



# Trustee Financial Orientation Session Q&A

Special Finance, Budget and Enrolment Committee

Wednesday, 23 January 2019

1. How much funding does the Toronto District School Board (TDSB) receive through the Learning Opportunities Grant (include the allocations that are enveloped)?

**Response:** The chart below outlines the Learning Opportunities Grant (LOG) allocations:

LOG		2017-18	Revised Estimates 2018-19
		\$	\$
- Learning Opportunities Amount		130,269,907	131,982,612
- Early Learning Assistance			
- Literacy and Numeracy Assistance	Enveloped	2,000,927	1,952,495
- Assistance for Student Success	Enveloped	11,084,682	11,041,707
- School Effectiveness Framework	Enveloped	1,027,989	
- OFIP	Enveloped	1,015,857	1,015,752
- Specialist High Skills Major	Enveloped	1,146,125	1,146,125
- Mental Health Leader	Enveloped	123,113	
- Outdoor Education	Enveloped	2,068,232	2,068,020
- Library Staff	Enveloped	747,738	766,357
- Local Priorities Fund (see note)	Enveloped	26,557,214	28,579,341
<b>Total LOG Allocation:</b>		<b>176,041,784</b>	<b>178,552,409</b>

Note: This funding will discontinue at the end of 2018-19.

2. What is the total amount spent on salaries and benefits from the operating budget?

**Response:** Approximately \$2.78B from the operating budget is allocated to salaries and benefits.

3. How much funding does the TDSB receive for Special Education and include a general description of the different components.

**Response:** The chart below outlines the TDSB’s Special Education funding allocation.

Grant	Description	2017-18 FS	2018-19 Rev Est
SEPPA	The Special Education Per-Pupil (SEPPA) Allocation recognizes the cost of providing additional assistance to the majority of students with special education needs. SEPPA is allocated to boards on the basis of total enrolment.	183,970,139	189,928,698
Special Education Equipment Amount	The Special Equipment Amount (SEA) allocation has two components: SEA Per-Pupil and SEA Claim Based. SEA Per-Pupil amount includes a base amount of \$10,000 plus an amount based on board's Average Daily Enrolment (ADE). SEA Per-Pupil Amount is allocated for the purchase of all computers, software, robotics and computer-related devices as identified for use by students with special education needs. SEA Claims-Based Amount provides funding to school board for the purchases of other non-computer based equipment utilized by students with special education needs. This process includes an \$800 deductible per claim.	11,451,643	11,061,713
Differentiated Special Education Needs Amount (DSENA) (see note 1)	The DSENA Allocation addresses the variation among boards with respect to students with special education needs and boards' ability to respond to those needs.	115,693,621	119,622,497
Approved Special Incidence Portion (SIP)	The SIP Allocation supports pupils who require more than two full-time staff to address the health and safety needs of both the students who have extraordinary high needs related to their disabilities and/or exceptionalities and others at their school.	4,131,000	3,754,485
Care, Treatment, Custody and Correctional Amount (CCTC)	The CTCC Amount provides funding to school boards to provide education programs for school-aged children and youth in care and/or treatment centres and in custody and correctional facilities.	14,025,168	14,145,325
Behavioural Expertise Amount (BEA)	The BEA allocation provides funding for school boards to hire board-level Applied Behaviour Analysis (ABA) professionals and starting in 2018-19 it will include a new ABA training amount.	789,496	1,162,254
		<b>330,061,067</b>	<b>339,674,972</b>
<b>Note 1</b>			
<u>Differentiated Special Education Needs Amount</u>			
Measures of Variability Amount		115,243,621	116,276,622
Collaboration and Integration		450,000	456,017
MDT Support Amount	Multi-Disciplinary Amount provides funding for all boards (up to four additional FTEs per school board), which helps to build board capacity and help teachers, educational assistants and other staff better understand and adapt to unique needs of their students.		394,303
Multidisciplinary teams and other staffing	Funding is provided for other staffing resources to support students with special education needs.		2,495,555
		115,693,621	119,622,497

- 4) When there is a funding gap of \$65M (supply staff), what is the context and is the gap higher because the Ministry of Education (EDU) didn't project accurately. Does EDU underestimate this shortfall traditionally?

**Response:** Yes, the TDSB has experienced a funding shortfall annually. The EDU would say it is a cost that boards are expected to manage locally.

- a. Do other boards experience this shortfall as well?

**Response:** Most school boards experience a similar shortfall, but the dollar amount varies according to size of school board.

- b. Is this a bigger problem for smaller boards vs larger boards?

**Response:** All boards experience similar challenges with supply cost shortfalls, regardless of size.

5. If the TDSB continues to run budget shortfalls, what steps/tools are implemented to address the shortfalls?

**Response:** In the past, staff reviews the operating budget and identify possible savings. Trustees review and approve reductions

The TDSB has been able, over the last couple of years, to maintain a status quo budget, while the Equity Action Plan and the Multi-Year Strategic Plan (MYSP) were being developed. This was done with the use of reserves and one-time events. These reserves are forecast to run out in the coming year and will require the board to adjust expenditures depending on grant announcements.

Now that the Board has approved a MYSP, the budget process this year is more directly connected, informed and guided by the MYSP.

6. Are there other funding sources for school renewal and repairs other than the Renewal GSN and the School Condition Improvement (SCI) funding?

**Response:** To date, there has been one related fund. In the last fiscal year, the TDSB received \$25M in Greenhouse Gas Reduction Funding (GGRF) to undertake renewal projects that would improve energy efficiency and reduce utility costs. This funding was cancelled in June 2018, with the proviso that any funding committed for GGRF projects would be honored. The TDSB had committed all \$25M by the time of the

announcement and was able to undertake all of this work. The funding for the current allocation must be spent prior to 31 March 2019.

7. Can the TDSB spend the money that it receives from Proceeds of Disposition (POD) from selling its school/facility property assets?

**Response:** All funds received as a result of the sale of TDSB properties are considered Proceeds of Disposition (POD). Currently these funds can only be used to address the renewal backlog. Any other use of the POD such as funding for Capital projects (e.g. major additions and new schools) requires both Board and EDU approval.

8. What is our current renewal backlog? What is the yearly increase of the backlog?

**Response:** The current renewal backlog stands at approximately \$3.9B as of January 2019. Typically, the movement of our backlog is upwards as the increase in renewal needs has exceeded our renewal funding.

Below is the history of the backlog from 2015 to date:

- September 2015, \$3.1B;
- September 2016, \$3.4B;
- September 2017, \$3.7B;
- January 2018, \$4.00B; and
- January 2019, \$3.9B.

During the EDU's most recent review of school board's renewal backlog, there as a change to the remaining useful life that for January 2019 slightly lowered the value of the backlog. Despite the recent reduction, it is trending upwards.

The database currently shows that the projected renewal backlog for the next four years would be as follows:

- January 2020, \$4.5B;
- January 2021, \$4.8B;
- January 2022, \$5.0B; and
- January 2023, \$5.2B.

This is without considering construction improvement projects, EDU state-of-repair assessments and data updates by EDU's consultant and any unseen factors.

9. Has the TDSB received information from the Ministry as to the status of funding for Early Years Capital Program / Childcare Capital Funding and if so, when will this funding end?

**Response:** At the present time, TDSB staff has not received any information on funding for this program.

10. Is the entire amount of the renewal backlog made up of building component repairs that are overdue or is it for repairs that will eventually need to be undertaken? What portion of the \$4B is for repairs that are of an immediate need?

**Response:** The renewal backlog is broken down into the following categories:

- **Urgent** - Building systems that are in critical or poor condition and critical to the operation of the building. There is no specific timeframe to repair/replace these systems; however, repair/replacement is recommended as soon as funding becomes available. Currently this amount is \$870M;
- **High** - Building systems that are in critical or poor condition, but not as critical to the operation of the building. There is no specific timeframe to repair/replace these systems; however, repair/replacement is recommended as soon as funding becomes available. Currently this amount is \$2B;
- **Medium** - Building systems that are in fair condition with low importance to the operation of the building. Currently this amount is \$700M;
- **Low** - Building systems that are in fair or good condition with very low importance to the operation of the building. Currently this amount is \$280M.

11. The TDSB has a very old infrastructure, what is the average age of our buildings? What impact does the age of the buildings have on renewal costs?

**Response:** The average age of the TDSB buildings is 63 years old.

Just like any building, as they age, components require replacement to keep the building in good working condition, to address energy efficiency and to ensure that appropriate technology is in place. All building components have a life cycle, and early in the life cycle most of the work is preventive maintenance type work. As we

transition into the later stages of the life cycle, costs begin to increase as you undertake major maintenance work to restore the component to as built functionality. Later in the life cycle, costs shift towards renewal/replacement and these are the most expensive expenditures.

12. How much of our SCI budget would be consumed by the urgent and high replacement components?

**Response:** The Board received \$227 M in SCI funding during the 2018/19 fiscal year. Our current urgent and high backlog sits at \$2.8B. Approximately 70% of our SCI funding is allocated to urgent and high priority items.

13. Are the leased properties under the Toronto Lands Corporation (TLC) included in the current renewal backlog? If not, do we know what the backlog is for these properties?

**Response:** The leased buildings under the TLC are not included in the current renewal backlog. The EDU assessment program does not include leased building in the annual assessments. In addition, only 1 administration building can be assessed per 5 year assessment cycle. There is no current estimated renewal backlog for TLC properties.

14. What is the School Facility Condition Index (FCI) and when it will be next updated?

**Response:** The FCI is used to determine the ratio of renewal needs to the replacement cost of a school. A higher FCI indicates that the cost of all of the outstanding renewal costs is approaching the replacement cost of a building. It does not indicate that a school is unsafe or that the environment is not conducive to student achievement.

It is updated throughout the year as work is completed. Every September we produce a comprehensive FCI. However, FCI's as well as the Renewal Needs Backlog are subject to change at any time for many reasons such as completed projects, assessments by EDU, data update, etc.

Please note that based on the current EDU benchmark, the replacement school might not have the amenities of the existing building (ex. Auditorium, Swimming pool, wide corridors etc.).

15. The operating budget has funding gaps, do we have similar funding gaps in the capital budget. Can the gaps be identified?

**Response:** For major capital projects, the EDU provides funding based on provincial benchmarks. This funding is not sufficient for most, if not all, capital projects.

For renewal, the industry standard and studies recommend that between 2% and 4% of the total replacement value of all schools be set aside annually to replace capital systems and facilities. EDU replacement value for our schools is \$8.56B based on EDU benchmark. However, our actual capital construction cost is higher by approximately 15% which makes the replacement value \$9.87B. Therefore, the annual capital budget should be approximately \$300M. This amount is required to keep the status quo. Last year we received \$274.3M, however, most of the renewal Grant (\$47M) is not used to replace building components, but is used for temporary repairs to extend the life of the backlog components.

16. Staff indicated that there have been revisions to the estimated life cycle of building components. When was this revision made and to what extent, does it impact boilers, roofing, how broad is the revision. Was the revision a detriment to safety?

**Response:** During the last round of assessments, the assessment teams indicated that the life cycles of various components were longer than previously indicated. This has the impact of increasing the component lifespan and pushing the replacement dates out, thus reducing the overall backlog. This does not decrease safety, but does limit our ability to replace components in a timely manner.

17. Aging infrastructure in our City is a significant issue. What funding has been received over time from the Renewal Grant and from School Condition Improvement to help the Board respond to the resulting enrolment pressure?

**Response:** The chart below provides the history of funding received to date:

Year	Renewal Grant	School Condition Improvement
2014-15	45,432,726	29,363,800
2015-16	49,487,333	225,780,292
2016-17	48,343,200	255,899,527
2017-18	47,115,706	200,873,970
2018-19	47,134,918	227,110,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>237,513,883</b>	<b>939,027,589</b>

18. Capital Priorities Grant:

- a) How many applications has the TDSB submitted in the past?
- b) Has the TDSB received its fair share of capital priorities funding?

**Response:**

	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Number of business cases for capital priorities funding requested by the EDU	8 business cases	8 business cases	10 business cases
Number of business cases submitted by the TDSB	8 school capital projects including 2 child care centres	8 school capital projects including 5 child care centres	10 school capital projects including 8 child care centres and 1 EarlyON centre
Number of business cases received by the EDU	220 school capital projects from 49 school boards (valued at \$2.7B) and 145 child care centres from 42 school boards	205 school capital projects from 54 school boards (valued at \$2.6B) and 168 child care and child and family centres from 47 school boards	250 school capital projects from 55 school boards (valued at \$3.3B) and 180 child care and EarlyON centres from 45 school boards
Number of capital priorities approved by the EDU for the 72 school boards	56 projects	51 projects	79 projects
Funding allocated by the EDU for capital priorities for the 72 school boards	\$498M	\$474M	\$784M



	2015	2016	2017
Number of TDSB capital priorities approved by the EDU	3 school capital projects (Davisville Jr PS / Spectrum Alt Sr Sch, Terry Fox PS, and Norseman JMS) and 1 child care centre	3 school capital projects (Hodgson MS, Courcelette PS, and Toronto Danforth PARC) and 1 child care centre	6 school capital projects (Baycrest PS, First Nations Sch of Toronto, Kipling CI, Dennis Avenue CS, George Syme CS, and Hollywood PS), 6 child care centres, and 1 EarlyON centre
Funding allocated by the EDU for TDSB capital priorities	\$29.3M: \$26.8M for the school capital projects and \$2.5M for the child care centre	\$15.2M: \$13.7M for the school capital projects and \$1.5M for the child care centre	\$40.5M: \$28.1M for the school capital projects; \$11.9M for the child care centres; and \$0.529 for the EarlyON centre
Funding TDSB would have received if the funds were proportionally allocated based on enrolment (TDSB's enrolment is 12% of the total in Ontario)	\$59M	\$56M	\$94M

In 2017, the TDSB submitted 10 business cases to the Ministry and 6 were approved. The remaining 4 will be re-submitted in the next round of capital priorities funding (assuming the Ministry's parameters and the demographic circumstances justifying the capital projects remain the same). The LTPAS lists another 14 capital projects. Staff will refer to this list to identify additional projects to submit to the Ministry to meet the application limit. Some capital projects in the LTPAS still require review and decisions of the Board before business cases can be submitted. As other accommodation studies are completed and reported to Board (such as Pupil Accommodation Reviews and Program Area Reviews), additional capital projects will be identified and added to the list in the LTPAS.

19. How much revenue in Education Development Charges (EDCs) does the TCDSB receive each year?

**Response:** The table below comes from the Toronto Catholic District School Board's (TCDSB) background study for their current EDC by-law and shows the charges collected each year from 2001 to 2018. Since 2010, the TCDSB has collected over \$10M in EDCs each year with some years exceeding \$20M.

<b>Date</b>	<b>EDC Collections</b>	<b>Cumulative EDC Collections</b>
<b>EDC Collections March 27, 2001 to March 29, 2002</b>	\$5,139,125.46	\$5,139,125.46
<b>EDC Collections March 30, 2002 to March 28, 2003</b>	\$11,601,192.26	\$16,740,317.72
Less: Refunds March 30, 2002 to March 28, 2003	-\$790,263.00	\$15,950,054.72
<b>EDC Collections March 29, 2003 to May 23, 2003</b>	\$1,967,310.76	\$17,917,365.48
Plus: Interest Earned March 27, 2001 to May 23, 2003	\$50,879.00	\$17,968,244.48
Less: Adjustments March 27, 2001 to August 27, 2003	-\$550.72	\$17,967,693.76
<b>EDC Collections May 24, 2003 to August 26, 2003</b>	\$813,508.00	\$18,781,201.76
<b>EDC Collections August 27, 2003 to August 31, 2004</b>	\$6,814,494.00	\$25,595,695.76
<b>EDC Collections September 1, 2004 to August 31, 2005</b>	\$5,442,440.00	\$31,038,135.76
<b>EDC Collections September 1, 2005 to August 31, 2006</b>	\$7,192,261.00	\$38,230,396.76
<b>EDC Collections September 1, 2006 to August 31, 2007</b>	\$3,121,519.00	\$41,351,915.76
<b>EDC Collections September 1, 2007 to December 31, 2007</b>	\$3,965,604.00	\$45,317,519.76
Plus: Interest Earned May 24, 2003 to August 31, 2007	\$1,975,365.00	\$47,292,884.76
<b>EDC Collections January 1, 2008 to August 24, 2008</b>	\$2,257,626.00	\$49,550,510.76
<b>EDC Collections August 25, 2008 to August 24, 2009</b>	\$6,590,282.00	\$56,140,792.76
<b>EDC Collections August 25, 2009 to August 24, 2010</b>	\$6,537,168.00	\$62,677,960.76
<b>EDC Collections August 25, 2010 to August 24, 2011</b>	\$12,921,435.00	\$75,599,395.76
<b>EDC Collections August 25, 2011 to August 24, 2012</b>	\$11,957,496.00	\$87,556,891.76
<b>EDC Collections August 25, 2012 to August 31, 2012</b>	\$1,853,115.52	\$89,410,007.28

Plus: Interest Earned September 1, 2007 to August 31, 2012	\$2,011,500.72	\$91,421,508.00
<b>EDC Collections September 1, 2012 to August 31, 2013</b>	\$13,279,902.00	\$104,701,410.00
Plus: Interest Earned September 1, 2012 to August 31, 2013	\$489,027.00	\$105,190,437.00
<b>EDC Collections September 1, 2013 to August 31, 2014</b>	\$22,004,871.00	\$127,195,308.00
Plus: Interest Earned September 1, 2013 to August 31, 2014	\$239,364.00	\$127,434,672.00
<b>EDC Collections September 1, 2014 to August 31, 2015</b>	\$22,089,570.00	\$149,524,242.00
Plus: Interest Earned September 1, 2014 to August 31, 2015	\$295,921.00	\$149,820,163.00
<b>EDC Collections September 1, 2015 to August 31, 2016</b>	\$13,151,735.00	\$162,971,898.00
Plus: Interest Earned September 1, 2015 to August 31, 2016	\$247,213.00	\$163,219,111.00
<b>EDC Collections September 1, 2016 to August 31, 2017</b>	\$17,940,782.00	\$181,159,893.00
Plus: Interest Earned September 1, 2016 to August 31, 2017	\$215,000.00	\$181,374,893.00
<b>EDC Collections September 1, 2017 to February 28, 2018 (includes City remittance during March 2018)</b>	\$16,494,005.47	\$197,868,898.47
Less: Refunds September 1, 2017 to December 31, 2017	-\$7,465.00	\$197,861,433.47
Plus:		
Projected EDC Collections March 1, 2018 - June 30, 2018		\$6,730,581.00
<b>Total Net EDC Collections March 27, 2001 to June 30, 2018</b>		\$204,592,014.47

Source: Source: TCDSB Education Development Charges Background Study and Review of Education Development Charges Policies, April 17, 2018; table 7-3; page 87

20. How much has the TDSB lost on this EDC funding opportunity?

**Response:** Using the TCDSB's charges as an indication of how much the TDSB could have collected, between 2001 and 2018 the TDSB could have collected over \$200M.

21. The TDSB is currently advocating for EDC's. If successful, would the EDCs apply to developments already completed?

**Response:** The charges are collected by the City of Toronto on behalf of a school board when a developer applies for and is issued a building permit. The TDSB would not be able to collect EDCs for developments that are completed and occupied or have started construction prior to the EDC by-law being passed.

22. What could EDC funding look like for the TDSB?

**Response:** The charges are applied to residential developments (per dwelling unit) and non-residential developments (per square foot). Every 5 years, the EDC by-law is reviewed and the calculations are updated. For example, the TCDSB's residential charges have increased over time from \$402 per dwelling unit to \$1,493 per dwelling unit. The non-residential charges have increased from \$0.22 per square foot to \$1.07 per square foot. Over the next 15 years, forecasts suggest that approximately 214,000 residential units will be constructed (approximately 14,000 units per year) and 65M square feet of non-residential development (approximately 4M square feet per year). If the TDSB was able to collect EDCs for this growth at the current rates charged by the TCDSB, the TDSB would collect over \$390M.

23. What is our Grade 4-8 Collective Agreement system average? What is the Provincial/funding average? Why is the average at which we staff "richer" than the Provincial/funding average?

**Response:** EDU Regulation pre-2017 required a system wide average class size not exceeding 24.5. This was in line with the funding level. However in 2008, as part of the Provincial Discussion Table agreement (that was the paradigm that defined the 2008-2012 Collective Agreement Round of Bargaining), established a "base" average of 23.74 and subsequent reductions to this average of 0.5 over a 4 year period. This was subsequently written into a Letter of Understanding in the Collective Agreement.

In 2017 the TDSB Grade 4-8 average of 23.24 became part of EDU Regulation. (see attached link). TDSB is not unique in this situation. Each Board across the province has a requirement outlined in regulation.

<https://www.ontario.ca/laws/regulation/120132?search=reg.+132%2F12>

The EDU funded average is now 23.84, down from the original 24.5.

TDSB has met the requirement in each of the years since the Letter of Understanding was included in Collective Agreement

- 2009-10: 23.64
- 2010-11: 23.54
- 2011-12: 23.44
- 2012-13 to 2018-19: 23.24

Hence our budgeted class size average is lower than the funded amount.

Further, our actual class sizes currently fall below the budgeted amount. For the 2018-19 school year, the Grade 4-8 System Average data is as follows:

<b>Grades 4-8</b>	Total	# Class	3513
		# Stu	81617
		Max Avg	23.23

The EDU has invited teachers' federations, education worker unions and trustees' associations to meet to begin discussing ways to improve teacher hiring practices and is requesting feedback on class sizes in kindergarten to Grade 12. The consultations run to 22 February 2019.

The EDU also issued two discussion guides to help focus the consultations. They are attached.

You can read the Minister's statement and learn more about the consultations [here](#):

24. Given that we use a system average for Grades 4-8, how do we respond to minimize the possibility of classes being "on the high end?"

**Response:** When we allocate staffing for the upcoming school year we attempt to avoid class sizes of this magnitude. During the first few weeks when schools realigned based on the actual number of students who have arrived at each school/in each class.

During the remainder of the school year schools can experience different levels of mobility and some schools can see fluctuations in enrolment that effect class size. Schools Principals work closely with Employee Services when they experience such increases to look at strategies to support these changes.

There are factors that influence the possible strategies available including available space in a building, programming needs, needs of specific groups of students and timetabling challenges. There is no one solution that works in every situation so we work collaboratively based on the context of the specific school.

# Class Size Engagement Guide

January 2019

Page | 1

In June 2018, Ontario elected a government committed to restoring accountability and trust in Ontario's public institutions and finances.

Ontario's Government for the People has just concluded the largest public consultation on education in the province's history. This comprehensive education consultation had participation from parents, students, educators, employers and organizations from across Ontario.

We have also recently concluded this year's consultation on education funding reform. The feedback we received will help us to deliver vital education programs and services efficiently.

At the Ministry of Education we are committed to working together with our education partners to achieve student success. We continue to look to our education partners to provide input on how we can achieve greater efficiencies and accountability throughout the sector and, through this guide, we are seeking your input on kindergarten to grade 12 class sizes in Ontario.

Our Government looks forward to working with all of you.

Sincerely,

The Honourable Lisa Thompson,  
Minister of Education



## About this Engagement

Class size changes potentially affect students and those working in the education sector. We are committed to discussing class size options, with education stakeholders through an engagement process that allows stakeholders to provide the benefit of their expertise, experience, and ideas. This guide is intended to support stakeholders in understanding the government's objectives and assist in the development of stakeholder submissions.

In order to ensure your feedback is considered, please forward your electronic submission by February 22, 2019 to: [EDULABFINANCE@ontario.ca](mailto:EDULABFINANCE@ontario.ca).

If you have questions about this engagement, please send them to: [EDULABFINANCE@ontario.ca](mailto:EDULABFINANCE@ontario.ca).

## Background on Class Size in Ontario

The Class Size regulation made under the *Education Act* (O. Reg. 132/12) governs class sizes in elementary and secondary panels. The funded class size average, or student to educator ratio, is the key driver of funding for each panel and is designed to support boards in meeting regulated class sizes.

The Pupil Foundation Grant, along with the Teacher Qualifications and Experience allocations, are the foundational allocations within the Grants for Student Needs that support the staffing of classroom teachers and Early Childhood Educators (ECEs). The ministry provides the framework, funding, and flexibility needed to support school boards in meeting class size requirements for all grades across the province, but class organization remains a local school board responsibility.

As educator staffing costs represent approximately 80 per cent of the Grants for Student Needs allocation, the province's current fiscal circumstances require an examination of whether changes to class size would allow school boards to deliver better value for government investment.

## Current Class Size Model

PANEL	Summary of Regulatory Requirements (O. Reg. 132/12) <sup>1</sup>
<b>ELEMENTARY</b>	
Kindergarten	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The maximum board-wide average class size is 26.</li><li>• All school boards have a class size limit of 29 students.</li><li>• Up to 10% of kindergarten classes of a board may exceed the class size limit and have up to 32 students under certain conditions<sup>2</sup>.</li></ul>

<sup>1</sup> This provides a general overview of the Regulation only. The regulation contains further details, including definitions of key terms. Stakeholders should consult the text of the regulation.

<sup>2</sup> If purpose-built accommodation is not available (this exception will sunset after 2021–2022); if a program will be negatively affected (e.g., French immersion); or where compliance will increase kindergarten/Grade 1 combined classes.

PANEL	Summary of Regulatory Requirements (O. Reg. 132/12) <sup>1</sup>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The funded average class size is 25.57.</li> </ul>
<b>Grades 1-3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 90 per cent of primary classes of a board must have 20 or fewer students.</li> <li>All school boards have a class size limit of 23 students.</li> <li>The funded average class size is 19.8.</li> </ul>
<b>Grades 4-8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maximum board-wide average class size is 24.5, except for certain boards identified in the class size regulation.</li> <li>The regulation provides for a 5-year transition period, beginning in 2017, at the end of which the maximum board-wide average class size for all board would be 24.5 or lower.</li> <li>The funded average class size is 23.84.</li> </ul>
<b>Mixed Grade</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All mixed-grade classes consisting of primary grade students (includes kindergarten) combined with students from junior-intermediate grades (grades 4 to 8) must have 23 or fewer students.</li> </ul>
<b>SECONDARY</b>	
<b>Grades 9-12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The maximum board-wide average class size is 22.</li> <li>The funded average class size is 22.0.</li> </ul>

## Hard Caps and Board-Wide Average Class Sizes

The ministry has heard, in previous education funding engagements that implementing hard caps on class sizes (as currently done in kindergarten and grades 1-3) is expensive and difficult for school boards to manage. It has been suggested that board-wide class size averages offer more flexibility for classroom organization and allows for more efficient use of board funds.

### For Consideration:

- Should the regulation continue to set hard caps on class sizes? Why or why not?
- If hard caps are to be set out in regulation, what is an appropriate class size limit?
- If hard caps were removed from regulation, what would be an appropriate mechanism to set effective class sizes?
- Are board-wide averages appropriate to set effective class sizes? Why or why not?
- Other than hard caps and board-wide averages, is there a different model for setting effective class size that the ministry should consider?

## **Kindergarten Classroom**

The kindergarten maximum average class size requirement of 26 students on a board-wide basis results in an average child to educator ratio of 13:1. Most kindergarten classes are staffed with two qualified educators – a teacher and an ECE.

Ontario Reg 224/10, under the *Education Act*, contains an exception to this requirement. A board is not required to have an ECE in a kindergarten class if there are fewer than 16 kindergarten students in the class. This exception may be applied to one class per school per stream (i.e., one exception is allowed for English classes and one exception for French immersion classes per school). Boards must hire an ECE for all kindergarten classes if there is another class in the same school and the same track with more than 30 students.

### **For Consideration:**

1. What are the implications of the present 'two educator' model for:
  - a. Student outcomes?
  - b. Educator workload and working conditions?
  - c. Value-for-money?
2. Are there other models the ministry should consider?

## Overall Class Size

There is little expert consensus on whether and how educational outcomes are affected by class size. The average class size for OECD countries and partner countries/economies in PISA 2015 ranged from less than 20 students in a classroom (e.g. Belgium and Finland) to 40 students or more (e.g. Vietnam, CABA (Argentina), B-S-J-G (China), and Turkey). The relatively larger classroom sizes in Asian countries and their high average student performance is often cited as an example that high performance is possible in larger classrooms (OECD, 2012 and 2016).

Ontario currently has one of the lowest student to teacher ratios among the provinces in Canada with restrictions on class sizes. Yet, when Ontario is compared to all other provinces regarding international testing, PISA 2015, Ontario is statistically performing as follows:

**Mathematics:** Lower than British Columbia and Quebec, the same as Alberta and Prince Edward Island and above Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, Newfoundland and Labrador, and Saskatchewan.

**Reading:** The same as Alberta, British Columbia, Nova Scotia and Quebec, and above Manitoba, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island and Saskatchewan.

**Science:** Lower than Alberta, British Columbia and Quebec, the same as Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island and above Manitoba, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Labrador, and Saskatchewan.

## For Consideration:

1. To ensure quality education, for each panel, what class size would be considered too large or too small? Why?
  - a. kindergarten
  - b. grades 1-3
  - c. grades 4-8
  - d. grades 9-12
2. Do changes to class size, in the range of 1-6 students, affect educator workload and working conditions?
  - a. If so, do these effects have an impact on students' learning outcomes?
  - b. How could such effects be mitigated?
3. Is there any other feedback that you think should be considered that has not been addressed so far?

## **Conclusion**

Ontario has a world-class publicly funded education system but others are quickly catching up. Through these types of engagements, the ministry challenges the status quo and seeks opportunities to do things better for the children in the Province of Ontario.

Thank you for taking the time to read this guide. We look forward to your feedback.

# Ontario School Board Hiring Practices

## Hiring Practices – Consultation Paper

### MESSAGE FROM THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION

Dear partners,

In June 2018, Ontario elected a government committed to restoring accountability and trust in Ontario's public institutions and finances.

Ontario's Government for the People has just concluded the largest public consultation on education in the province's history. This comprehensive education consultation had participation from parents, students, educators, employers and organizations from across Ontario.

We have also recently concluded this year's consultation on education funding reform. The feedback we received will help us to deliver vital education programs and services efficiently.

At the Ministry of Education we are committed to working together with our education partners to achieve student success. We continue to look to our education partners to provide input on how we can achieve greater efficiencies and accountability throughout the sector and, through this guide, we are seeking your input on teacher hiring practices in Ontario.

Our Government looks forward to working with all of you.

Sincerely,

The Honourable Lisa Thompson  
Minister of Education

## Hiring Practices – Consultation Paper

### INTRODUCTION

The Ministry of Education recognizes teachers as the single most important out-of-the-home factor in student success. This is supported by research that suggests that what teachers know and are able to do is crucial to student learning. As such, teacher quality is paramount in ensuring students are able to succeed in the classroom.

Prior to 2012, hiring practices and the transparency of hiring practices varied across school boards.

Ontario Regulation 274/12 – Hiring Practices (O. Reg. 274/12) came into effect September 2012. The regulation sets mandatory terms and conditions that all school boards who employ Ontario English Catholic Teachers' Association (OECTA), Elementary Teachers' Federation of Ontario (ETFO) or Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation (OSSTF) members (i.e. English language school boards) must follow when hiring long-term occasional and permanent teachers.

The Regulation, which is complemented by local collective agreement language, requires these school boards to:

- maintain a roster of occasional teachers (OTs) and establish a separate long-term occasional (LTO) teachers' list and rank OTs based on their seniority on the OT and LTO lists
- post long-term occasional teacher positions on their website
- conduct debrief interviews with unsuccessful candidates when requested
- only hire teachers to LTO and permanent positions from the LTO teachers' list (or OT roster), based on qualifications and seniority, giving due regard for the provision of the best possible program, safety and well-being of students, as required under Ontario Regulation 298 of the Revised Regulations of Ontario, 1990 (Operation of Schools — General).

The purpose of O. Reg. 274/12 was to bring greater transparency, fairness, consistency, and accountability to school board hiring practices of teachers. However, since its implementation, stakeholders, including parents, principals, directors of education and teachers, have raised concerns about the regulation. As boards make hiring decisions under the Regulation, we have been told that student success may be negatively impacted and there have been some unintended consequences, such as increased principal workload and classroom teacher turnover, which impact consistency in the classroom.

### ABOUT THIS CONSULTATION

Education partners and stakeholders are being given an opportunity to provide feedback about O. Reg. 274/12 via consultation to address concerns shared with the Ministry of Education. We would like feedback on the following principles, with a lens to having quality teaching in the classroom for all students:

- transparency
- consistency
- clarity
- diversity & equity
- reducing administrative burden

Stakeholders and partners are encouraged to send written feedback (see Appendix 1 for template) to [PTPSB@Ontario.ca](mailto:PTPSB@Ontario.ca) by February 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2019.



## Hiring Practices – Consultation Paper

### CONSIDERATIONS

#### Providing for Teacher Mobility

Currently, if a permanent teacher relocates to another school board they lose all of their accumulated seniority and have to begin as a daily OT in the new school board. As a result, it can take the relocating teacher a number of years before they are able to secure a permanent teaching position in their new school board. Permanent teachers could see this as a barrier to relocating. This is because school boards can only hire teachers for permanent teaching positions from their OT roster and LTO list. As such, relocating permanent teachers must first apply and be interviewed for placement on the school board's roster of occasional teachers.

Per the Regulation, a teacher is placed on a school board's OT roster and ranked by their seniority as an OT in that particular school board. Once they have been hired, they must teach at least 20 days over a ten-month period to be eligible to interview for the LTO list. When that school board hires for a LTO or permanent position, the board must interview and offer the position to the five teachers with the highest seniority with the appropriate qualifications in their school board. Following the completion of a four-month (80 instructional days) LTO assignment, without an unsatisfactory evaluation, the teacher is eligible to apply for inclusion on the LTO list and then for permanent teaching positions. However, there is variation across teacher federations; for example, the regulation does not apply to Association des enseignantes et des enseignants franco-ontariens (AEFO).

#### Discussion Questions:

1. What changes could be made to O. Reg. 274/12 to provide greater mobility for relocating occasional and permanent teachers or principals and vice-principals returning to teaching?
2. Is there a need to have both an OT roster and LTO list, or could these be merged together to create one without hindering clarity and transparency?
3. How could teaching experience be made portable for hiring purposes (i.e. recognizing all teaching experience, not just experience with a particular board)?

#### Interviewing the Most Qualified Candidates

For any LTO or permanent teaching position, under the current regulation, a school board must interview the five teachers from the LTO list who (i) are the most senior, (ii) have the required qualifications for the position and (iii) have agreed to be interviewed. If a teacher meets or exceeds the qualifications for the position, but is not part of the five most senior teachers, they would not qualify for an interview (unless all five of the interviewed candidates did not accept the position after it was offered to them). As such, the opportunity to hire this qualified candidate, and impact student learning in a positive way, would be missed.

#### Discussion Questions:

1. Would increasing the current cap of five teachers to, for example, eight, result in any meaningful and helpful change? Or would this just increase the administrative burden of principals and school boards and add to teacher churn for time to fill vacancies during the school year?
2. If interview list caps were removed altogether, how should interviews be structured?
3. Currently the regulation lists three elements used to select interviewees. What elements would you like to see in a regulation for selecting a group of interviewees that would maintain consistency and transparency?

## Hiring Practices – Consultation Paper

### Determining the Basis for Hiring

O. Reg. 274/12 requires school boards to organize their OT roster and LTO list based on the date each teacher was hired. When a teaching position becomes available, school boards must interview and hire candidates that have the highest seniority on the OT roster and LTO list.

Consistent and transparent hiring practices are important; however, the ministry has heard concerns about hiring that is heavily based on seniority, including:

- Seniority-based hiring values only time spent on a list. It does not value quality of teaching, commitment to students, experience/time spent in a particular school, or suitability for the particular assignment.
  - Examples of situations we have heard include schools looking for teachers with qualifications in music, math, physical education, indigenous languages, or to recruit based on diversity, but these might not be the teachers with the most seniority.

### Discussion Questions:

1. How can the current focus on seniority-based hiring be changed so that hiring practices consider impact on student success, quality of teaching, diversity and transparency, while remaining consistent and fair?
2. How can hiring practices that are not seniority-based prevent bias from entering the hiring process?
3. Other than seniority, what components would you like to see in hiring practices for teachers?

### Applying Hiring Practices Across the System

Currently, the application of the Regulation's sections is determined by the position to which the teacher is applying. For example, sections 10 to 15 of the Regulation apply to the hiring of occasional teachers in bargaining units represented by OECTA, while members belonging to AEFO are exempt from the Regulation altogether. As such, even though there is a regulation intended to standardize hiring practices across the province, hiring practices look different depending on which position the teacher is applying to.

### Discussion Questions:

1. Can a consistent set of hiring practices work effectively across the province?
  - If yes, why?
  - If no, why not?
2. Could there be a parallel set of hiring practices for vice-principals who return to bargaining units?
3. What hiring practice criteria can work if applied across the province (e.g. minimum posting requirements)?

## **CONCLUSION**

As all organizations do, the government must continue to look for innovative best practices that will help us meet our organizational goals of preparing students for success while in K-12 classrooms and following graduation. One way of doing this is to look at the ways we are currently working on meeting our goals and identify opportunities to improve current practices.

Thank you for your interest in this important matter. We look forward to receiving your feedback.

Hiring Practices – Consultation Paper

Appendix 1 – Feedback Form

This is the feedback form that will be used to frame feedback about Ontario Regulation 274/12 – Hiring Practice. Please submit feedback to [PTPSB@Ontario.ca](mailto:PTPSB@Ontario.ca) by February 22nd, 2019.

Ontario Regulation 274/12 – Hiring Practice Feedback Form
Name: Title (if applicable): Organization (if applicable):
<b>Providing for Teacher Mobility</b> <u>Guiding Questions</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What changes could be made to O. Reg. 274/12 to provide greater mobility for relocating occasional and permanent teachers or principals and vice-principals returning to teaching?</li><li>• Is there a need to have both an OT roster and LTO list, or could these be merged together to create one without hindering clarity and transparency?</li><li>• How could teaching experience be made portable for hiring purposes (i.e. recognizing all teaching experience, not just experience with a particular board)?</li></ul>
Feedback:
<b>Interviewing the Most Qualified Candidates</b> <u>Guiding Questions</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Would increasing the current cap of five teachers to, for example, eight, result in any meaningful and helpful change? Or would this just increase the administrative burden of principals and school boards and add to teacher churn for time to fill vacancies during the school year?</li><li>• If interview list caps were removed altogether, how should interviews be structured?</li><li>• Currently the regulation lists three elements ((i) are the most senior, (ii) have the required qualifications for the position and (iii) have agreed to be interviewed) used to select interviewees. What elements would you like to see in a regulation for selecting a group of interviewees that would maintain consistency and transparency?</li></ul>
Feedback:

## Hiring Practices – Consultation Paper

### Determining the Basis for Hiring

#### Guiding Questions

- How can the current focus on seniority-based hiring be changed so that hiring practices consider impact on student success, quality of teaching, diversity and transparency, while remaining consistent and fair?
- How can hiring practices that are not seniority-based prevent bias from entering into the hiring process?
- Other than seniority, what components would you like to see in hiring practices for teachers?

Feedback:

### Applying Hiring Practices Across the System

#### Guiding Questions

- Can a consistent set of hiring practices work effectively across the province? If yes, why? If no, why not?
- Could there be a parallel set of hiring practices for vice-principals who return to bargaining units?
- What hiring practice criteria can work if applied across the province (e.g. minimum posting requirements)?

Feedback: