is submitted.		

Date(s)	Description of Item	All Schools (not deemed oversubscribed)	Oversubscribed Schools
Week of February 2, 2015	Parents are informed their child is admitted		School admits students based on Date/Time stamp according to the 2014 Admission Policy. Priority Waitlists are created and maintained until September 30, 2015 by Date/Time stamp.
As of February 2 nd , 2015	Schools may begin to redirect students to other TCDSB schools		After having confirmed registration with successful applicants, the school begins the process of informing unsuccessful applicants of alternate schools to which candidates may be redirected.
April 30, 2015	Oversubscribed Schools with space in the program begin to accept students off the Priority Waitlists		After April 30, 2015 when an oversubscribed school has openings in a program at any grade, the school may begin to accept applications off the priority Waitlists.
From February 2 until September 30, 2015	Registration continues on the online application (SOAR)	School continues to receive applications and place students.	School continues to receive applications. Placement only occurs if additional space becomes available after April 30, 2015.
January 8, 2015 & throughout the school year	Provision for saving two spots for Kindergarten students in schools with Special Education Intensive Support classes for students identified through IPRC (Special Services)		
September 30, 2015	Last day for maintaining Priority Lists for the 2015-16 year	Should space become available in a school prior to the end of the 2015-16 school year, the school may consult the priority waitlists to offer admission to the next student(s) on the list.	

STATUS OF SIBLING RULE DURING REVIEW OF ADMISSIONS AND PLACEMENT POLICY

Date	Meeting	Report Title	Status of Sibling Rule
Pre 2014	N/A	N/A	No formal sibling rule in place. Practice has been for schools to try to accommodate siblings
January 30, 2014	Regular Board	Review of Admissions Policy (SA.01) & Placement Policy (SA.02)	<p>One of the key principles recommended by staff on which to base a revised policy is the implementation of a defined sibling rule for the elementary panel: space permitting, priority shall be 1) siblings in or out-of-boundary; 2) students in-boundary; 3) students out-of-boundary.</p> <p>This sibling rule as a key principle was approved by the Board for consultation.</p>
February 27, 2014	Regular Board	same as above	No change to sibling rule approved for consultation.
March 27, 2014	Regular Board	Communications & Community Engagement Plan for Admissions Policy (SA.01) & Placement Policy (SA.02)	Board approves community engagement plan for Admissions and Placement Policies. No change to sibling rule approved for consultation.
May 22, 2014	Regular Board	Review of Admissions Policy (SA.01) & Placement Policy (SA.02)	Report provides Trustees with the results and themes which emerged from the community engagement process. Majority were of the opinion that out-of-boundary siblings should not have the same priority as in-boundary students. Based on consultation, staff recommended that the sibling rule be revised to reflect the following priority, subject to availability of space:

			1) students & siblings in-boundary; 2) siblings out-of-boundary; 3) students out-of-boundary. Trustees deferred the Policy for further review and an update in the fall.
September 25, 2014	Regular Board	same as above	Staff recommends same sibling rule as stated above, (May 22, 2014). No decision by Trustees.
October 16, 2014	Corporate Affairs	same as above	Staff recommends the same sibling rule as stated above (May 22nd, 2014). Trustees approve that in-boundary students and siblings, as well as out-of-boundary siblings shall have highest priority, (unless older sibling is in specialty program). Further verification and clarification of language and accuracy is requested by Trustees.
October 23, 2014	Regular Board	Elementary Admission Policy (SA.01) Update	Staff recommendation reflects revised priority for the sibling rule as approved by Trustees above: in-boundary students and siblings as well as out-of-boundary siblings shall have the highest priority, (unless older sibling is in specialty program).

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing this letter from the position of a devoted parent and supporter of the TCDSB. My education began at St. Michael's School in the St. Lawrence neighbourhood. (where my mother worked until 2013 as a special education teaching assistant) It was the foundation of a life of Catholic education and the cornerstone of a life path which has brought my wife Larissa and I the fortune of being parents. Our Son Charles Suda is a student at OLPH and we are delighted by the way his daily experience at the school nurtures a positive learning experience and helps to shape his identity as a young Catholic. We can't say enough about how important the TCDSB is in the community and over the years it is clear that many families have recognized the quality of the education putting extra strain on the system. We (the Sudas) like many others truly value the importance of having schooling for our Children that supports family values and serves to provide the utmost in faith based scholastic excellence.

It is on this note that I would like to point to a concern which has arisen as a result of the revisions to admissions policies specifically regarding sibling priority. Given the importance of family values I was surprised to read in the Review of Admission Policy (S.A. 01) and Placement Policy (S.A. 02) that only a minority of parents commented on the need to keep the family unit intact. In our conversations with parents at OLPH there was unanimous concern that this policy would break up families. OLPH is very tight knit school with an excellent rating in scholastics. The socio-economic realities of our community have made the school a desirable option for elementary education. Unfortunately the Board's decision regarding policy won't change the fact that the school will continue to see high applicant to seat ratios and resources will always be at a premium. There will always be a need to displace students out of highly concentrated catchments to those with capacity.

Section D. on Page 4 of the Review of Admission Policy (S.A. 01) and Placement Policy (S.A. 02) states "that every participant had the opportunity to comment and review all of the regulations". Given the amount of backlash we have personally witnessed, I can't imagine this to be as accurate a statement as the authors may have thought when they completed the process. The stark reality is that there is no perfect solution to the problem however it does appear there needs to be a great deal more dialogue, community engagement and thought invested before these policies are set in stone. In the interim We respectfully implore the Board to consider re-instating priority to siblings in order to allow families already in the school pipeline to remain intact. The logistics of having two kids attending different schools are onerous and in some cases impossible. Families with children who do not have siblings will have the option of keeping their kids together at another school. Perhaps in future it should be made clear to new applicants that there will be no sibling priority and thus parents can make their decisions with that knowledge.

Lastly, I would like to point to one of the stated TCDSB Multi-Year Goals that 'Parents will be supported in their integral role of nurturing the relationship between home, school and parish' and take this opportunity to offer a personal example of how the change in policy can drastically affect children and their parents. My wife Larissa lives with Multiple Sclerosis and together with many people who suffer from debilitating illness, she struggles with mobility. The added burden of stress or fatigue resulting from this policy change generally and practically for

the years going forward; could have a significant impact on the severity of Larissa's condition and therefore on our family. I would imagine there are many other examples of people with extenuating circumstances. There are many considerations in making changes to policy when it comes to allocation of school resources in our community and we believe strongly that taking priority away from siblings in our schools will undermine the ability *'to work together as a community of believers committed to putting the values of our faith into practice in the daily life of the school, the home, and in all of society.'* From tcdsb mission statement.

Respectfully Yours,
David Suda and Larissa Williamson

January 5, 2015

Toronto Catholic District School Board
80 Sheppard Ave East
Toronto, Ontario
M2N 6E8

Dear Members of the Board,

The very recent and unexpected change in policy instituted by the TCDSB relating to sibling priority for registration came as a huge shock to myself and to my family. I am a proud member of the OLPH community, both the church and the school, and reside only a few steps from the school. My husband and I were delighted to have a Catholic school within our community and are proud to raise our children with strong christian beliefs.

My eldest daughter happily attends OLPH School and has forged strong ties within the school. Through our active participation in school activities, fundraisers and events, we, as a family, have made OLPH an important part of our lives and it has, in a sense, become a part of our extended family. It has always been my understanding that my younger daughter would also join OLPH and had I known that my daughters might not be able to attend the same school, I certainly would not have selected this institution in the first place.

The 'family unit' is an important part of Catholic life and this new policy change is threatening our ability to keep our family together. I am saddened and disappointed that this change was even considered, much less applied. While I understand that certain residents in neighbourhoods with oversubscribed schools may be frustrated by the lack of available space at their school, I certainly do not think that separating a family that already attends a school to make space is a valid or viable solution to that problem. I myself was blessed to have my eldest daughter join OLPH since there was room when we applied, however I should not have to be penalized for the current lack of space and have my family separated as a result.

I cannot see how any family would ever consider joining an elementary school which would not make all available efforts to ensure that future siblings will be able to join that same school. This policy does not promote a family-friendly school environment and it is hard to believe that the Catholic School Board would adopt such a policy.

I sincerely hope that you consider the negative impact of this policy change and how it is threatening the family unit. It is a destructive way to fix a problem and will create a lack of family togetherness for families who join schools in the TCDSB and/or discourage new families from joining.

Your attention and consideration regarding this matter are very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
Margaret Margossian

Hi Lalita,

I am submitting a written delegation regarding the reconsideration of the admission policy that is on the public agenda for January 6. If you require any additional information or if it is necessary for me to complete an additional form, please let me know right away.

Thank you for allowing us time to respond to your proposed changes.

When we moved to Toronto in 2007, we selected where to live based on several criteria. Key among the criteria was a community and faith based school with academic excellence. This was OLPH. So we purchased our home on Garfield Ave, so that our daughter Kate and future children would be able to walk to school and be part of the community we lived in. We never regretted our choice and our daughter has flourished in her learning and her faith at OLPH.

Since moving into the OLPH community we have been blessed with a second daughter, Brooke. And we looked forward to her continuing along with Kate at OLPH to achieve the same learning and faith experience and for them to be together as they bond as sisters. We had always been told that siblings were prioritized for entry and so felt we would always be safe with OLPH.

We were extremely disheartened to hear that the policy was going to be changed now and that it could impact Brooke and Kate going to OLPH together. We really think that one needs to consider the impact on siblings to split them up during their early school years and the impact this would have on their faith.

Should Brooke not be accepted into OLPH we would be faced with sending her to the other community based school, which is not part of the separate school board, so we would have to make a trade off of our faith for community.

We are also concerned of the impact it would have on splitting our children up and having to take them to two separate schools that would be on two separate curriculums. We would be forced to trade off events and activities between multiple schools and even our charitable giving. There is also a great legacy of common teachers and common school experiences that we think is important for siblings to be able to share over their life's journey and this will be pulled apart if we have to split up our children.

We really believe there is an important sibling development aspect to having our children at the same school and we are hoping you will reconsider your decision. We had based our decisions to go to OLPH on the old policy and it doesn't seem fair that it was changed and implemented so suddenly. We hope you will reconsider.

Sincerely,

Christine & Robert Paterson
10 Garfield Ave
416-418-5533

Peter and Claire Gordon
48 Moore Avenue
Toronto, Ontario
M4T 1V3

Board of Trustees
Toronto Catholic District School Board
80 Sheppard Avenue East
Toronto, Ont.
M2N 6E8

Re: Consideration of Sibling Admission Policy--Quinne Gordon , OLPH

Thank you for taking the time to reconsider the admission policy for in-district siblings at Our Lady of Perpetual Help School. We, the Gordon family are active members of the Moore Park and OLPH community. We have three daughters, all of whom we had planned to attend the school. Our daughter Quinne Gordon, was set to join her big sister Reese in September 2015. We have a family history with OLPH. In addition to my parents marrying at OLPH church, my mother was a teacher with the Board for over 20 years and actually taught at the school. Our family has been thrilled to continue the tradition and be active participants at Our Lady of Perpetual Help School.

On many occasions over the years, we have been told by the leadership of the school and Board that all of our children would be able to remain together. This is a primary reason why we invested in OLPH. We put faith in the family values of the school and the Catholic church and trusted that the importance of family cohesion would be honoured. It is heartbreaking for us to think of how we would tell our daughter Quinne that she is not able to attend the school that she has visited daily as she picks up her big sister Reese.

Similar to many families with multiple children at the same school, my husband PJ and I are highly committed and have made personal investments in this school. We believe that families that have more than one child in a school do make a

larger commitment to the school which only enhances the school, the Board and the church. We have committed our volunteer time, personal finances (both through donations and tax dollars) to the Catholic Board for some time. It is disappointing to realize that our investment in the school is of no relevance. It seems as though no consideration has been made for the logistical and personal stress that will be placed on loyal families as their children are forced to attend different schools. We have little girls that need to be dropped off by a parent, how can we as parents be in more than one location at a time? Finally, we also question the financial benefits of dividing up our children as this will force our personal and financial commitments to be limited. It is disappointing to us that we wouldn't be able to contribute to the school in the manner that would like.

We would ask that the trustees representing the wellbeing of the children and the values of the Catholic Church take the time to consider the impact of separating children and dividing families that have been loyal to their Board and community.

Kind Regards,

Peter J. Gordon and Claire Gordon

Please note: Communication item 9.f has been removed from the online version of this agenda package at the request of its author. To access a copy of this communication, please contact the Toronto Catholic District School Board - Archives and Records Management Department.

Dear TCDSB Leadership,

Introduction

We have two children at OLP in grade 1 and SK and two younger children ages 4 and 2 that we hope to send to OLP in September 2015 and September 2017. Our two children currently at the school have had an amazing experience largely due to the terrific staff and the sense of community and family that the school has. Given their closeness in age our children share many of the same friends and experiences together. We have witnessed firsthand how the older sibling eased the transition to school for his sister. We also see clear benefits from the two visiting each other during the school day and helping each other if there are issues during the day. The sibling relationship has strengthened as has their sense of family. Our younger daughter has been along for drop off and pickups at the school over the past three years (my wife walks with all four children to the school each day) and our 4 year old has been talking about her chance to attend school with her older siblings next year. I think the emotional cost will be devastating and unsettling for her if she were to be sent to another school next year. Not only would she not get the positive benefits of having her siblings around but she would also have to try to make sense of why she has been separated from her brother and sister. Difficult for me to fully comprehend at 36 years of age let alone for a 4 year old. We would definitely need to weigh the emotional cost of sending her to public school on her own versus the disruption caused to our older two by moving them to public school as well to keep the family together in the neighbourhood.

Family Values

It is important to my wife and I to raise our children in the Catholic faith. A key factor this decision is the importance the church places on family in a day and age where the notion of family is being attacked from all angles. Pope Francis recently said "Not only would I say that the family is important for the evangelization of the new world. **The family is important, and it is necessary for the survival of humanity.** Without the family, the cultural survival of the human race would be at risk. **The family, whether we like it or not, is the foundation.**" (emphasis added) I feel the decision to not place in-catchment siblings in a priority category above other in-catchment students is a decision against stronger communities and against families.

Sibling Preference in Other Large Urban Centers

The reasons noted are personal reasons. I wanted to see how this was handled in other school boards, so I have looked into best practices across North America in terms of the priority given to siblings in applying for schools. I looked into 5 large urban centers where I felt that there would be similar supply and demand issues for education. I note that all of these centers, Boston, New York, Chicago, Vancouver and San Francisco, all provide sibling preference for school opportunity (especially for in-catchment students). Given time, I only looked at 5 centers and the results were consistent. In reviewing the various reports and decision by these school boards around sibling preference the following factors were key in the decisions:

- Importance of family
- Building a strong community
- Logistics for parents of having children at different schools

The following three examples are informative precedents in considering sibling preference. In two of these examples the trustees overturned their original decision to remove sibling preference after feedback from parents. None of these school boards attempted to touch sibling preference for in-catchment siblings as school boards and articles on the matter refer to that as an “untouchable policy” given feedback from parents.

Key Examples of Sibling Preference in Other Centers

- **2012 New York the New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE) decision on sibling preference for the Gifted and Talented Programs (GT)**
 - In 2012 the NYC DOE originally decided to remove sibling preference for admittance to GT programs
 - The GT program requires incoming kindergarten students to write a test for admittance and there is significantly more demand than there is space for this program
 - The admission policy prior to 2012 had the highest scoring students admitted with the exception of those students who had siblings in the program – as long as they reached a minimum preset standard the sibling would be admitted even if they did not meet the non-sibling cutoff
 - In 2012 the DOE removed the sibling priority but them quickly reversed its decision based on feedback from schools and families and reinstate the sibling priority
 - Please see the following news story on the matter: [DOE Reverses Itself on Sibling GT Policy](#)
 - You will note the following quote in the article from Joyce Szuflita an educational consultant with NYC School Help
 - **"The city gives sibling preference everywhere else. I feel for the families whose kids are scoring high but I don't know how a family can get two different kids to schools in two different boroughs at the same time."** (emphasis added)
 - The decision to continue the sibling preference was upheld in 2013 by the Manhattan Supreme Court: <http://nypost.com/2013/08/07/ok-for-siblings-of-gifted-and-talented-students-to-get-doe-boost-judge/>
 - You will note the article quotes Manhattan Supreme Court Justice Alice Schlesinger saying the following: “there’s a “rational basis” for the policy because it’s intended **to make it easier on families by not forcing their kids to attend different schools.**” (emphasis added)
- **2004 Boston Public Schools (BPS) Review of Assignment Process**
 - Please see the 2004 Boston Public School Task Force Report - [BPS Task Force Report](#)
 - In the report they conclude on sibling preference - **Sibling preference: A student assignment plan should include preference for assignment to the same school for siblings.** (page 8 of Report)
 - Further on Page 14: Sibling preference is important to all families in Boston and must be maintained. **Once the siblings are assigned,** we recommend the following procedure for assigning students from the walk-zone. (emphasis added)
 - The full Algorithm of priorities is listed on page 15 and is as follows:
 - 1) Sibling walkers
 - 2) Siblings
 - 3) Children who live within the walk-zone set at 50%

- 4) Children who live within the buffer zone
- 5) The rest of the children who live within the primary zone
- 6) Children from the secondary zone
- **2012 BPS Revisiting of Sibling Preference**
 - In September 2012 the BPS tried to tighten sibling preference for out of catchment siblings – see attached article from Boston Magazine [Boston Public Schools Changed Rules](#)
 - This change was eventually over turned in December 2012 after review by the Mayor’s External Advisory Committee on School Choice (EAC) – please see the following press release from Boston Mayor Menino’s office [Mayor Menino's Press Release on Sibling Preference](#)
 - Commenting on the EAC’s decision Mayor Menino said “The intention with a new student assignment plan is to offer families quality schools, closer to home, building stronger communities. **Thursday's EAC recommendation will allow families to keep their children at schools where they have connected and invested as we transition towards a new school choice model.**”
 - It is important to note here that the BPS never attempted to lower the priority for in-catchment siblings who remain the highest priority above that of other in-catchment students

Human Rights Arguments

It is important to note that the Supreme Court of Manhattan Decision touched on the human rights argument for not having sibling preferences and found that sibling preferences in no way encroached on the human rights of the individuals. While the NYC DOE case was clearly in a different jurisdiction, I have had a preliminary consultation with [The Human Rights Legal Support Centre](#) in Ontario (click link for further details on HRLSC) and they have indicated providing preference to siblings is not against any of the grounds protected by the Code ([for information on the grounds click here](#)). They stated they did not believe there was any human rights violation in providing preference to siblings.

Summary

I unfortunately need to travel for business this week and will not be able to attend the meeting in person. I request that you reconsider your decision and place siblings in-catchment in the highest priority ahead of other in-catchment students. This type of preference is supported by other large school boards in urban areas across North America. In-catchment sibling priority is fundamental guiding principal for assignment one that BPS indicated “must be maintained”. It is important, especially in the Catholic School system, given the importance members of the community place on family when the family unit is being attacked from every angle. The logistics of dropping siblings at different schools creates unnecessary complications and this practical logistics argument has been a key factor in many school board decisions on sibling preferences and was cited by Justice Alice Schlesinger in the NYC DOE decision.

Thank you for taking the time to reconsider this matter. Please vote to keep families together.

Regards,

John Medland, CFA

Partner

Blair Franklin Capital Partners Inc.

T. 416.304.3988

jmedland@blairfranklin.com

www.blairfranklin.com

January 6, 2015

Dear Members of the Board,

Your new policy regarding sibling priority is disturbing and very concerning to me as both a parent and a catholic parishioner.

The catholic religion has a very strong belief in honouring the family unit. I am a proud Catholic and believe that family togetherness is key in fostering love and unity, especially among children. Since our children spend most of their young lives at school, either in the classroom or on the playground during recess and lunch, it is my belief that separating siblings by placing them in different schools goes entirely against these important values.

I have cherished memories of playing and learning at school, with my older brother at my side lending me a helping hand whenever I would call on him, whether to resolve a playground conflict or by including me in lunchtime soccer matches. I have two daughters and my wish is for them to have these same experiences. My daughters are extremely close and help each other and support one another as my wife and I have taught them to do, and this goes hand in hand with their religious formation.

However, this policy change may well lead to my daughters being separated from one another and going on their separate paths, and at such a tender age. This is an extremely sad outcome and may result in my eldest daughter leaving her current school to attend the same school as her sister. And unfortunately, the local school that they will have to attend, is non-catholic.

I understand that all families in a neighbourhood deserve the chance to send their children to their nearest catholic school, but dividing families who already attend those schools is not the solution to alleviate this problem. It is difficult to understand how new families will sign on to the idea that their children may not be guaranteed to be together.

I pray that the TCDSB recognizes the importance of family, above and beyond all else, and reverses this policy which goes against the idea of family togetherness as promoted by the catholic religion.

Sincerely yours,
Edward Rizk

Good afternoon Ms. Fernandes,

I am a parent at Our Lady of Perpetual Help School. My husband and I are unable to attend the meeting tomorrow night as we are both travelling for work, but would like to voice our concerns about this proposed admissions policy that puts in-district siblings of children currently enrolled at an elementary school in the same position as other in-district children without siblings in the school and siblings of out-of-district children attending the school.

We have 2 older children currently enrolled at OLPH in grades 1 and 3. We also have a 2011 child who we plan to register for JK in 2015/2016. Our school is oversubscribed and if this policy goes into effect, there is a good chance that our youngest daughter who is a baptized Catholic and lives in the OLPH school district will not get into the same Catholic school as her 2 older siblings. This would result in an untenable situation where my husband and I would need to drop and pick up our children at different locations. We both work outside the home and this is not an option for us. If our youngest does not get into the school, we will need to pull all 3 children out of OLPH and find a school option where they can all attend together. This will likely be the public school in our district as it is close to our home.

We have just learned of this policy. We would have vehemently opposed had we known about this earlier. This policy creates undue hardship for our family. We appreciate that the Board is trying to create fairness and transparency, but breaking apart Catholic families, especially when the children are in district seems quite unfair to us. We can understand a situation where in-district children are prioritized over out of district siblings, on the theory that out-of-district families would have assumed the risk that enrollment may vary from year to year and there may not be space when it is time for their younger children to enroll. However, for families like ours who live in district and have other children already attending the school, this proposal feels patently unfair.

We have invested a lot of time, effort and resources into OLPH school and our children have set down deep roots with the school and church community. We sincerely hope you will reconsider.

Kind regards,
Maneli Badii and Mark Adams



Maneli Badii | Bio
Director, Professional Development

155 Wellington Street West
Toronto, ON M5V 3J7

T 416.367.6985
MBadii@dwpv.com

DAVIES WARD PHILLIPS & VINEBERG LLP

To the Trustees at TCDSB

Unfortunately, my husband and I are unable to attend the Board Meeting scheduled for January 7th. We are the parents to two current students at Our Lady of Perpetual Help School and a third potential student in FDK in September 2015. We are writing to appeal to the Board that they reconsider the current policy that gives equal status to siblings of current students and in boundary students with no siblings. This policy has the potential to separate siblings in schools where there are limited spaces. We feel it is in accordance with Catholic values and principles, to keep families together. Therefore, we object to the current change in policy, and request that it be reconsidered to give siblings of current students first priority and in boundary applicants with no siblings at the school, second priority. Thank you for your time and your consideration regarding this very important matter.

Sincerely,

Neil and Arlene FitzGerald

Good afternoon,

The principal at Our Lady of Perpetual Help Catholic school brought to my attention just prior to the holidays and approximately 3 weeks before kindergarden registration that siblings of children already attending the school (and are in district) will not get priority over students applying who do not have siblings attending already. I'm writing to contribute my voice to the many parents in our community who are very upset that their younger children will potentially not be attending school with their older siblings. Our family lives right next to the school and McGrath's have been attending OLPH for generations - it would be such a shame if, despite the money and time we have contributed to the school and the community, our youngest of 3 son's could not attend the school. I have no idea where we would put him either as this was our plan since he was born and we have had so little warning to prepare to potentially send him somewhere else.

I was reading the draft policy package that was put together and (please correct me if I'm reading this wrong) it clearly states that in order to adopt the new admissions policies there will be ample warning and communications sent out to families so that they can prepare. It acknowledges that the first few years will be difficult as the school community implements the new policies:

G. IMPLEMENTATION, STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN

1. The greater majority of individuals involved in the consultation felt that the goals of the identified policies were worth pursuing and were in support of the policies as presented. Many acknowledged that the first year or two of implementation might be more challenging than subsequent years and advocated strongly for proactive communication.
2. The communications plan must be comprehensive and pervasive, particularly during the first few years after adoption and would have to encompass the following elements:
 - a. Letter home to every parent in the system
 - b. Newsletter inserts
 - c. Website updates
 - d. Admission Policy Pamphlet for distribution in June report cards and August mailing.

I know that "the Board recognizes the importance of the family unit and will undertake its best efforts, within the context of this Policy, to place siblings at the same school" (<http://www.tcdsb.org/Board/Policies/Documents/Elementary%20Admission%20and%20Placement%20Policy%20-%20FINAL.pdf>). So please reconsider the decision to take away sibling priority!! I will do my best to attend the meeting tomorrow evening to show support for keeping the original policy - with my kids if I have to!

Thank you for your time and reconsideration of this important matter.
Kind regards,
Jaime McGrath

To: Trustees, Toronto Catholic District School Board
From: Vinay Mehta and Halla Elias
Date: January 5, 2015

Re: Reconsideration of Admissions Policy

The TCDSB is supposed to be committed to families.

The decision to change a long standing policy of priority registration for siblings significantly changes the TCDSB's commitment to families and in particular the cohesion of the family unit.

Having our three children in potentially two or three different Catholic schools is not practical. Beyond the basic practical considerations such as geographic separation between multiple schools, your decision also impacts our relationship with the local parish because then our children are associated with multiple parishes through their respective schools thereby diminishing a familial parish. Also, with both parents working, there will be difficulty with pick-up and drop-off at different locations as well as spending time with each child at school functions.

Another consideration is the safety and support of our children. Anxiety of a child and parents will be lessened knowing that there is an elder sibling to keep an eye out for the younger sibling.

Your changes to the sibling policy will only drive families away from the TCDSB to other educational institutions whether public or private so that families can remain as one unit.

We sincerely appreciate your reconsideration of this issue and hope that you will reinstate priority registration for siblings.

Best regards,

Vinay Mehta and Halla Elias

To: The Board of Trustees, Toronto Catholic District School Board

RE: Opposition To Admission & Placement of Elementary Pupils Policy ("Policy")

1. Policy Will Have Negative Long-Term Impact On The OLPH & Catholic Community

- Rather than deal with the exclusion of one child from OLPH, many families in the catchment area will choose to educate their children in a non-Catholic system. We know of 15-20 families who were turned away from OLPH last year and **not one family** has stayed within the Catholic board.
- Minimizing disruption to a young child's education & development is a priority for families. Once the children begins a non-Catholic program, it is less likely that they will return to the Catholic board or OLPH, even if spots become available in later grades
- We currently have a daughter currently in JK at OLPH who has a younger sister that is eligible for JK next year. Our children's parents, grandparents, aunts and uncles attended OLPH and received the sacraments at the parish. As long-time members of the school, church and Moore Park communities, we have a vested interest in maintaining the sense of faith, family and education that make OLPH special.

2. Policy Discriminates Against Younger Siblings Of OLPH-Enrolled Students Of In-Boundary Families

- The Policy will deny younger siblings of current students from receiving the same Catholic education in the same community afforded to the elder sibling
- Many families, including our own, purchased a home in the OLPH catchment area in part to ensure that their child would receive a Catholic education at OLPH as part of OLPH community
- Apart from logistical challenges that the policy will pose to families as they transport children between schools, younger siblings will be forced to attend a school away from their community, siblings and friends

3. Policy Is Inconsistent With OLPH Parish Values

- The OLPH community values faith, family and education. This is clearly evidenced by the fact that the families of OLPH students are also active members of the OLPH parish, where they celebrate baptism, communion, confirmation, weddings & funerals
- Forcing the younger sibling of an existing student to attend a Catholic school in a different neighborhood is disruptive to these values and the sense of community that is important to OLPH

4. Poor Timing & Execution – Advance Dialogue With Families Regarding The Policy Was Appropriate

- The fact that so many families made submissions and attended this meeting on a short time frame indicates how strongly we feel about the Policy and its impact on our families
- While the Policy was approved October 23, 2014, families were only made aware of the Policy beginning mid-December, prior the holidays (our family became aware of the policy on December 15)
- Applications for JK enrolment are this Thursday, January 8, and yet the only opportunity to voice our concerns regarding the Policy is tonight, January 6
- The ‘last minute’ communication of the Policy by the Board inhibits appropriate debate, consideration and dialogue between with OLPH stakeholders. Earlier communication and discussion of the Policy would have fostered goodwill & co-operation, and potentially a more viable solution.

Dear Members of the Board,

I would like to the admission police for siblings to be reconsidered. As Catholics we all believe that an united family is the cornerstone of a healthy community. This new policy means that siblings may end up in different schools which will take a significant toll on the families, not only from the logistics perspective but most important It will weakens the partnership between schools and families.

This policy does not reflect the importance of keeping family together.

Regards,

Marchetti family

Dear Jo-Ann and TCDSB Board,

Re: Reconsideration of the Admissions Policy

First I would like to thank the board for reconsidering the admissions policy for the TCDSB.

I currently have 2 children enrolled in OLPH, and a third that will be on his way in another year. When I heard of the news that the admissions policy had changed, I immediately panicked at the thought that my third child may not get into the school his siblings go to.

This year my second child was admitted into OLPH as a JK student, and she was so proud to be going to the same school as her big sister who is in first grade. But when it came around to actually starting, she was terrified. Still, after a few months she is upset when I drop her off. But the one thing that made me feel better as a parent, my first grade daughter said "Mom, you don't need to worry about Hannah, she is okay. Mrs. Redmond lets me check on her every day." I think about how that made me feel as a parent, knowing that even though my daughter was having a rough time adjusting, she had her sister there to comfort her and make her feel better.

I sincerely hope that the admissions policy will change to reflect siblings as a priority. I would never want to break apart my family. Family is our strongest support system, and I felt so proud of my daughter that she realized that too. The family unit should be priority above all.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

Sincerely,

Chris Henstock and Carrie Gamache
OLPH Parents

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission to the TCDSB regarding the change in admission policy which denies students a priority right to attend a TCDSB school where they have siblings currently attending. I am writing, on behalf of my family, to strongly urge you to reconsider your ill-advised decision and place siblings in-catchment in the highest priority ahead of other in-catchment students. For the reasons stated below, our family strongly believe that this is in the best interests of Toronto's community of Catholic students and for the TCDSB in general.

We have a family of three girls, with two currently attending OLPH and our third planning to attend next year for junior kindergarten. The idea that our youngest daughter may not attend the same school as her big sisters is shocking and distressing to both my wife and I and to each of our three daughters. How could we possibly explain this to any of our children while also advocating how important family values are to the Catholic faith? The decision is nothing short of a stunning rejection of the core principles of Catholicism and a sad reflection of the board's willingness to (in part) appease the demands of non-Catholic parents wishing to shop for the best school regardless of their religious beliefs. It must be reversed.

I would like the opportunity to explain our particular situation to you, not in an effort obtain any special accommodations but rather to possibly highlight some (but not all) of the injustices and inequities created by the decision - a decision which we firmly believe is diametrically opposed to the importance which the Catholic faith places in family values, family cohesiveness and strong communities and neighborhoods.

We currently live directly next to OLPH where we (literally) share a fence with the school. We have long found it to be a happy relationship where we gladly allow the staff and parents to use our garden equipment for spring clean or to put their leaves out at the end of our driveway in the fall. We put up with parents clogging our street at drop-off and pick-up without a fuss and even countenance the odd harried parent who blocks our driveway to run a student into class. We contribute to silent auctions, to fund-raising efforts and neighbourhood clean-ups. Frankly, we do whatever the school asks of us. We do this because being a supportive parent and a good neighbour is what good Catholics do.

For some time now, we have found it curious at best and completely illogical at worst, that our Catholic children have no right to attend the school that we are situated directly right next to; but we also understand the logistical impediments of ranking priority according to actual proximity. However, the results of an admission policy that ignores relative in-catchment proximity AND sibling affiliation creates absurd results for those that believe that schools are an important part of their local community or that family involvement in a school is important. We are now faced with a situation where, two girls are at the Catholic school directly next to us and our third is attending the non-Catholic at the far end of our neighbourhood. Because of our strong belief that children should be raised in their home community, we have no intention of sending our youngest on a bus to another Catholic School while the other two skip across the yard to OLPH. We bought the home that we live in on the assumption that our children would attend school together in our own neighbourhood. In fact, rather than having two kids at a Catholic school in our neighbourhood and one at another school that she buses to, we would pull all three from the Catholic system altogether and send them to the same non-Catholic school. We would do this for the following reasons:

1. Siblings work together at school, they guide each other, help each other, give each other advice. They work together as a family in a way that helps them grow individually and as a family.
2. We want our children to feel as though they belong to a school, a neighbourhood and a community.

3. We as parents want to dedicate our time and resources to one school, allowing for a much more significant impact on the school and our children.
4. We want a consistent teaching approach for our children - particularly in the field of religious studies.
5. Parents benefit from the logistical elements of one school for one family - getting to know the teachers, one single drop-off and pick-up.

The decision to deny siblings the right to go to school together must be reconsidered and over-turned.
Thank you for considering this submission.

Yours truly
Scott Kraag
Partner
Torys LLP

Scott A. Kraag
Torys LLP

January 5, 2015

Dear TCDSB Leadership,

We are writing to request a reconsideration of the sibling policy. We are parents of three children. Our daughter started at OLPH in JK over four years ago. She is now in grade three. Her brother has joined her at OLPH and is in grade one. They have a younger brother who is looking forward to joining his older sister and brother in September 2015. The OLPH community is home for us; the principal, the teachers, and fellow parents in the school are the people who are raising our children with us.

When we joined the OLPH family in 2010, the boundary for the school catchment area was not yet firm. We were assured that a policy existed that if we chose to send our daughter to OLPH, her siblings would be also be able to attend OLPH regardless of the catchment area. This policy played a significant role in our decision to join the OLPH community.

As families who live outside the newly determined school boundaries are no longer admitted to the school, out-of-catchment siblings will become a non-issue. In the interim, we request that siblings of out-of-catchment area students in the school are given the same priority as in-catchment siblings.

Practical issues are also a consideration - getting three children to different schools at the same time (and pickup).

Sibling support at school is obviously very important to the integration, support, and academic success of our children within the school community and therefore should be a key consideration.

We respectfully request that you vote to give siblings, in-catchment and out-of-catchment, highest priority ahead of other students.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter and for keeping families together.

Regards,

Dr. Amy Finch

John O'Dwyer

January 6, 2015

To the Toronto Catholic District School Board,

This letter is in regards to the TCDSB FDK admission policy regarding Siblings.

Siblings, living in the catchment area, should be guaranteed registration into the TCDSB FDK program.

My brothers, sister and I grew up in the TCDSB. My mother is a retired teacher in the TCDSB and my father a Deacon in Catholic Archdiocese of Toronto. My husband and I now have three children and want to raise all three children in the Catholic Church and the Toronto Catholic school system. We live in the OLPH catchment area and go to church at Our Lady of Perpetual Help (OLPH) every Sunday.

I would like to say we bought our house in our area for the school system (like many people have), but we didn't. We moved to the area, 8 years ago, not knowing anything about the local schools. However, it was always assumed, our children would go to our local catholic school and be brought up in the catholic faith.

When it was time for our son to enroll in FDK (Full day kindergarten), we naturally looked to our local catholic school, OLPH. Therefore, last January at the stroke of midnight, my husband and I were both on our laptop computers, trying desperately to enroll our son, Eamon, in FDK at OLPH Catholic School. That same night, we were supposed to be in Punta Cana Dominican Republic, but had changed our travel plans so we could be at home, on our computers, enrolling our son in our local catchment area catholic school.

After a few glitches with the computer program, SOAR, we luckily got through and registered Eamon for the program. Going through the process, we never felt that the admission policy, guaranteeing sibling registration, was "unfair" or "unfounded" – allowing siblings first priority in registration made sense. We knew that there were only a few spots available, after siblings, and we had to follow the registration guidelines to ensure Eamon was enrolled. We also knew that we only had to do this once and both Eamon's younger brother and sister would be enrolled.

1 year later, it is very upsetting to find out that, in fact, Eamon's sblings (Fiona and Ben) are not guaranteed spots and could potentially not attend our local area catholic school.

It is not an option to send our three children to different schools or to an out-of-district Catholic School. Therefore, Eamon and his siblings will be denied a Catholic education, if one of his siblings is not accepted into the FDK program at OLPH Catholic School.

We completely disagree with the admission policy that siblings are not guaranteed spots in the FDK program (if they live in the catchment area). It is completely absurd that the TCDSB would allow families to be split up and make children from the same family attend different schools.

Siblings, living in the catchment area, should be guaranteed registration into the TCDSB FDK program.

Thank you for your time,

Nuala (and Dave) Zietsma