



**BOARD OF EDUCATION OF  
SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 46 (SUNSHINE COAST)**

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE  
AGENDA**

Tuesday, April 24<sup>th</sup>, 2018 from 9:30-12:30 p.m.  
School Board Office – Gibsons, BC

---

- 1) Goal 3.c. – International Education
- 2) Memorandum of Agreement Review
- 3) Trustee Evaluation Process / New Trustee Orientation Process
- 4) Funding Model Review Feedback
- 5) Communication Plan (standing item)

Additional materials:

- BCSTA Trustee Elections Resources: <http://bcsta.org/resources-and-services/trustee-elections-2018/>
- OAG – Public Governance: A Guide to the Principles of Good Practice (Full Report):  
<http://www.bcauditor.com/sites/default/files/publications/2008/report13/report/public-sector-governance-guide-principles-good-practice.pdf>
- Statement of Education Policy Order (Mandate for the School System):  
[https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/education/administration/legislation-policy/legislation/schoollaw/d/oic\\_128089.pdf](https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/education/administration/legislation-policy/legislation/schoollaw/d/oic_128089.pdf)



# International Education Program

Development for the Future

## Overview

What does an International Program Require?  
Implementation of Recommendations  
Directions for the Future



# Program Budget

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM			
	Per FTE	FTE	Total
<b>Revenue</b>	10,500	11	<b>\$ 115,500</b>
Less: Agency Fees			(17,325)
<b>Net Revenue</b>			<b>\$ 98,175</b>
School Funding	5,170	11	\$ 56,870
Memberships & Pro D			4,000
Activity Costs			12,875
Recruitment & Program Development			15,000
Student Support			1,100
<b>Program Expenses</b>			<b>\$ 89,845</b>
<b>Net Program Contribution</b>			<b>\$ 8,330</b>



## Program Support

School Orientation: Academics/Behavior/Teams/Clubs  
 Regular Activities  
 Program Coordinator: Dave Hunt  
 School Administration, Counselors and Teachers  
 Homestay Contractor and Coordinator: MLI /Ceri Bowes  
 Agent Communication  
 Social Media updates  
 Direct Recruitment: UP Global Student Fair- Helsinki/ STS Office visit- Gothenburg



(2016/17: 22 Students/11 FTE)

Countries Represented this year: 25 Students/ 13.5 FTE

China	Italy
Germany	Japan
Slovakia	Spain
Switzerland	



Agencies Represented 2017-18:

ARC International – USA/Taiwan  
Student Travel Services (STS) - Europe  
Muskoka Lakes International (MLI) - Canada  
Global Partners Institute (GPI) –Vancouver  
Kobe Yamata School – Japan



### Partner Agencies 2017-18:

ARC International – USA/Japan

Global Partners Institute (GPI) –Vancouver

Estudie Canada - Spain

International Education Exchange (iEduex) - Spain

Kobe Yamata School – Japan

Muskoka Lakes International (MLI) – Canada

Munich Academic Program (Map) – Germany

Student Travel Bureau (STB) - Brazil

Student Travel Services (STS) – Europe

UP Global – Finland

UR Edu - Taiwan

# Social Media Presence

@learninbc




# Social Media Presence

[Learninbc.ca](http://Learninbc.ca)  
Learninbc.com



# Program Fees

Tuition Fees Increase to \$11,000 2019-2020 School Year

**School District No. 46  
(Sunshine Coast)**  
A COMMUNITY ENGAGED IN LIFELONG LEARNING  
AND EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE


## PROGRAM FEES

2015/16 School Year	One Year	One Semester
Program Application Fee (non-refundable)	\$250.00	\$250.00
Tuition	\$10,250.00	\$5,125.00
Medical Insurance	\$800.00	\$400.00
Homestay Fees	\$8,000.00	\$4,000.00
Monitored Custodial Guardianship Fee	\$1,250.00	\$750.00
Homestay Placement Fee (non-refundable)	\$350.00	\$350.00

2016/17 School Year	One Year	One Semester
Program Application Fee (non-refundable)	\$250.00	\$250.00
Tuition	\$10,500.00	\$5,250.00
Medical Insurance	\$800.00	\$400.00
Homestay Fees	\$8,500.00	\$4,250.00
Monitored Custodial Guardianship Fee	\$1,250.00	\$750.00

# MOA Review

Report to the Board April 24, 2018

## How did we get here?

- November 2016 Supreme Court decision that the *Education Improvement Act* was unconstitutional.
- Collective agreements dating back to 2002 were restored.
- A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) was reached March 3, 2017 between BCPSEA and the BCTF
- This agreement restores language specific to class size and composition, non-enrolling Special Education staffing and related processes, and Teacher Librarian staffing ratios

## District Staffing Ratios

- Counselors = 1:300
- Learning Assistance = 1:446
- Special Education Resource Teachers = 1:237
- Teacher Librarians = 1:400
- ESL Teachers\* = 1:36.9

(\* the MOA allows for ESL teacher ratio to be combined with Learning Assistance)

## Class Sizes

- K & Gr. 1 = 20
- Gr. 1-3 = 22
- Gr. 3/4 split = 24
- Gr 4-7 = 30 (splits 28)
- Gr. 8-12 = 30
- Gr. 8-12 Industrial Education or Lab classes = 26



# Composition

- 2 “Low Incidence” students limited per class
- “Low Incidence” designations include:
  - Physically Dependent
  - Deaf-Blind
  - Moderate to Profound Intellectual Disability
  - Physical Disability or Chronic Health
  - Visual Impairment
  - Deaf or Hard of Hearing
  - Autism Spectrum Disorder

# Ensuring “Best Efforts”

Source	Information
Your restored local language	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Class size limits for K-3 superior to those outlined in the MoA</li> <li>• Class size limits for 4-12</li> <li>• Class composition limits for K-12</li> <li>• Flex factor</li> </ul>
The <a href="#">School Act</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Hard caps” for K-3 class size</li> <li>• Class size limits for 4-12, subject to exceptions</li> </ul>
The <a href="#">School Act Class Size and Compensation Regulation</a> (“the Regulation”)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exceptions for 4-12 class size limit of 30 students under the Act</li> <li>• Remedy for 4-12 classes over 30 students that are “appropriate for student learning”</li> </ul>
The <a href="#">Memorandum of Agreement</a> re: LoU No. 17: Education Fund and Impact of the Court Cases — Final Agreement (the MoA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K-3 class size limits</li> <li>• Class size limits for primary-intermediate combined classes</li> <li>• Definition of “best efforts”</li> <li>• Remedy for classes that exceed class size and composition limits despite “best efforts”</li> </ul>

## “Best Efforts” Include

- Re-examining school boundaries
- Re-examining school space utilization within a school or between schools
- Utilizing temporary classrooms
- Renegotiating lease or rental contracts
- Completing Post and Fill for vacant positions
- Class reorganization to meet composition language without reducing by more than:
  - 5 students K-3
  - 4 students in a shop or lab class
  - 6 students in another grade or class

## Non-Compliance

- It is understood that non-compliance may also happen for some of the following reasons:
  - Compelling family issues; siblings
  - Age of the student
  - Distance to another school
  - Student safety concerns
  - Needs issues for students
  - Anticipated student attrition
  - Time of year
  - Physical space limitations
  - Teacher recruitment challenges

## Remedy

- Class re-organization will not happen after Sept. 30 or 21 calendar days after the start of any class
- Teachers with a class size or composition not in compliance with the provisions are eligible to select one of the following remedies:
  - Additional Prep time
  - Additional non-enrolling teacher support
  - Additional enrolling teacher support
  - Other remedies that local parties agree upon

## Remedy Challenges

- Most Teachers have selected additional Preparation time
- Remedy is required in more classes at Secondary due to fewer class offerings
- Additional staff positions have depleted the TTOC list
- We are currently managing; TTOC hiring is ongoing

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

Between:

British Columbia Public School Employers' Association ("BCPSEA")

and

The British Columbia Ministry of Education ("Ministry of Education")

and

British Columbia Teachers' Federation ("BCTF")

(collectively referred to as "the Provincial Parties")

---

RE: LOU NO. 17: EDUCATION FUND AND IMPACT OF THE COURT CASES – FINAL  
AGREEMENT

---

WHEREAS the Provincial Parties acknowledge that, as a result of the majority of the Supreme Court of Canada<sup>1</sup> adopting Justice Donald's conclusion<sup>2</sup> that the *Education Improvement Act*<sup>3</sup> was unconstitutional and of no force or effect, that the BCPSEA-BCTF collective agreement provisions that were deleted by the *Public Education Flexibility and Choice Act* in 2002 and again in 2012 by the *Education Improvement Act* are restored;

AND WHEREAS the Provincial Parties further acknowledge that the Supreme Court of Canada's decision triggered Letter of Understanding No. 17 to the 2013-2019 BCPSEA-BCTF Provincial Collective Agreement, which required the Parties to re-open collective agreement negotiations regarding the collective agreement provisions that were restored by the Supreme Court of Canada.

AND WHEREAS the Provincial Parties further acknowledge that Letter of Understanding No. 17 required an agreement "regarding implementation and/or changes to the restored language";

AND WHEREAS this Memorandum of Agreement has been negotiated pursuant to Letter of Understanding No. 17 to the 2013-2019 BCPSEA-BCTF Provincial Collective Agreement and fully and finally resolves all matters related to the implementation of the Supreme Court of Canada's decision. As such, the Provincial Parties acknowledge that the re-opener process set out in Letter of Understanding No. 17 has been completed.

---

<sup>1</sup> *British Columbia Teachers' Federation v. British Columbia*, 2016 SCC 49

<sup>2</sup> *British Columbia Teachers' Federation v. British Columbia*, 2015 BCCA 164

<sup>3</sup> S.B.C. 2012, c. 3

THEREFORE THE PROVINCIAL PARTIES AGREE THAT:

**1. IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT**

Shared Commitment to Equitable Access to Learning

1. All students are entitled to equitable access to learning, achievement and the pursuit of excellence in all aspects of their education. The Provincial Parties are committed to providing all students with special needs with an inclusive learning environment which provides an opportunity for meaningful participation and the promotion of interaction with others. The implementation of this Memorandum of Agreement shall not result in any student being denied access to a school, educational program, course, or inclusive learning environment unless this decision is based on an assessment of the student's individual needs and abilities.

Schedule "A" of All Restored Collective Agreement Provisions

2. The Provincial Parties will develop a Schedule of all of the the BCPSEA-BCTF collective agreement provisions that were deleted by the Public Education Flexibility and Choice Act in 2002 and again in 2012 by the Education Improvement Act ("the restored collective agreement provisions"), which will be attached to this Memorandum of Agreement as Schedule "A".

Agreement to be Implemented for September of the 2017-2018 School Year

3. Commencing in September of the 2017-2018 school year and thereafter, school staffing will, subject to the terms of this Memorandum of Agreement, comply with the restored collective agreement provisions.

Continuation of Existing Funding for the Remainder of the 2016/2017 School Year

4. The Education Fund provisions referred to in Letter of Understanding No. 17 to the 2013-2019 BCPSEA-BCTF Provincial Collective Agreement will remain in place for the remainder of the 2016/2017 school year, following which the Education Fund provisions shall end.
5. The priority measures established pursuant to the January 5, 2017 Memorandum of Agreement Re: LOU No. 17, Education Fund and Impact of the Court Cases – Priority Measures will remain in place for the remainder of the 2016/2017 school year.

Agreement Implementation Committee

6. Following the execution of this Memorandum of Agreement, the Provincial Parties will continue to meet as needed through June 30, 2017 to facilitate implementation of the Agreement for the Spring staffing process. After June 30, 2017, the Provincial Parties will meet to facilitate implementation of this Memorandum of Agreement on a quarterly basis until the opening of the next round of collective bargaining. Specific activities to be undertaken during these meetings include, but are not limited to:

a. Restored Language: Housekeeping

Housekeeping changes mutually recommended by the local parties will be approved through a four-party process with one representative from BCPSEA, one representative from the BCTF, one representative from the School District, and one representative from the BCTF local Housekeeping changes will be limited to titles of committees, dates, names of positions, and terminology. This housekeeping process will not delay implementation of any of the restored language.

b. Updating Terminology Pertaining to Students with Special Needs

Terminology pertaining to students with special needs contained within the restored collective agreement provisions will be updated by the Provincial Parties. This process does not include changes to the definitions and classifications of special education designations and does not supersede or otherwise affect the work of the Class Composition Joint Committee set out in paragraph 20 below.

c. Dispute Resolution

Where a dispute arises regarding the interpretation or application of this Memorandum of Agreement, the following process will apply:

- i. The local parties will meet and attempt to resolve the dispute;
- ii. Where, after meeting, the local parties are unable to resolve the dispute, the local parties, with the assistance and representation of the Provincial Parties, will meet again and attempt to resolve the dispute;
- iii. Where, after meeting, both the local and Provincial Parties are unable to resolve the dispute, either party may file a grievance and utilize the grievance procedure to resolve the dispute.

**II. NON-ENROLLING TEACHER STAFFING RATIOS**

The following will form part of a final agreement as per LQU#17 regarding non-enrolling teacher staffing ratios:

7. Effective upon the commencement of the regular 2017/2018 school year, all language pertaining to learning specialists shall be implemented as follows:

- i) The minimum district ratios of learning specialists to students shall be as follows (except as provided for in (ii) below):
  - a. Teacher librarians shall be provided on a minimum pro-rated basis of at least one teacher librarian to seven hundred and two (702) students.
  - b. Counselors shall be provided on a minimum pro-rated basis of at least one counsellor to six hundred and ninety three (693) students.
  - c. Learning assistance teachers shall be provided on a minimum pro-rated basis of at least one learning assistance teacher to five hundred and four (504) students.

- d. Special education resource teachers shall be provided on a minimum pro-rated basis of at least one special education resource teacher per three hundred and forty two (342) students.
  - e. English as a second language teachers (ESL) shall be provided on a minimum pro-rated basis of at least one ESL teacher per seventy four (74) funded ESL students.
- ii) For the purpose of posing and/or filling FTE, the Employer may combine the non-enrolling teacher categories set out in paragraph 1(i)(c)-(e) into a single category. The Employer will be deemed to have fulfilled its obligations under paragraph 1(i)(c)-(e) where the total non-enrolling teacher FTE of this single category is equivalent to the sum of the teachers required from categories 1(i)(c)-(e).
- iii) Where a local collective agreement provided for services, caseload limits, or ratios additional or superior to the ratios provided in paragraph 1(i) above – the services, caseload limits or ratios from the local collective agreement shall apply. **Provisions to be identified in Schedule "A" to this Memorandum of Agreement.**
- iv) The aforementioned employee staffing ratios shall be based on the funded FTE student enrolment numbers as reported by the Ministry of Education.
- v) Where a non-enrolling teacher position remains unfilled following the completion of the applicable local post and fill processes, the local parties will meet to discuss alternatives for utilizing the FTE in another way. Following these discussions the Superintendent will make a final decision regarding how the FTE will be deployed. This provision is time limited and will remain in effect until the renewal of the BCPSEA-BCTF provincial collective agreement. Following the expiration of this provision, neither the language of this provision nor the practice that it establishes regarding alternatives for utilizing unfilled non-enrolling teacher positions will be referred to in any future arbitration or proceeding.

#### 8. Dispute Resolution

Where a dispute arises regarding the interpretation or application of the non-enrolling language, the following process will apply:

- a. The local parties will meet and attempt to resolve the dispute.
- b. Where, after meeting, the local parties are unable to resolve the dispute, the local parties, with the assistance and representation of the Provincial Parties, will meet again and attempt to resolve the dispute.
- c. Where, after meeting, both the local and Provincial Parties are unable to resolve the dispute, either party may file a grievance and utilize the grievance procedure to resolve the dispute.

### III. PROCESS AND ANCILLARY LANGUAGE

- 9. The BCPSEA-BCTF collective agreement process and ancillary provisions that were deleted by the Public Education Flexibility and Choice Act in 2002 and again in 2012 by the Education

Improvement Act will be restored. [Provisions to be Identified in Schedule "A" to this Memorandum of Agreement]

10. The Provincial Parties recognize that it may take time to transition from existing practices to the processes that are defined in the restored language. The 2017/2018 school year will serve as a transition period for full implementation of the restored language by January 31, 2018 as follows:

A. School-Based Process and Ancillary Language

Restored school-based process and ancillary language including, but not limited to, language pertaining to school-based teams, staffing committees, and the role and function of staff committees, shall be implemented upon the commencement of the regular 2017/2018 school year. [Provisions to be Identified in Schedule "A" to this Memorandum of Agreement]

B. District-Based Process and Ancillary Language

The following restored collective agreement provisions shall be implemented as soon as practicable but by no later than January 31, 2018. During this transition period, current practices may be utilized while the necessary supports are put in place to implement the process and ancillary language. [Provisions to be Identified in Schedule "A" to this Memorandum of Agreement]

- i. Restored school-based process and ancillary language that makes reference to a district-level process, and;
- ii. Restored district-level processes and ancillary language including, but not limited to language pertaining to district committees and screening panels.

11. Where the local parties agree they prefer to follow a process that is different than what is set out in the applicable local collective agreement process and ancillary provisions, they may request that the Provincial Parties enter into discussions to amend these provisions. Upon agreement of the Provincial Parties, the amended provisions would replace the process and ancillary provisions for the respective School District and local union. [Provisions to be Identified in Schedule "A" to this Memorandum of Agreement].

12. Where a dispute arises in anticipation of or during the 2017/2018 school year regarding clause 2 above, the following process will apply:

- i. The local parties will meet and attempt to resolve the dispute;
- ii. Where, after meeting, the local parties are unable to resolve the dispute, the local parties, with the assistance and representation of the Provincial Parties, will meet again and attempt to resolve the dispute;
- iii. Where, after meeting, both the local and Provincial Parties are unable to resolve the dispute, either party may file a grievance and utilize the grievance procedure.



**IV. CLASS SIZE AND COMPOSITION**

**PART I: CLASS SIZE PROVISIONS**

13. Effective for the commencement of the 2017/18 school year, the BCPSEA-BCTF collective agreement provisions regarding class size that were deleted by the Public Education and Flexibility and Choice Act in 2002 and again in 2012 by the Education Improvement Act will be implemented as set out below.

**Class Size Provisions: K-3**

14. Effective for the commencement of the 2017/2018 school year, the size of primary classes shall be limited as follows:

- A. Kindergarten classes shall not exceed 20 students;
- B. Grade 1 classes shall not exceed 22 students;
- C. Grade 2 classes shall not exceed 22 students;
- D. Grade 3 classes shall not exceed 22 students;

15. Where there is more than one primary grade in any class with primary students, the class size maximum for the lower grade shall apply.

16. Where there is a combined primary/intermediate class, an average of the maximum class size of the lowest involved primary grade and the maximum class size of the lowest involved intermediate grade will apply.

**K-3 Superior Provisions to Apply**

17. For primary and combined primary/intermediate classes where the restored collective agreement provisions provide for superior class size provisions beyond those listed in paragraphs 2 through 4 above, the superior provisions shall apply. **Provisions to be Identified in Schedule "A" to this Memorandum of Agreement.**

**Class Size Language: 4-12**

18. The BCPSEA-BCTF collective agreement provisions regarding Grade 4-12 class size that were deleted by the Public Education and Flexibility and Choice Act in 2002 and again in 2012 by the Education Improvement Act will be implemented upon the commencement of the 2017/2018 school year.

**PART II – CLASS COMPOSITION PROVISIONS**

**Implementation of Class Composition Language**

19. The BCPSEA-BCTF collective agreement provisions regarding class composition that were deleted by the Public Education and Flexibility and Choice Act in 2002 and again in 2012 by the Education Improvement Act will be implemented upon the commencement of the 2017/2018

school year. The Provincial Parties agree that the implementation of this language shall not result in a student being denied access to a school, educational program, course, or inclusive learning environment unless this decision is based on an assessment of the student's individual needs and abilities.

Class Composition Joint Committee

20. Given the complexity of class composition issues and the changes that have occurred within the definitions of special education designations and classifications, a Class Composition Joint Committee (The Committee) will be established upon ratification of the Letter of Understanding #17 final agreement to examine and resolve outstanding issues related to class composition as follows:

- A. After establishing terms of reference, the Committee will meet and attempt to agree upon a consistent approach to how composition impacts class size/teacher workload for those School Districts that have class composition language;
- B. If, after meeting, the Committee is unable to agree upon a consistent approach to class composition, the Committee will meet and attempt to agree upon the definitions of special education designations and classifications in the current context of educational service delivery;
- C. If the Committee is unable to agree on the definitions of special education designations by June 30, 2018, the matter will be referred to Arbitrator John Hall for a final and binding determination of the definitions and classifications of special education designations in the current context of educational service delivery. Arbitration dates will be pre-booked during the fall of 2018 and best efforts will be made to conclude the arbitration hearing by November 30, 2018. The Provincial Parties will request that Arbitrator Hall's decision be issued as soon as possible and, in any event, no later than January 31, 2019. This decision will be used to determine class organization for the 2019/2020 school year and thereafter until the Provincial Parties negotiate an alternative approach to class composition;
- D. Unless the Provincial Parties agree otherwise, during the 2017/2018 and 2018/2019 school year, the current Ministry of Education definitions of special education designations and classifications will apply on an interim and without prejudice basis while the work of the Committee set out in paragraphs 8(A-C) is completed;
- E. The Provincial Parties recognize that the interim Committee approach to class composition issues set out in paragraph 8 (A, B and D) is agreed to on a without prejudice basis. Neither of the Provincial Parties will refer to this approach or the practices that it establishes regarding class composition in any future collective bargaining, arbitration or proceeding, including the final and binding arbitration referenced in paragraph 8(C).

**PART III- CLASS SIZE AND COMPOSITION COMPLIANCE AND REMEDIES**

Efforts to Achieve Compliance: Provincial Approach

21. The Provincial Parties agree that paragraphs 22-25 of this agreement establish a provincial approach regarding the efforts that must be made to comply with the class size and composition provisions set out in Schedule "A" to this agreement and the remedies that are available where non-compliance occurs. This provincial approach applies to all School Districts and replaces all restored collective agreement provisions related to compliance and remedies for class size and composition. For clarity, the restored collective agreement compliance and remedy provisions that will be replaced by this provincial approach will be identified in a Schedule "B" to be developed by the Provincial Parties. The Provincial Parties commit to reviewing this provincial approach in the 2019 round of negotiations.

Best Efforts to Re-Meet to Achieve Compliance

22. School Districts will make best efforts to achieve full compliance with the collective agreement provisions regarding class size and composition for the commencement of the 2017/2018 school year and thereafter. Best efforts shall include:

- A. Re-examining existing school boundaries;
- B. Re-examining the utilization of existing space within a school or across schools that are proximate to one another;
- C. Utilizing temporary classrooms;
- D. Reorganizing the existing classes within the school to meet any class composition language, where doing so will not result in a reduction in a maximum class size by more than:
  - five students in grades K-3;
  - four students for secondary shop or lab classes where the local class size limits are below 30, and;
  - six students in all other grades.

These class size reductions shall not preclude a Superintendent from approving a smaller class.

Note: For the following School Districts, class sizes for K-1 split classes will not be reduced below 14 students:

- 10 (Arrow Lakes)
- 35 (Langley)
- 49 (Central Coast)
- 67 (Okanagan-Skaha)
- 74 (Gold Trail)

ERRORS AND OMISSIONS EXCEPTED

- 82 (Coast Mountain)
- 85 (Vancouver Island North)

E. Renegotiating the terms of existing lease or rental contracts that restrict the School District's ability to fully comply with the restored collective agreement provisions regarding class size and composition.

F. Completing the post-and-fill process for all vacant positions.

Non-Compliance

23. Notwithstanding paragraph 10, the Provincial Parties recognize that non-compliance with class size and composition language may occur. Possible reasons for non-compliance include, but are not limited to:

- compelling family issues;
- sibling attendance at the same school;
- the age of the affected student(s);
- distance to be travelled and/or available transportation;
- safety of the student(s);
- the needs and abilities of individual student(s);
- accessibility to special programs and services;
- anticipated student attrition;
- time of year;
- physical space limitations;
- teacher recruitment challenges.

Remedies for Non-Compliance

24. Where a School District has, as per paragraph 22 above, made best efforts to achieve full compliance with the restored collective agreement provisions regarding class size and composition, but has not been able to do so:

A. For classes that start in September, the District will not be required to make further changes to the composition of classes or the organization of the school after September 30 of the applicable school year. It is recognized that existing "flex factor" language that is set out in the restored collective agreement provisions will continue to apply for the duration of the class.

For classes that start after September, the District will not be required to make further changes to the composition of classes or the organization of schools after 21 calendar days from the start of the class.

It is recognized that existing "flex factor" language that is set out in the restored collective agreement provisions will continue to apply for the duration of the class.

- B. Teachers of classes with the restored class size and composition provisions will become eligible to receive a monthly remedy for non-compliance effective October 1, 2017 (or 22 calendar days from the start of the class) as follows:

$$(V) = (180 \text{ minutes}) \times (P) \times (S1 + S2)$$

V = the value of the additional compensation;

P = the percentage of a full-time instructional month that the teacher teaches the class; S1 = the highest number of students enrolled in the class during the month for which the calculation is made minus the maximum class size for that class;

S2 = the number of students by which the class exceeds the class composition limits of the collective agreement during the month for which the calculation is made.

**Note:** If there is non-compliance for any portion of a calendar month the remedy will be provided for the entire month. It is recognized that adjustments to remedies may be triggered at any point during the school year if there is a change in S1 or S2.

- C. Once the value of the remedy has been calculated, the teacher will determine which of the following remedies will be awarded:
- i. Additional preparation time for the affected teacher
  - ii. Additional non-enrolling staffing added to the school specifically to work with the affected teacher's class
  - iii. Additional enrolling staffing to co-teach with the affected teacher
  - iv. Other remedies that the local parties agree would be appropriate

In the event that it is not practicable to provide the affected teacher with any of these remedies during the school year, the local parties will meet to determine what alternative remedy the teacher will receive.

**Dispute Resolution:**

25. In the event that a dispute arises regarding whether a School District has made best efforts to achieve full compliance with the collective agreement provisions regarding class size and composition, the following process will apply:
- i. The local parties will meet and attempt to resolve the dispute.
  - ii. Where, after meeting, the local parties are unable to resolve the dispute, the local parties, with the assistance and representation of the Provincial Parties, will meet again and attempt to resolve the dispute.
  - iii. Where, after meeting, both the local and Provincial Parties are unable to resolve the dispute, either party may file a grievance and utilize the grievance procedure to resolve the dispute.

IV. EFFECTIVE DATE

26. Subject to ratification by the Provincial Parties, the provisions in this Memorandum of Agreement will become effective on September 1, 2017, unless specified otherwise (including, but not limited to, paragraphs 4 and 5 above).

Dated at Vancouver, British Columbia this 3rd day of March, 2017

British Columbia Teachers' Federation  
per



British Columbia Public School Employers' Association  
per



British Columbia Ministry of Education  
per



## **Synopsis of Prior Years Board Evaluation**

- 2012-2013: Board Evaluation Survey using the Role of the Board as a basis for evaluation. Survey results were discussed in a closed Committee of the Whole working session on July 2, 2013. The meeting notes were disclosed at the October 14, 2014 regular meeting.
- 2013-2014: Board Evaluation Survey using the Role of the Board as a basis for evaluation, with a revised ranking structure. Survey results were discussed in a closed Committee of the Whole working session on August 27, 2014. The meeting notes were disclosed at the September 9, 2014 regular meeting.
- 2014-2015: Board Self-Evaluation Survey that asked three questions: What do you feel is going well with our work as a collective Board? What areas in our work need improvement or attention in the next year? What are any new areas of work you think we should be initiating? A meeting to discuss survey results was rescheduled several times. The survey results were included for discussion in the following year's survey review on June 21, 2016.
- 2015-2016: Board Evaluation Survey using the Strategic Plan as a basis for evaluation. The 2015-2016 survey results, the results of the prior year's survey, and the Special Advisor's Report for SD83 were discussed at a Special Closed Meeting on June 21, 2016.
- 2016-2017: Individual interviews with each trustee to discuss thoughts on process. Summary provided at the May 16, 2017 Committee of the Whole.

## **Questions to consider for 2017-2018 Board Evaluation:**

1. Why are we here?
2. How do we define success?
3. How can the board—this board—be of most value to the organization?
4. What behavior are we settling for?
5. What five things should we track as a board?
6. Reflections on the term:
  - a. Have we followed through on all on our strategic plan priorities?
  - b. What would you say to the next board? what it means to be a trustee, what they should be aware of?

# TRUSTEE ORIENTATION HANDBOOK



## Table of Contents

1. Introduction
  - a. Welcome
  - b. Vision, Mission and Values
  - c. Outline of familiarization process with senior staff
    - i. Date for first working session for orientation: December 16, 2014 from 9:30 am to 2:30 pm at the SBO
    - ii. Introduction to Board Staff and Principals (date to be determined)
    - iii. Tour of district facilities (date to be determined)
  - d. Website Orientation
2. Role of the Trustee and Board
  - a. School Act
  - b. Board Policies
  - c. Strategic Plan
  - d. Achievement Contract
  - e. Local Government Elections Regulation / Board of Education of School District No. 46 (Sunshine Coast) Bylaw No. 74
  - f. Report to the Community
3. School District Staff
4. School District Budget (View current and past budgets online at: <http://www.sd46.bc.ca/index.php/budget>)
5. Calendars
  - a. School Calendar/School Hours
  - b. Meetings – Board office, principals, staff
    - i. Communications Plan
  - c. Budget – process and dates to be aware of
  - d. District Awards and Recognition (Service Recognition, Graduation Ceremonies, Remembrance Day Assemblies/Legion Ceremonies, etc.)
6. Board Committees
7. BCSTA – BC School Trustee Association
8. BCPSEA – BC Public School Employers’ Association
9. Motions – What is the process?
10. Trustee Stipend, Expense Form and Professional Development Guidelines
11. Glossary – Commonly used acronyms and terms in education
12. SD46 Policy and Bylaws (See Appendix 1 or view online at: <http://www.sd46.bc.ca/index.php/policies>)
13. Parent Involvement / PAC Communication
14. Programs and Services (Information available online at: <http://www.sd46.bc.ca/index.php/programs-and-services>)



**APPENDICES:**

1. Board Policies and Bylaws
2. *School Act* – Sections 4, 5 & 6
3. Property List
4. School District Brochures





PUBLIC SECTOR  
GOVERNANCE

**A GUIDE TO THE  
PRINCIPLES OF  
GOOD PRACTICE**



OFFICE OF THE  
**Auditor General**  
of British Columbia



## WHY THE EMPHASIS ON GOVERNANCE?

Governance deals with the structures and processes by which an organization is directed, controlled and held to account. Proper governance provides the means to help an organization achieve its goals and objectives.

The achievement of good governance is important for every public sector organization, including ministries, Crown agencies, health authorities and school boards, among others. Many of government's programs and services also cut across organizational or jurisdictional boundaries and if they are to be delivered in a seamless way then good governance needs to be in place.

The principles and ideas discussed here apply to cross-government initiatives as much as to individual public sector organizations.

“Government agrees that good governance is essential to the success of organizations, regardless of whether they are in the public, private or not-for-profit sectors.”

Government of BC response to the Office of the Auditor General of British Columbia report, *Public Sector Governance: A Guide to the Principles of Good Practice*.



## WHERE SHOULD WE START?

Good governance is underpinned by five core principles. An organization that uses good governance is one that always, in word and action, demonstrates: accountability; leadership; integrity; stewardship; and transparency (the A - LIST).

- A** **Accountability** is the process whereby organizations, and the individuals within them, take responsibility for their decisions and actions.
- L** **Leadership** is setting the “tone at the top” which is absolutely critical if an entire organization is to embrace good governance.
- I** **Integrity** is acting in a way that is impartial, ethical and not misusing information or resources, which is reflected in part through compliance with legislation, regulations and policies as well as the instilling of high standards of professionalism at all levels.
- S** **Stewardship** is the act of looking after resources on behalf of the public and is demonstrated by maintaining or improving capacity to serve the public interest over time.
- T** **Transparency** is achieved when decisions and actions are open, meaning stakeholders, the public and employees have access to full, accurate and clear information on these matters.



## HOW CAN THESE PRINCIPLES BE PUT INTO PRACTICE?

The elements that constitute good public sector governance, and upon which practices can be modelled, can be demonstrated as the components of a house, as follows.

### House of Governance



Source: Australian National Audit Office, *Public Sector Governance*, 2003.

### Governance Framework

1. **LEADERSHIP, ETHICS AND A CULTURE COMMITTED TO GOOD PUBLIC SECTOR GOVERNANCE**  
The implementation, evaluation and improvement of a public sector organization's governance structures and processes are the responsibility of leaders, and without such commitments, there would be no foundation to build on.
2. **STAKEHOLDER RELATIONSHIPS (INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL)**  
Understanding the various roles, accountabilities and needs of each stakeholder group contributes to strong

relationships, and supports the success of the three central components, or "windows", of the "House of Governance".

3. **RISK MANAGEMENT**  
This provides a public sector organization with the means to understand and address risks in order to better achieve its objectives.
4. **INTERNAL COMPLIANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY**  
An efficient and well-governed public sector organization will ensure that internal controls and accountabilities are clearly defined and consistent with the organization's objectives.
5. **PLANNING AND PERFORMANCE MONITORING**  
Governing bodies that review and foster better planning and performance monitoring will be more effective and relevant.
6. **EXTERNAL COMPLIANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY**  
External scrutiny is an integral part of work in the public service and meeting these accountabilities is one of the measures of success for public sector organizations.
7. **INFORMATION AND DECISION SUPPORT**  
Information management is critical for a public sector organization to meet its objectives and accountabilities, namely by ensuring that the right information gets to the appropriate people in a timely manner.
8. **REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS**  
Ongoing review, evaluation and adjustments of governance arrangements are a key process and this includes the governing body checking its own structures, processes and overall performance.



## HOW SHOULD WE GAUGE OUR PROGRESS AND SUCCESSSES?

Good governance requires more than just a checklist approach and it is important that the following not be seen as an end in itself. The items listed below are a starting point for gauging the state of structures and processes that aid public sector organizations in achieving good governance and, in turn, obtaining stakeholder confidence.

### *Leadership, ethics and a culture committed to good public sector governance*

- Leaders have clearly defined mandates and responsibilities as well as the skills, knowledge and available resources to lead effectively.
- A formal code of conduct is adopted by the organization.
- Appropriate structures and processes are in place to ensure the organization is free of influence by prejudice, bias or conflicts of interest.
- Members of the governing body exercise leadership by conducting themselves in accordance with high standards of behaviour, as a role model for others in the organization.
- Good governance flows from a shared ethos or culture, with this being expressed as values and demonstrated in behaviour.

“Regardless of organizational type, corporate governance regimes are unlikely to be effective where there is a lack of clarity about the participants involved, their relationships with each other and their respective responsibilities.”

Board Resourcing and Development Office of British Columbia, Best Practice Guidelines.

### *Stakeholder relationships (internal and external)*

- An active and planned approach is taken to defining and understanding stakeholder relationships so they can be developed and strengthened.
- Appropriate structures and processes are in place to measure and review the quality and effectiveness of service or product delivery to stakeholders (both internal and external).
- Clear channels of communication are established with stakeholders regarding the organization’s mission, roles, objectives and performance.
- Effective communication is established with stakeholders, including procedures for both internal and external enquiries and complaints.
- Information in general is shared among key players, politicians, public servants and other stakeholders subject to respecting the confidentiality of personal information and commercial confidences.
- Communication to stakeholders is balanced, understandable, transparent and timely.
- Accountability to stakeholders is promoted by publicizing the identity of the members of the governing body, together with information about how and why they came to be appointed.
- Clear management processes are established and documented.



## *Risk management*

- The system is based on a clear understanding of the organization's objectives.
- Key strategic, operational and financial risks associated with the organization's objectives are identified and assessed, appropriate responses (e.g., implementing internal controls) are determined, and assurance is provided that the chosen responses are effective.
- Risks are monitored and the responses are evaluated.
- The effectiveness of the risk management system is reported publicly, referring explicitly to the governing body that holds responsibility for the system.
- The risk management system considers the full range of the organization's activities and responsibilities, and continuously checks that various good management disciplines are in place.

## *Internal compliance and accountability*

- Staff's roles, responsibilities and accountabilities and how those relate to the rest of the organization are clearly defined.
- A strong internal control environment with processes and measures that are aligned with the external accountability framework is created.
- Actions already completed are reported and discussed, and stakeholder input is sought to help plan and carry out new activities.
- Staff are held accountable to the governing body, but the governing body's responsibilities to staff are also acknowledged.
- Clear policy is implemented on when and how the governing body will consult and involve staff and their representatives in decision-making.

## *Planning and performance monitoring*

- A clear statement of the organization's purpose is in place, which is used as a basis for planning.
- Appropriate structures and processes are in place to monitor financial and non-financial performance against the organization's plan.
- Financial and non-financial performance measures are reported.
- Suitable and practical performance measures are used as management and accountability tools.
- The quality of service for users is measured and such information is made available as necessary to review service quality effectively and regularly.

## *External compliance and accountability*

- A clear understanding exists of external stakeholder institutions and the organization's accountability and responsibilities to them.
- Strong and robust organizational structures and processes are in place to comply with and meet external accountabilities.
- An annual report (including financial statements) is published on a timely basis that presents an objective, balanced and understandable account along with an assessment of the organization's activities, achievements, financial position and performance prospects.
- A statement is published on whether or not standards or codes of governance have been adopted. This statement should identify the standards or codes adopted, whether compliance has been achieved with them and, if not, in what respect there has not been compliance and why.
- The interest and confidence of the public and service users are encouraged and maintained through relationship and dialogue building.



- The organization as a whole seeks and welcomes feedback, and responds quickly and responsibly to comments.
- The organization has a clear policy on the types of issues on which it will consult or engage the public and service users and clearly explains how it will use the input received in decision-making and how it will report back on these decisions.
- Relationships with the leaders of other organizations are formed and maintained as a foundation for effective working relationships at operational and strategic levels.

### *Information and decision support*

- Governing bodies concern themselves with levels of detail that are most appropriate for their role, while ensuring they still provide effective oversight and scrutiny.
- Information and decision support structures reflect both external and internal accountabilities as well as major organizational decisions.
- The organization develops strong and robust record-keeping and file management systems.
- Clear objectives are stated for decisions.
- Information is tailored to the functions of the governing body.
- Information is directly relevant to the decisions the governing body has to make; is timely and objective; and gives clear explanations of technical issues and their implications.
- Professional advice on legal and financial matters is taken and used appropriately in decision-making and elsewhere throughout the organization.
- The organization's resources are used to provide the information and advice that is needed for good governance.



### *Review and evaluation of governance arrangements*

- Reviews and evaluations are carried out on an ongoing basis, and led internally. As well, external reviews should be completed at intervals to give the organization the benefit of outside objectivity and expertise.
- Controls are reviewed as part of a continuous improvement process.
- Risks are monitored and evaluated constantly and programs and procedures are established to address these risks.

Ongoing fiscal constraints and increasing public expectations mean that public sector organizations are often being asked to do more with less. Strong organizational governance is an essential tool to ensure that government organizations continue to meet their stakeholder's needs and expectations.

- Office of the Auditor General of British Columbia

For further information on this, please refer to the detailed report, *Public Sector Governance: A Guide to the Principles of Good Practice*.





OFFICE OF THE  
**Auditor General**  
of British Columbia

Victoria, British Columbia

Tel: 250-419-6100

Email: [bcauditor@bcauditor.com](mailto:bcauditor@bcauditor.com)

[www.bcauditor.com](http://www.bcauditor.com)

Visit our website for the most current information on [Public Sector Governance](#).



# K-12 Public Education Funding in British Columbia

FUNDING MODEL REVIEW DISCUSSION PAPER

Ministry of Education | March 2018

# A Review of B.C.'s Public Education Funding Model is Underway

## INTRODUCTION

The British Columbia (B.C.) Ministry of Education (the Ministry) is consulting with K-12 sector stakeholders to review B.C.'s public education funding model. The goal of the funding model review is to ensure that available funding is allocated equitably across B.C.'s 60 Boards of Education.

B.C.'s education system continues to generate positive student outcomes. More students are graduating than ever before, with an 84 percent six-year completion rate.<sup>1</sup> This includes significant increases in recent years among Indigenous students and students with special needs in recent years.<sup>2</sup> Further success has been demonstrated by B.C. students through strong results on national and international education skills assessments. B.C. ranked first in the world for reading, third for science, and ninth for mathematics in the 2015 Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), out of 72 participating OECD jurisdictions.<sup>3</sup>

Building on this strong foundation, the Ministry is committed to fostering a flexible, personalized and sustainable education system, which is focused on strong outcomes and equitable access to educational opportunities for all students. While B.C.'s student outcomes are among the best in the world, there are still areas for improvement such as closing the gap between Indigenous students and children in care with all other students. Recognizing that funding is an influencing factor in the delivery of educational programs and services across the province, it is important to explore the ways in which B.C.'s funding model can support equitable access and improved outcomes.

In response to feedback from education sector stakeholders, the Minister of Education announced a funding model review, which is now underway. The review is focused on the way available funding (as determined by government through the annual budgeting process) is allocated to B.C.'s 60 Boards of Education. The funding model review will include several phases. The Ministry and the BC School Trustees Association (BCSTA) have developed a Statement of Principles for a new funding model. At the same time, the Ministry has conducted initial research, exploratory engagement meetings with stakeholders, and surveys during the fall of 2017 – a summary of emerging themes is included in this paper.

This paper will inform the work of an Independent Review Panel, which will make recommendations to the Minister of Education in summer 2018. Once government has an opportunity to review and consider the recommendations, the Ministry of Education will then develop options for transitioning to a new model, which is expected to be in place for the 2019/20 school year.

---

<sup>1</sup> The six-year completion rate is the proportion of students who graduate, with a B.C. Certificate of Graduation or B.C. Adult Graduation Diploma, within six years from the first time they enrol in Grade 8, adjusted for migration in and out of B.C.

<sup>2</sup> Six-year Completion and Graduation Rates <http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/reporting/province.php>

<sup>3</sup> Measuring up: Canadian Results of the OECD PISA Study *The Performance of Canada's Youth in Science, Reading and Mathematics (2015)* funded by the Council of Ministers of Education of Canada [http://www.cmec.ca/Publications/Lists/Publications/Attachments/365/Book\\_PISA2015\\_EN\\_Dec5.pdf](http://www.cmec.ca/Publications/Lists/Publications/Attachments/365/Book_PISA2015_EN_Dec5.pdf)

The purpose of this discussion paper is to summarize the feedback that has been heard through the process so far.

Interested parties are asked to submit written comments on this discussion paper to the panel (details are provided at the end of the paper).

## **BACKGROUND: CURRENT FUNDING MODEL**

The current method of allocating funding to the province's 60 Boards of Education has been in place since 2002. In general, the model does not allocate funding for a specific purpose. Operating grants represent the vast majority of funding to school districts (over \$5 billion annually) with 79 percent of funding being allocated on a basic per student (full-time equivalent) basis, and the remaining funds being allocated based on unique student and district (geographic) needs.

Outside of operating grants, a series of 'special grants' totaling \$680 million annually provide additional funding for specific purposes—such as facilities maintenance, the operation of Strong Start Centres, etc. Only 10 percent of total operating funding is restricted for a specific purpose, while the remainder is flexible and available for Boards of Education to direct according to local priorities.

The current model was designed in an era of enrolment decline. Much has changed since that time, more specifically:

- Over the last 15 years, B.C. has experienced a lengthy period of enrolment decline followed by three years of significant enrolment growth (1 percent each year), which is forecast to continue for the foreseeable future; and
- Communities, industries, and populations have changed dramatically, for example, urbanization has led to population declines in some communities and rapid growth in others, resulting in major changes to local student populations across the province.

Further, as social, cultural, technological, and economic trends are rapidly shifting, so too are the ways in which students are learning and the skills they will require to succeed after graduation in an increasingly complex and interconnected world. This has led to new methods of education delivery, such as the Ministry's curriculum redesign, as well as changes to data collection through the implementation of a new student information system. At the same time, the expectations placed on schools and school districts by parents, stakeholders, and the public have also increased over time – especially in rural communities. Parents expect a highly personalized approach to educational programs and services for their children, focused on each individual student's specific learning needs. Industry expects that their immediate and future workforce needs will be met.

Currently, funding is not directly linked to furthering student success, but rather, is largely based on inputs (numbers of students reported by school districts in specific categories). This approach leads to more time and resources being spent on counting and assessing students, as opposed to delivering educational services and driving student outcomes. B.C.'s K-12 education system must prepare students for the future by helping them successfully transition to post-secondary education and the workplace, and to thrive in a rapidly changing world. The funding model has not adjusted to

reflect the changes noted above, with the same model having remained in place for more than 15 years.

In contrast, other jurisdictions have taken steps in recent years to adjust their models to reflect changes in their educational, legislative, community, and economic landscapes. B.C.'s funding model is becoming outdated relative to other provinces. For these reasons, now is an excellent time to review the funding model in B.C. to understand whether modifications should be made to ensure funding is dispersed in a manner that best contributes to individual student success, and aligns with the local and regional operational realities that school districts face.

## REVIEW PROCESS TO DATE

### *Initial Steps*

Since October 2017, a number of important steps have been completed in the early stages of the funding model review, including:

- Established a Statement of Principles in conjunction with the B.C. School Trustees Association (BCSTA) to ensure the new funding model reflects the priorities of the K-12 sector's co-governing partners;
- Completed a cross-jurisdictional analysis of funding models across Canada, as well as in-depth reviews of Ministry program areas, and a scan of key funding issues since 2002;
- Review of the rural education engagements completed by the Ministry in 2017;
- Administered a technical survey and a perspectives survey to 350 sector stakeholders, including Trustees, Superintendents, and Secretary-Treasurers;
- Invited Boards of Education and stakeholder groups to provide written submissions for the Independent Review Panel to consider; and
- Met one-on-one with several K-12 sector stakeholder organizations, with additional meetings planned over the coming months.

### *Statement of Principles*

A Statement of Principles for the new funding model has been co-developed by the Ministry and the BCSTA to help ensure that the new funding model focuses on distributing available funding in an equitable manner that supports continuous improvement of student outcomes.

The principles are that the funding model will be:

- **Responsive:** Allocates available resources amongst Boards of Education in consideration of unique local and provincial operational requirements.
- **Equitable:** Facilitates access to comparable levels of educational services and opportunities for individual students across the province.
- **Stable and Predictable:** Supports strategic, multi-year planning for educational programming and school district operations.

- **Flexible:** Respects the autonomy of, and does not unnecessarily restrict, individual Boards of Education in the spending of their allocations to further student success.
- **Transparent:** Calculates funding using a clear and transparent methodology.
- **Accountable:** Allocates resources to Boards of Education in the most efficient manner and ensures that resources provided are being utilized as intended.

### **Emerging Themes**

Seven key themes have emerged from the consultations and research to date. Each identified theme includes a description of the current state, a discussion of the issues, challenges, and opportunities that have been raised through the review process thus far—posing a number of key questions that can be considered in the next phase of this process. These themes may be adjusted over the course of the next stage of the funding model review process, depending on the feedback received and results of further research (see Next Steps section).

## **Theme 1: Student Success in the Context of an Evolving Education System**

### **What We’ve Heard**

**The current model does not directly incent improvements to student outcomes, and may not provide sufficient flexibility to enable individualized and flexible educational approaches to further student success.**

*“Students in the province deserve a quality education no matter where they live. Any changes to the funding formula must maintain or improve equity and access for all students in the province.”*

– Survey Respondent

### **Current State**

The funding model that has been in place since 2002 does not include any direct link between funding and student outcomes, and does not explicitly promote student success. However, there is no consensus amongst stakeholders on how to define meaningful, relevant outcomes either broadly or for individual students, and so this concern must be viewed in the context of a high-performing education system with graduation rates and other education outcomes at an all-time high.

The current model provides supplementary allocations to address the unique needs of students and characteristics of school districts. However, gaps in student achievement persist, for example, completion rates and assessment scores differ between rural and urban students, between Indigenous and non-Indigenous students, and for students with special needs or other vulnerabilities such as children in care. The 2016/17 six-year completion rates were 69 percent for students with special needs, 66 percent for Indigenous students, and 50 percent for Indigenous children in care, which fall well below the 84 percent completion rate for all students. The rural education

engagement process also highlighted that rural student completion rates were, on average, 7.7 percent below urban completion rates from 2013/14 to 2015/16. Current funding approaches for various educational services and programs may not be contributing to better outcomes for all students to the greatest extent. There may be opportunities to fund differently to support improved student outcomes.

In addition, the emergence of new technology and trends towards online and blended education delivery in some cases, require a funding model that can support multiple delivery methods while encouraging a flexible, personalized learning experience for all students.

B.C.'s new curriculum implementation began in 2016/17 for Kindergarten to Grade 9, and will continue with Grade 10 in 2018/19 and Grades 11-12 in 2019/20. While additional funding has been provided to support educators through this transition, feedback from stakeholder survey participants suggests that changes need to be made to the funding model to support the new curriculum by recognizing that the current course-based funding approach may not fully reflect the evolving ways in which educational programs will be delivered now and into the future.

The new curriculum is student-focused and does not specify delivery methods – learning happens in a variety of places with flexible time frames and pedagogical approaches. The current funding model distinguishes between different types of learning environments with varying levels of funding depending on whether it is distributed learning or in a 'bricks-and-mortar' school. As well, funding based on registration in an approved list of courses for certain grades can limit flexibility and choice for students, and in some cases, has inadvertently led to a focus on registering students to maximize funding rather than focusing on each student's learning needs, preferences and outcomes.

Seventy-four percent of survey respondents indicated that delivering personalized and competency-driven learning will result in operational challenges that may not be appropriately recognized in the current funding model. These challenges may vary by school district. The recent rural education engagement process found that many small school districts, or those where students are more geographically dispersed into smaller schools, already offer a high degree of personalization, while school districts operating a greater number of larger schools may find it more challenging to allocate appropriate resources and supplies to achieve a comparable level of personalization.

This funding model review is an opportunity to investigate whether different funding approaches could lead to further improvements in student achievement, greater equity of access to educational programs and services for all students, and better alignment with the changes that are underway in the delivery of educational services and implementation of the new curriculum.

### **Key Questions**

Questions to explore through the next stage of the review could include:

- Should funding vary by method of delivery, by level of education, by subject matter, and/or by type of student, or should Boards of Education have the flexibility to develop programs and services without having to worry about multiple funding components?

- Could the funding model better support changes in educational program delivery, including more flexibility, individualized learning, cross-curricular studies, and teacher collaboration, in ways that result in better outcomes for students?
- Can the funding model be modified to help close educational gaps and improve equity of access to educational programs and services?
- Can different funding approaches be used to promote individual student choice?
- Should funding directly incent improvements to individual student success?
- Are there certain types of funding that should be targeted or restricted to allow government to direct funds for specific purposes or policy initiatives, and to track those expenditures and outcomes more rigorously?

## Theme 2: Education for Special Needs, Vulnerable and Indigenous Students

### *What We've Heard*

**Inclusive education is the concept of integrating students with designated special needs, vulnerable students, and Indigenous students into a regular classroom setting in a manner that supports their individual success. Initial research and stakeholder feedback has revealed that education funding approaches for special needs, vulnerable and Indigenous students in B.C. lags in three key ways:**

- 1. The current funding directs a disproportionate amount of time and resources towards administration, assessments, and paperwork, rather than direct services to students;**
- 2. There are vulnerable student populations which are not specifically included within the funding formula, and the data being used to calculate existing allocations may not be comprehensive enough to capture the true landscape of vulnerable student populations in school districts; and**
- 3. The rules around targeted funding for Indigenous students may be too restrictive and may not be enabling better outcomes for Indigenous students.**

*“Education is a basic right for ALL students - not just typical students but those with complex learning needs as well. I believe that if competencies are important to society, we need to shift our culture to that of complete inclusiveness.... and that means meeting the needs of all students - not just the majority.”*  
*– Survey Respondent*

### **Current State**

A summary of the challenges faced by the identified student groups (special needs, vulnerable and Indigenous students) is discussed in more detail below, and includes key questions for consideration in the next stage of the review for each of these student groups.



## 1. STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

*“Support for inclusion of students with special educational needs is generally the most challenging area to address with the current system.”*  
– Survey Respondent

Challenges in providing support to all students with additional needs emerged as a strong theme in the stakeholder surveys. Seventy-seven percent of respondents had the opinion that there are students who require services and supports that are not receiving them within the context of the current process for assessing, designating, and issuing funding (some of whom have medical conditions, others who require social or other types of supports) not specifically captured within the model.

The current funding model incentivizes school districts to devote a great deal of time and resources towards assessing students in order to secure additional funding, which generates more paperwork and administration costs. Several school districts reported spending between 15 and 20 percent of their overall special education budget on administration, assessments, paperwork, and reporting, instead of services to students. Extrapolating provincially, this would equate to well over \$100 million per year that could be repurposed from administration to educational service delivery to support these students.

One unintended consequence of the current diagnosis-and reporting-based funding approach for special education services is long wait times for assessments, in both urban and rural districts, and a lag in access to services for these students. The recent rural education review found that wait times for assessments could be longer than one and a half years in some school districts, forcing many parents to pay up to \$3,000 to have their children assessed privately. In addition, students may require support that falls outside the current diagnosis-based system, and these students may not be offered the services that they require because they do not attract any supplemental funding. Although the percentage of students designated as having special needs within the broader B.C. student population has stayed relatively constant over the past 15 years, the number of students being diagnosed in supplemental funding categories has increased by 65 percent since 2002. Overall, student enrolment has fallen by 10 percent during this period.

Many other Canadian provinces such as Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Ontario use differential modifiers to predict vulnerability and the incidence of students with additional needs, and do not solely rely on assessments or reporting to determine funding levels. Only 15 percent of stakeholder survey respondents expressed a preference for keeping the current funding approach; the vast majority recommended moving away from a predominantly medical diagnosis-based model for special education funding.

### **Key Questions**

Opportunities to be explored through the funding model review may include:

- Should an alternative, non-diagnosis (or reporting-based) model of funding students with special needs be considered?

- How can a new funding model ensure that individual students, in all parts of the province, receive the support they require in a timely manner?
- How can a new funding model reduce administrative costs and increase resources dedicated to services to students?
- Could the funding model better support special needs students in ways that result in better outcomes for students?

## 2. VULNERABLE STUDENTS

The current funding model includes a Supplement for Vulnerable Students, which is calculated based on economic conditions, demographic vulnerabilities, social conditions, and educational attainment. This supplement provides a small amount of additional funding to districts to assist with providing services to vulnerable students, on top of funding received through CommunityLINK. The CommunityLINK funding is a special purpose grant that has been in place since 2002/03, and is used to support meal programs, mental health services, and other initiatives for vulnerable students. A total of \$63.6 million was disbursed across all public school districts in 2017/18 for this purpose. Separate funding is also provided for provincial resource programs, which support educational services for students in hospitals, in youth custody, or in treatment centres.

However, preliminary findings from reports by B.C.'s Office of the Auditor General and from the B.C. Representative for Children and Youth, suggest that not all the needs of vulnerable students are being met by Boards of Education. In addition, there is a degree of inequity in the system where some school districts have local municipalities that match government funding or have more robust Parent Advisory Committee networks with the ability to raise significant funds for vulnerable student services.

### *Key Questions*

The funding model review presents an opportunity to investigate whether there are more effective approaches to allocating funding for vulnerable students. Potential questions may include:

- How can a new funding model contribute to improved equity of access to services, and improved outcomes for vulnerable students?
- Should allocations for vulnerable students be combined with those for other students?
- Should the funding model differentiate between the needs of different types of vulnerable students?
- Are there data sources from other agencies that could be incorporated to better capture trends in vulnerable student populations in school districts?

## 3. INDIGENOUS STUDENTS

The current funding model provides an allocation to Boards of Education for each self-identified Indigenous student (over and above the basic per student amount). This funding is targeted and must be spent on the provision of Indigenous education programs and services, over and above the

regular education program. There were 58,283 self-identified Indigenous students in 2016/17 and total supplemental funding was \$70.3 million in 2017/18.

Many stakeholder survey respondents felt that targeted funding for Indigenous students is sufficient to address the development and delivery of Indigenous education programs. However, some feedback suggests that the current use of a per-pupil rate for self-identified Indigenous students is not equitable, because services cost more in some districts than in others, and because reliance on students to self-report may lead to under-representation and, therefore, a lack of services to some students.

In addition, while the completion rate for Indigenous students was 66 percent in 2016/17, up from 47 percent in 2003/04 (one year after the current funding formula was introduced), this is still significantly lower than the completion rate for all students. The current funding model may not be allocating funding in a manner that best improves outcomes for Indigenous students, and this warrants further analysis and discussions.

Funding for Indigenous student education is complex, as both the provincial government and federal government have different responsibilities, and there is a direct relationship between funding levels provided by each. Any changes to Indigenous student education funding must be discussed with the other levels of government involved in the education of Indigenous students, including the First Nations Education Steering Committee and the Government of Canada. Funding changes could impact federal funding allocated through the Tripartite Education Framework Agreement, which is currently being re-negotiated. The Province is also committed to implementing the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which could manifest as a true educational partnership with Indigenous peoples based on rights, reconciliation and respect.

### **Key Questions**

A recent report from B.C.'s Office of the Auditor General recommended evaluating the effectiveness of targeted funding and enhancement agreements as strategies to close the gaps in education outcomes between Indigenous and non-Indigenous students.<sup>4</sup> There is now an opportunity to review and modify the current funding model with respect to this type of funding. Potential questions to be explored include:

- Should there be a more explicit link between funding and closing educational gaps for Indigenous students?
- Are there opportunities to improve the approach to funding services for Indigenous students in alignment with the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> AN AUDIT OF THE EDUCATION OF ABORIGINAL STUDENTS IN THE B.C. PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM (November 2015), B.C. Auditor General, [https://www.bcauditor.com/sites/default/files/publications/reports/OAGBC%20Aboriginal%20Education%20Report\\_FINAL.pdf](https://www.bcauditor.com/sites/default/files/publications/reports/OAGBC%20Aboriginal%20Education%20Report_FINAL.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> UNITED NATIONS DECLARATION ON THE RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES (March 2008), United Nations, [http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS\\_en.pdf](http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf)

- Should funding be allocated to Boards of Education for Indigenous students include a per-pupil amount based on self-identification, a grant based on general population data, or other criteria?

## Theme 3: Responsiveness to Local Circumstances

### *What We've Heard*

**The funding model does not adjust sufficiently for enrolment dynamics between and within districts, differences in types, sizes and geography of schools, or composition of students.**

*"The proportion of funding that is directly variable with enrolment is too high."*

- Survey Respondent

*"The formula needs to recognize the unique characteristics of each school district."*

- Survey Respondent

### *Current State*

Enrolment in B.C. has been increasing over the past several years. Despite this provincial trend, there is significant variability in enrolment amongst different school districts and even schools within the same school district - some are experiencing rapid growth, while others are facing a continuous slow decline.

School district enrolment changes every year due to demographic changes, as well as migration between districts, to and from the independent school system, and between provinces. The current funding model cannot respond to real time enrolment changes within a school district; instead student counts are currently made at three points in the school year. In addition, some school districts have voiced concerns that the funding model is not responsive to demographic shifts during the school year for vulnerable student populations, including refugees.

The current model includes funding protection to ensure that no district experiences a decline in operating grants greater than 1.5 percent compared to the previous year's September funding. Funding protection is intended to support school districts experiencing significant enrolment decline, but does not benefit districts with relatively flat enrolment that have all of the same inflationary pressures that other school districts face, but may not receive additional funding year over year. Also, the current model does not consider potential economies of scale in those districts where enrolment is increasing and larger numbers of students attract significant amounts of funding.

The current funding model includes allocations for a range of geographic factors. However, 64 percent of stakeholder survey respondents felt that there are additional factors that are not captured by the current geographic supplements, such as differences in costs to provide transportation services, and differing incidences of poverty and vulnerability. Further, respondents suggested a preference for adjusting the funding mix to a more balanced ratio between base funding and supplemental funding, compared to the current ratio, which is more than 80:20.

Finally, the current model may not appropriately consider different enrolment and student population dynamics within a single school district, especially in those school districts that have both large urban centres and rural and remote satellite communities.

### **Key Questions**

Potential questions and areas of investigation for the funding model review may include:

- Should a combination of base and supplemental funding be utilized? If so, what is the most appropriate balance of base funding compared to supplemental funding?
- Should the funding amount be calculated predominantly on headcount, course or credit-based, or another method?
- Should different districts receive different funding rates based on their size/enrolment context or other factors?
- Are the current factors weighted appropriately and do they cover all the required school district characteristics to generate equitable funding allocations?
- Are there other data sources that could be used to more equitably disperse funding based on current population and/or geographic dynamics?
- Should the funding formulae account for significant enrolment shifts within a school district (e.g. flat or declining overall but with large growth in parts of districts)?
- Should some remote schools and school districts be allocated funding through a different mechanism (e.g. should schools with fewer than 50 students, or alternate schools, be funded differently than the rest of the province)?

## **Theme 4: Flexibility**

### **What We've Heard**

**Boards of Education have limited flexibility in budgeting, despite considerable local autonomy in the utilization of unrestricted operating funding. Special grants and targeted funding further restrict flexibility and there are no criteria for when they should be utilized.**

*“Continued flexibility for Boards to address the unique needs of their individual districts is of paramount importance. This can be facilitated by moving grants from special purpose into operating.”*  
– Survey Respondent

### **Current State**

Nearly all Canadian jurisdictions place a high value on the autonomy of Boards of Education and flexibility in education spending. British Columbia's approach resembles that of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Ontario, whereby only a small percentage of funding is enveloped or restricted for a specific use.

In addition, the number of special purpose grants provided outside of the operating grant determined by the funding allocation system (“outside the block”) has been growing, and since these allocations typically have restrictions and separate reporting requirements, they create less flexibility for Boards of Education. Moreover, reporting for special purpose grants takes up valuable staff time; over half of survey respondents indicated that reporting requirements impose a significant administrative burden relative to the amount of funding provided. On the other hand, targeting or restricting funding allows government to direct funding to specific purposes or policy initiatives, and to track those expenditures more rigorously where there is a need to do so.

### **Key Questions**

The current review is an opportunity to investigate whether different funding approaches could resolve some of the challenges faced by Boards of Education with respect to flexibility. Questions to explore through the funding model review could include:

- Should the funding model be adjusted to provide Boards of Education with greater flexibility and autonomy in spending? If so, which areas require flexibility, and which areas require more targeted or restrictive approaches?
- Which types of funding should be targeted and/or restricted to support equity of access to educational programs and services across the province and continuous improvement of student outcomes?
- Should the number of grants “outside the block” be reduced, or have fewer restrictions?

## **Theme 5: Financial Management and Accountability**

### **What We’ve Heard**

**Strong financial governance and accountability support the education sector goals of enhancing student learning. The current governance structure for Boards of Education leads to a conservative approach to budgeting. This, combined with the timing of funding payments, contributes to increasing accumulated surpluses and cash balances.**

*“If there is a funding protection component, it should be reviewed in conjunction with districts’ surplus and local capital balances that are accumulating on an ongoing basis.”*

*– Survey Respondent*

### **Current State**

The current funding model and legislative context (e.g. passing a balanced budget) drive school district processes and impact their ability to manage their budgets and plan for the long-term. Variability in the timing of funding means school districts receive some funds later in the school year, and there can be limited ability to add staff or make other longer-term, strategic investments. Unspent operating grants contribute to accumulated surpluses and cash balances, which is an area of concern for the Ministry of Finance and the B.C.’s Office of the Auditor General.

School districts often prepare conservative budgets based on initial enrolment figures, and use an overestimation of expenditures and underestimation of revenues to build a financial cushion. This approach avoids running a deficit, which is not permitted under the *School Act*, helps mitigate the risk of over hiring (beyond funding levels), and ensures that baseline programs continue.

Enrolment changes, particularly prolonged enrolment decline, have led to reduced operating grants for some Boards of Education. However, some Boards of Education have not reduced their operations to match lower levels of enrolment; instead, they use accumulated surpluses to balance their budgets, which means that they may offer a higher level of service to students than some of their counterparts who are also in enrolment decline, but run the risk of annual deficits. Other Boards of Education have made the difficult local decisions required to adapt to the new level of enrolment by generating accumulated surplus or redirecting surplus funds to new programming in anticipation of lower funding levels.

School districts are the only broader public sector entity that can carry forward prior years' accumulated surplus, and to use these funds to balance their current year budget. There was a total of \$300 million in accumulated surplus as at June 30, 2017. While a portion of these funds may be internally restricted (i.e. earmarked by the Board of Education for a specific use), some portion could be repurposed or reinvested by Boards of Education for other purposes.

Additional inequity exists as a result of the varying abilities of school districts to generate supplemental revenue, which leads to differences in educational opportunities across the province (e.g. some districts have extensive facility rental or lease programs, and some are able to attract significant numbers of international students, which generates tuition fee revenue, while other districts without this ability can be disadvantaged in comparison).

### **Key Questions**

The funding model review presents an opportunity to explore these issues further, and to strengthen financial governance and accountability in the education sector. Possible areas of focus and questions may include:

- Should school district spending be monitored throughout the year and allocations adjusted if a surplus is projected? For example, ensure that funding provided is being utilized as intended?
- Should the manner in which funding is confirmed be restructured and flowed to minimize the growth of cash balances?
- Should there be a limit on the amount of accumulated operating surplus that can be carried over from year to year?
- What is the optimal timing for announcing and releasing funds throughout the school year?
- Should the funding model account for school district own-sourced revenues, ensuring equity of educational opportunities for all students, regardless of where they live in the province?

## Theme 6: Predictability and Costs

### *What We've Heard*

**A model based largely on student enrolment means that funding can be unpredictable. At the same time, certain types of costs are more fixed than others and can often differ widely amongst school districts. This can limit flexibility for Boards of Education when it comes to financial planning and budget management.**

*“Our current financial forecasts indicate we will be in a deficit situation within the next two years as a result of declining enrolment at our remote schools, and we have very few cost-reducing measures available to address the anticipated funding losses.”* – Survey Respondent

### *Current State*

Enrolment can shift amongst school districts, or between public and independent education systems in any given year, which can cause swings in funding. As an example, SD67 (Okanagan Skaha) has seen their annual funding change by +0.3 percent (2015/16), -1.4 percent (2016/17) and +3.0 percent (2018/19). A shift of only a few students in a small community can make planning a challenge in some locations. In addition, as the number of special purpose grants has increased over the past several years, a number of stakeholders have expressed concern regarding the predictability and certainty of funding going forward.

There are some types of costs, such as utility rates and statutory benefits that school districts have little ability to influence. As well, discretionary spending by Boards of Education is limited, as approximately 89 percent of all operating funding is spent on salaries and benefits, which is guided by 60 different local versions of the provincial collective agreement for teachers and 71 collective agreements for support staff and professional associations.

The added effect of restoring class size and composition language as a result of the Supreme Court of Canada decision in late 2016 has further reduced flexibility for Boards of Education in terms of how their schools and classrooms can be organized and staffed. The restored class size and language has impacted the costs to deliver educational services consistent with the terms outlined in the Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) with the BC Teachers' Federation. The number of staff required, and thus the costs of delivering services to students in the context of the MoA, varies amongst school districts.

In addition, school districts have their own local collective agreement with different class size and composition language, they also have different staffing processes and requirements for the determination of services to students with special needs. There are other collective agreement provisions, such as clauses regarding professional development, release time and remote allowances, which can also lead to greater (or lesser) costs amongst school districts that are not directly recognized in the current funding model. Further, while the current model contains an allocation to recognize variances in teacher compensation costs, differing costs for support staff compensation are not currently recognized.



In addition to these factors, Boards of Education in smaller, rural school districts have reported being more sensitive to changes in costs on an annual basis, and often find it more difficult to cope with unforeseen and/or escalating costs such as increased heating costs during a difficult winter, or cooling costs during a hot summer.

With a funding model that is not directly aligned to costs, and instead allocates funding largely based on enrolment, there can be a mismatch between service delivery costs and funding levels in some school districts, especially when enrolment changes dramatically year over year. School districts have stated that it can be difficult to increase or decrease costs annually to match funding levels. This can make it difficult for Boards of Education to perform strategic, long-term financial planning, and, in some cases, sustain core programs and services over time.

### **Key Questions**

The funding model review presents an opportunity to investigate whether funding mechanisms can better support long-term budgeting and help school districts deal with fixed and variable costs more effectively. Possible questions to consider in the next phase of work may include:

- How can funding be confirmed earlier or in a multi-year timeframe to support strategic, long-term budget planning?
- Are there mechanisms that could be introduced to the funding model to reduce the fluctuations in funding year over year?
- Should the funding model, or the structure and process supporting the model, be modified to track unexpected cost increases or decreases, so that adjustments can be made if needed?
- Should new mechanisms be considered to equalize the cost differential amongst school districts for items that may be more fixed, such as compensation and staffing levels set by collective agreements?

## **Theme 7: Geographic, Economic and Demographic Factors**

### **What We've Heard**

**The rural education review identified that the funding model may not fully recognize the unique needs of rural and remote school districts, or the additional costs to operate and maintain adequate service levels in rural and remote schools.**

*“Rural communities do not have the economy of scale to adequately offer programs and services to our students. There is a need for increased operating funds for rural schools for staffing and programming.”*  
– Survey Respondent

*“The current funding model doesn't adequately address the issue of the different cost of living in different jurisdictions. Boards in certain geographic areas face challenges in attracting qualified*

*employees as there is little or no incentive for an employee to move to an area where they will earn the same but have to pay more for housing and other living expenses.” – Survey Respondent*

### **Current State**

Approximately 32 percent of students in B.C.’s public K-12 system attend schools located outside of the main urban centres of Greater Victoria, the Lower Mainland and Kelowna areas. There are approximately 140 communities with only one school; these schools tend to be highly integrated in the social, cultural and recreational network of the community.

There are currently several mechanisms of allocating funding to support rural areas. Inside the core operating grant, allocations for geographic supplements direct additional resources toward rural areas while the Rural Education Enhancement Fund, Student Transportation Fund, and the Rural and Remote Workplace Sustainability Fund, are special grants and programs that have been established specifically to support rural school districts. However, the rural education review process identified that challenges remain. Rural districts have expressed that recruitment and retention of staff, inability to provide adequate programming and services, transportation gaps, and school closures are critical issues that could be addressed in a more comprehensive manner through a new funding model.

Many stakeholder survey respondents felt that factors unique to their school district were not captured by the current geographic supplements, particularly in remote and rural areas. Rural districts emphasized factors such as higher costs of providing transportation in geographically-dispersed areas, especially where travel through difficult terrain, such as mountains or bodies of water, is required. Pressures unique to urban districts, such as a higher cost of living and greater competition for qualified resources, were also highlighted. Survey results generally suggest school districts would prefer that the funding mix include a higher weighting towards geographic or region-specific factors than the current model provides.

### **Key Questions**

There is an opportunity to demonstrate through the funding model review that action is being taken to address the specific challenges identified through the rural education engagement process. Questions to be investigated may include:

- What geographic, economic and/or demographic modifiers should be part of the funding model and what weight should they have relative to overall student enrolment?
- Should different funding approaches be established for different groupings or types of school districts (Remote, Rural, Urban, and Metro)?

## Next Steps

This discussion paper will serve as the frame of reference for the Independent Review Panel, which will lead the next phase of research and consultation as part of this process. The next phase of work will, include:

- Additional research and data gathering,
- Regional technical working sessions for trustees and senior staff in the spring of 2018,
- Meetings with other stakeholder groups, such as the B.C. School Trustees Association, B.C. School Superintendents Association, B.C. Association of School Business Officers, B.C. Confederation of Parent Advisory Councils, B.C. Principals and Vice Principals' Association, the B.C. Teachers' Federation, and the CUPE B.C. will also be arranged,
- Consultation with other levels of government involved in K-12 education in B.C., including the Department of Indigenous Services Canada and the First Nations Education Steering Committee, and
- An interim reporting out to confirm what the panel has heard to date.

The Chair of the Independent Review Panel will present a final report and recommendations to the Minister of Education in the late summer of 2018 for consideration, and the Ministry will work with the Technical Review Committee to model options going forward.

Once a decision has been made by government, the key features of the new model will be communicated in the winter of 2018/19, with preliminary grant announcements issued under the new funding model in March 2019 (for the 2019/20 school year), including transitional measures (if required).

Boards of Education are encouraged to work with their local stakeholder groups, including parents, to gather their views on how funds should be allocated for K-12 public education, and provide this feedback to the Independent Review Panel in writing. Written submissions and questions about the funding model review can be sent to: [k12fundingreview@gov.bc.ca](mailto:k12fundingreview@gov.bc.ca) before the end of April 2018.

**DRAFT - BOARD COMMUNICATION PLAN**

		AUGUST	SEPTEMBER	OCTOBER	NOVEMBER	DECEMBER	JANUARY
<b>REGULAR BOARD MTG</b>	Strat Plan		N/A	Vision 1.g. Outdoor Education 2.d. Parent Communication	Mission 1.i. Technology 2.j. Sustainable Practices	Inclusion 1.b. Reading 2.b. Reading Teachers 2.e. Healthy Staff 2.h. Safe / Healthy (Cultural)	Innovation
	Recurring		F/S Approval BCSTA Provincial Council Motions	Student Trustee Appointment SSCFGS Submission Enrolment Report		Board Elections BCSTA AGM & Prov Motions BCPSEA AGM Motions	Committee Appointments
	Regs				School Vans (repealed)	Transportation regs (x2)	Donations
<b>COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE</b>	Strat Plan		Implementation Plan (Year 3) Trustee Prof. Learning Plan		2.h. Safe / Healthy (Cultural)		2.a. Prof dev 3.d. Gov's Visioning Student Trustee/BCSTA AGM
	Recurring		SSCFGS Discussion Communication	External Committees Report Communication		School Growth Plans Communication	School Growth Plans Debrief Draft School Calendar Review Communication
	Other		Partners in Learning Update	Truth and Reconciliation Report BCPSEA Governance	Communication	Partners in Learning - Review	
<b>EDUCATION COMMITTEE</b>	Strat Plan		1.g. Outdoor Education 2.d. Parent Communication	1.i. Technology	1.b. Reading 2.b. Reading Teachers		1.d. SEL 3.b. Collaboration 1.a. Early Learning
	Recurring		Grad Exit Survey Curriculum Parent Engagement	MDI Curriculum Parent Engagement	Curriculum Parent Engagement	Curriculum Parent Engagement	Curriculum Parent Engagement
	Other		Untargeted Charitable Dons.				
<b>OPERATIONS COMMITTEE</b>	Strat Plan		Summer Work Review	2.j. Sustainable Practices Catchment Area Review	2.e. Healthy Staff	Wired Glass Motion	Bus Route Opt. Report Joint Use Update
	Recurring			Prelim. Budget Timelines	Budget		Amended Budget
	Other		Sponsorship Regulation				Transportation Review
<b>POLICY COMMITTEE</b>	Policies			Role of PAC/DPAC	Surplus Policy		
	Recurring			Appeals Bylaw Review			
	Other						
<b>OTHER</b>	Annual Report to Community Trustee Audit Info Session	DSL/Trustee Dinner Supt Evaluation Cmte Partners in Learning Invitations BCPSEA Symposium	Partners in Learning - Selection South Coast Branch Meeting	Partners in Learning Event Intergovernmental Meeting Trustee Academy	Supt Evaluation Cmte	School Visits BCPSEA AGM	
<b>CONSULTATIONS</b>			Transportation Consults.	Preliminary Budget Consults.	Preliminary Budget Consults.	Preliminary Budget Consults.	

Legend: Moved Removed Added

**DRAFT - BOARD COMMUNICATION PLAN**

		FEBRUARY	MARCH	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	JULY
<b>REGULAR BOARD MTG</b>	Strat Plan	Collaboration 1.a. Early Learning 1.d. SEL 2.a. Prof dev 3.b. Collaboration 3.d. Gov's Visioning	Equity 1.c. Math 2.f. Leaders 2.h. Safe / Healthy (Ops)	Respect 1.e. Mental / Phys Health 3.g. Cap U & Post Secondary	Responsibility 1.f. Music 1.k. Grad 2.i. Facilities 3.c. Int'l students	1.h. Experiential Learning 1.j. indigenous learning 3.f. SIB/Squamish Nation 2.g. Celebrations	
	Recurring	Amended Annual Budget	School Calendar	BCSTAAGM Motions School Allocation Rates Min. Approved Projects / Capital Plan Bylaw	Budget Approval / Bylaw	District Report to Ministry Budget Approval (if required) Five-Year Capital Plan Motion	
	Regs	Conduct on ...Buses (repealed)	School Attendance Areas Inclement Weather Purchasing				
<b>COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE</b>	Strat Plan			3.c. Int'l students MoA - Review	2.g. Celebrations		
	Recurring					Strategic Plan Yr in Review Communication	
	Other	Communication	Communication	Communication Trustee Evaluation Process	Communication		
<b>EDUCATION COMMITTEE</b>	Strat Plan	1.c. Math 2.f. Leaders	1.e. Mental / Phys Health 3.g. Cap U & Post Secondary	1.f. Music 1.k. Grad	1.h. Experiential Learning 1.j. indigenous learning 3.f. SIB/Squamish Nation		
	Recurring					Untargeted Donations? Curriculum Parent Engagement	
	Other	Curriculum Parent Engagement	Curriculum Parent Engagement	Curriculum Parent Engagement	Curriculum Parent Engagement District Report to Ministry		
<b>OPERATIONS COMMITTEE</b>	Strat Plan	2.h. Safe / Healthy (Ops)		2.i. Facilities	Risk Management		
	Recurring	Prelim. Budget Considerations Prelim. Budget Discussion Enrolment Projections	Staffing Timelines Funding Announcement	Budget Summary AFG Plan	Five-Year Capital Plan Budget (if required)	Emergency Preparedness Summer Work	
	Other	Transportation Review	Transportation Review	Transportation Review Zoning referrals	Transportation Review Zoning referrals	Transportation Review Zoning referrals	
<b>POLICY COMMITTEE</b>	Policies			Surplus Policy Trustee Election Bylaw Trustee Pro-D Policy Review Inaugural Meeting Bylaw			
	Recurring						
	Other						
<b>OTHER</b>		Review March cmte schedule	Supt Evaluation Cmte	Student Forum Service Recognition BCSTAAGM	Bursary Tea Intergovernmental Meeting	Retirement Celebration Grad Ceremonies ACE-IT Ceremonies	
<b>CONSULTATIONS</b>		Draft School Calendar Circulation		Catchment Area Consults	Catchment Area Consults		