



2009-2010 SCHOOL YEAR BUDGET

PRIORITIES & GOALS

INTRODUCTION

The following estimate of revenues and expenditures to support improved student learning during the 2009-2010 school year is presented to the Board of Trustees as recommended by the Director of Education -- on behalf of senior administration. The budget includes **\$213,537,496** in operating expenditures and **\$14,887,456** in capital expenditures for a total budget of **\$228,424,952**.

The budget is hereby presented to the Board of Trustees on Wednesday, June 10, 2009 as information – to be brought forward for further discussion in Committee of the Whole on Monday, June 15, 2009 and on Monday, June 22, 2009 for approval in public session.

PRIORITY:
NURTURING OUR
CATHOLIC
COMMUNITY:

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

The budget will be presented in the following segments:

- a) *Capital Planning Area*
- b) *Transportation Planning Area*
- c) *School Operations Planning Area*
- d) *Learning Services Planning Area*
- e) *Board Administration Planning Area*
- f) *Reductions from the 2008-09 budget to achieve a balanced 2009-10 budget AND grants that have ended and are not reflected in the 2009-2010 budget.*
- g) *Requests not added to the 2009-2010 budget*
- h) *New grants for 2009-2010*
- i) *Conclusion*
- j) *Budget Motions*

PRIORITY:

IMPROVING
STUDENT
LEARNING and
ACHIEVEMENT:

When we present each budget area, we will identify:

- a) The lead staff person for the budget category;
- b) An indication of any constraints or flexibility concerning the funding;
- c) The percentage of the overall operational budget that this category represents;

PRIORITY:
BUILDING
CAPACITY TO LEAD
& LEARN:

**MINISTRY
GOALS
2009-2010**

High levels of student achievement

- *Going deeper and wider on literacy and numeracy, including reaching the targets of 75 per cent of learners achieving at the provincial standard in Grade 6*

- *Continuing innovation in secondary schools in reaching the 85 per cent graduation rate.*

Reduced gaps in student achievement

- *Reducing the gap in achievement for those groups of learners who, for whatever reason, need extra help.*

Increased public confidence in publicly funded education

- *Fostering greater two-way engagement with the public to inform the implementation of the mandate and to foster public confidence*

- *Strengthening the role of schools as the heart of communities*

- *Recognizing the pivotal role of schools in developing the workforce and citizens of tomorrow.*

d) The human resource obligations that we have under collective agreements/terms and conditions of employment.

As in the past several years, the budget motions are presented as motions “A”, “B”, “C” and “D” to accommodate the requirements of the *Municipal Conflict of Interest Act*.

Budget Motion “A” deals with the Board’s Employee Assistance Program contract with Catholic Family Counseling. This motion represents **\$125,000** or 0.05% of the total budget.

Budget Motion “B” deals with the *Learning Services Planning* area. This area includes all salary and benefits and programs and services related to the hiring or declaration of surplus to the board’s needs of teachers, educational assistants, administrators. In this category, because of local flexibility, funds from one area could be used to, for example, hire teachers through the addition of a new program. Alternatively a decision could be made to have fewer teachers and more educational assistants. This motion represents **\$179,516,967** or 78.6% of the total budget.

Budget Motion “C” deals with all other planning areas; that is, transportation, capital, board administration and school operations (maintenance). This motion represents **\$48,907,985** or 21.4% of the total budget.

Budget Motion “D” summarizes the previous budget motions as approved and directs administration to file the approved balanced budget with the Ministry of Education.

BUDGET POLICY PROVISIONS

Board Policy IV 007, “Financial Planning and Budgeting” outlines conditions under which the school year budget must be developed and against which the Board of Trustees must measure compliance. The policy provisions and how compliance is demonstrated is contained in a monitoring report that accompanies this budget letter of transmittal.

PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS

The following planning assumptions guided the development of this budget:

- √ 2009/10 budget is year two of a four-year plan.
- √ Most decisions for allocating resources are determined by the Ministry before we receive the revenue from the province.
- √ About 85% of budget is spent on human resources.
- √ About 97% of budget is spent on schools. This includes all human resource, maintenance and transportation costs for operating our schools.
- √ The budget will be balanced without use of reserves.
- √ Budget holders were asked to begin from a zero base identifying spending that would continue because of commitments and what spending may end.
- √ Budgets need to address environmental sustainability & elimination of waste.
- √ There are four major planning areas – Learning; Board Administration; Transportation; Operations [Maintenance].

PROVINCIAL CONTEXT

There is a provincial context that is worth noting. For 2009-2010 the Province of Ontario will spend **\$19.4 billion** on elementary and secondary school education. That translates into **\$100 million** for every instructional day.

THE IMPACT OF ENROLMENT ON THE BUDGET PROCESS

Enrolment has a significant impact on the board's budget process. Indeed, many (if not all) of the calculations for the board's revenue are based on:

- 50% of the enrolment on October 31 of each year, plus,
- 50% of the enrolment on March 31 of each year.

This calculation means we take half of the enrolment as at October 31st and add to it 50% of the March 31st enrolment and then multiply it by whatever factors are outlined in the Grants for Student Needs in order to arrive at whatever the revenue is for a particular area.

Accuracy with respect to the board's enrolment is critical. The enrolment projection in June is compared to the number of learners who actually show up by the October 31st count date.

When we underestimate in June we receive more revenue in the autumn and this is good news when the Revised Estimates are completed. If, however, we overestimate in June we end up losing revenue in the autumn. Budget cuts during the school year are problematic particularly in the area of human resources. Consequently, it is far more prudent to be cautious in staffing in the May-June period than to end up over-hiring and not being able to release staff. Since enrolment determines revenue and revenue and enrolment determine staffing, it is critical to be cautious and accurate with enrolment projections.

Our enrolment projection for 2009-2010 is as follows:

Area	2009-2010 Average Daily Enrolment (ADE)	2008-2009 Average Daily Enrolment (ADE)	Difference + / - (FTE)
Junior Kindergarten	651	688	-37
Senior Kindergarten	765	740	25
Grades 1 to 8	12,700	12,898	2
Total Elementary	14,116	14,326	-210
Total Secondary	7,447	7,507	-60
Total System	21,563	21,833	-270

Our enrolment decline is consistent with the enrolment decline of school boards across Ontario and is expected to continue for the foreseeable number of years before making slight increases.

SPENDING RULES

The funding model is a just that, a model. The model uses the board's enrolment and a provincially determined dollar benchmark for each category to generate revenues for the school board. Some of the revenue grants are based on equality and some are based on equity.

The grants that are based on **equality** are a straight mathematical calculation. That is, the model takes the board's projected enrolment and multiplies the dollar amount for the item; for example, salary. The result is what the board receives in revenue for that particular area.

The grants that are based on **equity** are the result of calculations that take into consideration whether a school board is rural or urban, large or small. For some grants such as the Learning Opportunities Grant, the Region's level of secondary school graduation or the number of English Language Learners as a percentage of the local population plays a much larger determinant of how much funding the school board receives for a particular area.

The government's **EPO grants (Educational Programs – Other)**; that is, grants that are program related and provided to the board outside of the normal *Grants for Student Needs* process, are based on equity of outcomes and very much related to board data on student achievement. **Appendix A** to the budget outlines under *Other Revenues* the many grants that are based on equity and are targeted funding. If the board does not spend the money in these

pre-determined areas, the funds are returned to the Ministry of Education.

As a result of the funding model, the *Education Act* and Regulations, the following rules must be adhered to in developing and implementing the budget. These rules are:

1. All revenues received for Special Education must be spent on Special Education;
2. The revenues received for Board Administration and Governance is the maximum amount that can be spent on Board Administration and Governance. Surplus amounts in this area may be spent in all other areas except Capital;
3. Revenue that has been pre-determined for a particular area such as primary class size, EPO grants (educational programs – other) must be spent in the intended area or the money returned to the Ministry;
4. Capital revenue must be spent on the areas intended for the grant and the board may not use capital reserve funds without approval of the Minister;
5. The board must file a balanced budget with the Ministry;
6. Once the first three rules have been met, revenues in any area may be transferred to support budget priorities in other areas.

OVERALL BUDGET

The overall budget is **\$228,424,952** and is broken down as demonstrated through the following chart:

Area	% of Operating Budget	Amount
Learning Services	84.1%	\$179,516,967
School Operations and Maintenance	9.8%	\$20,986,675
Board Administration	3.0%	\$6,347,907
Transportation Consortium	3.1%	6,685,947
Total Operating Budget	100%	\$213,537,496
Total Capital Budget	100%	\$14,887,456
Total Budget	100%	\$228,424,952

CAPITAL BUDGET Dave Bennett and Shesh Maharaj - Leads

The Capital budget of **\$14,887,456** represents 100% of the overall expenditures on capital projects and is treated differently than the rest of the school board budget – known as the operating budget. The following are the constraints on the use of capital funds:

- √ The capital portion of the Pupil Accommodation Grant deals with additions, renovations to schools, new school construction, school renewal and prior capital debt. These funds must be used for capital purposes.
- √ School boards may not use capital reserves for ANY capital projects without prior approval of the Minister of Education.

The Capital budget funds the long-term care and renewal of our school sites and buildings. Some of the work related to capital projects, particularly school renewal, is carried out by our school operations and maintenance personnel. This portion of the Capital budget is known as School Renewal.

School Renewal

These are projects that are undertaken to address areas such as:

- * barrier free access/renovations/alterations
- * site improvement
- * in-school communication systems
- * roofing/window repairs, replacement
- * electrical and lighting system improvements
- * HVAC/mechanical systems
- * life safety systems and fire protection.
- * elevating devices
- * landscaping/paving/signs/painting
- * building and fire code upgrades/alterations
- * indoor air quality improvements
- * flooring and floor systems
- * plumbing & drinking water improvements

These projects address the board's priority of providing funding to maintain schools and administrative sites and to provide funding to meet safe school / health and safety legislation.

Annually, the facility and capital planning staff assess the needs of the system in consultation with administrators and prepare a list of projects for completion during the upcoming summer months. Consequently, in November 2009, a list of projects will be developed for completion during the summer of 2010. These projects are funded by school renewal funds; funds that can only be used for this purpose.

Apart from the above, capital funds are used to construct new facilities. Currently work is progressing on our new school at Grand River South scheduled to open in September 2010.

This school will replace Notre Dame CES and St. Patrick CES.

REPORT ON USE OF CAPITAL RESERVE FUNDS

The Board has two reserve funds – one entitled the **Capital Reserve Fund** and the other titled **Operating Reserve Fund** [sometimes referred to as a “working reserve”]. Capital reserves are used to support building and site projects whereas the Operating Reserve Fund is used to support non-capital areas such as purchasing textbooks, buying additional computers, balancing the operating budget or addressing an unforeseen deficit caused by an outbreak of flu where staff who are ill are replaced by, for example, supply staff and this cost exceeds the overall approved budget.

Capital Reserve: Our capital debt is largely composed of the debentures for the schools we built between 1997 and today – six elementary schools and one secondary school, along with the renovations and additions to many more elementary and secondary schools over the years. In order to ensure that school boards have sufficient funds in their reserves to pay for current debt, the Ministry of Education introduced a new requirement in 2008 that school boards require the permission of the Minister of Education to use capital reserve funds. Accordingly, as capital projects are identified and approved by the board there is a requirement that the Ministry be involved in the approval of the project before reserve funds are committed to the project.

Funds from the sale of property and funds derived from the Educational Development Charge Bylaw must be placed in the board’s capital reserve funds and used for additions, new schools et cetera as approved by the Ministry of Education. Similarly, funds received for *Good Places to Learn, School Renewal, Prohibitive to Repair* et cetera must be used for the purposes intended -- such as additions to schools, upgrades to schools or new school construction as approved by the Ministry. Any funds not used in one year must be placed in the capital reserve for subsequent use.

The Capital Reserve funds for 2009-2010 are projected as follows:

Area	Balance at Aug 31/08	Balance at Aug 31/09	Balance at Aug 31/10
Grant for Improved Access	162,733	162,722	165,902
Pupil Accommodation Reserve	8,326,397	7,050,000	6,238,766
Disposition of Property	9,052,447	9,180,000	9,221,951
Education Development Charges	504,442	715,000	718,267
Totals	18,046,019	17,107,722	16,344,886

As a matter of information, the current status of the Operating Reserve Fund is:

Area	Balance at Aug 31/08	Balance at Aug 31/09	Balance at Aug 31/10
Working Funds	300,173	0	0
Classroom	3,005,101	3,050,000	3,063,938
WSIB	563,146	563,146	563,146
Continuing Education	180,316	185,100	185,946
Network Infrastructure	1,083,589	1,100,010	1,105,037
Totals	5,132,325	4,898,256	4,918,067

There is no anticipated use of the Operating Reserve Fund during 2009-2010. If there are reserves to be used from this fund, the Board of Trustees would need to provide approval.

Capital debts are paid for from the Capital Reserve. In order to pay our capital debts, therefore, the Board of Trustees in approving the Capital budget thereby grants permission to use the Capital Reserve to pay these debts as they come due throughout the budget year.

TRANSPORTATION – Shesh Maharaj - Lead

The **Transportation budget** of **\$6,685,947** represents 3.1% of the school board *operating* budget. Of this total, **\$256,793** or 4% of the transportation budget is for human resource costs. Transportation funds are provided in order to transport learners from home to school, including transportation of learners with special needs.

In 2006-07 the Ministry of Education mandated that coterminous school boards form transportation consortia to enhance the delivery of transportation within the same geographic area. The **Student Transportation Services of Waterloo Region** has been established and operates as a third-party to each school board.. Each board shares in the overhead costs and each board contracts with the consortium along with the local French Catholic publicly funded board to purchase services to meet the individual board's transportation policy.

For 2009-2010 our payment to the STSWR consortium for transportation services is **\$6,685,947**.

SCHOOL OPERATIONS – Arnie Wohlgemut - Lead

The **School Operations budget** of **\$20,986,675** represents 9.8% of the school board *operating* budget. Of this total, **\$11,091,704** or 53% of the School Operations budget is for human resource costs. The majority of the non-human resource costs go to the heating, hydro and maintenance cost of maintaining our schools. In recognition of our responsibility to be stewards of scarce resources and an increasingly endangered environment, facility services as part of our system wide focus on sustainability has engaged through this budget in the following initiatives in support of the learning environment:

A) Ontario EcoSchools Program. This is a ministry supported curriculum initiative that will build sound environmental habits into our learners. The four pillars are: **ecological literacy, waste minimization, energy conservation & school ground greening.**

i. **Ecological literacy:** We will support this pillar of the program with technical support and funding of up to two (2) half day teacher leave days for *EcoSchools* in-service workshops.

ii. **Energy conservation:** We will look for ways to make “real time” energy data available to the schools where technology is available.

iii. **Waste minimization:** We will implement and support the food waste program (green bins) in partnership with the Region of Waterloo, thru training of facility staff and minor adjustments to the facility. Other schools in the province have been able to divert over 50% of waste from landfill.

iv. **School grounds greening:** we believe the school grounds are an additional classroom. We will support school yard greening by having standards that include native species that are school friendly and by adding 10% to all grants from Evergreen Learning Grounds the schools receive. We will take a more active roll in their school greening committees. The focus will be on shading, cooling of the playground and providing low activity learning spaces. In addition maintenance will be piloting an earth friendly weed control method that is expected to reduce dandelions by 70% and promote healthier grass.

B) Support all schools in a collective effort to remove hindrances to the learning environment. This includes additional outlets in classrooms to reduce trip hazards and permit expanded use of computer technology including interactive learning boards (sometimes referred to as Smart

Boards).

C) Ground Water Protection. We will be providing training to all custodians on the proper use of salt thru the Region of Waterloo “Smart About Salt” program.

LEARNING SERVICES – Rick Boisvert, Heather Cullen, Bruce Rodrigues, Bryan Mahn, Sandra Quehl - Leads

The *Learning Services budget* of **\$179,516,967** represents 84.1% of the school board *operating* budget. Of this total, **\$165,717,414** or 92% of the Learning Services budget is for human resource costs. The following are the sub-areas for this planning area:

- Program Services
- Student Services (Special Education)
- All Elementary and Secondary Schools
- Adult and Continuing Education
- Information Technology (non Learning Services Information Technology costs are also included in the board administration and operation portions of the budget)

The Learning Services budget represents the largest component of the board’s budget and ranges from staffing our schools to providing for regular curriculum delivery from JK to Grade 12 and includes Religious Education, parish-school relations, exploring our faith life and the commitment of leaders to achieving excellence in Catholic education. As well, this area covers specific grant allocations for safe schools, special education, student success, new teacher induction and literacy and numeracy.

The program segment of the Learning Services budget will address our system’s progress in meeting and exceeding the targets for improvement of student achievement. By June 30, 2009 we will be submitting a draft of our Board Improvement plan that covers learning from JK to Grade 12. The plan is based on a needs assessment and focuses on the following domains: literacy, numeracy, pathways and Catholic community, culture and caring. The plan will be finalized in September following the release of the provincial assessment data. The plan will be filed with the board and Ministry by October 2010. This is a new planning cycle introduced by the Ministry for 2009-2010 and will permit boards to shift resources, if necessary, as they plan revisions to the budget for the November Revised Estimates period.

The *School Services (Special Education) budget* of **\$25,295,515** represents 14.1% of the Learning Services budget. Special Education funds must be spent on learners who need special education programs, services and equipment. Any excess revenue in this area must be placed in a Special Education Reserve and used in this budget area exclusively in subsequent

years for learners with special needs.

We do know from our data that we are making progress as we focused during 2008-2009 on our model for special education delivery. To this end we know:

- More younger learners were assessed through the use of the OPA grant. This permitted strategies to be identified so that gaps could be identified earlier and therefore closed in the early years;
- More complex cases were identified by schools and this spoke to the emerging needs of schools. This assisted staff to target support and resources that can help to close the gap;
- Remediation Plus and Corrective Reading programs were implemented board wide and used to assist a number of learners improve in reading. A significant number of learners improved in reading comprehension. The Empower was piloted in two schools in partnership with the Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, to address the learning needs of a select group of learners with a learning disabilities profile.

The introduction of these programs is encouraging. The system will continue to collect data during the 2009-2010 school year. Data collection will include an analysis of how we deploy our special education human resources at all levels of the organization.

The Special Education budget has \$1.2 million allocated for non-human resource areas. Approximately \$660,000 is spent on specialized equipment for learners. Staff development receives \$118,000 while \$221,000 is expended on supplies including supplies for specialized areas such as Braille paper, community workplace supplies and student specific software.

At their June 3rd meeting, the *Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC)* unanimously endorsed the Special Education budget for 2009-2010.

With respect to our school budgets for 2009-2010, it is noted that school budgets were not reduced. Rather, schools were allocated the same per pupil amount as last year and schools were requested to achieve a 20% reduction in photocopying. The savings achieved from reducing photocopying may be re-directed to other areas within the school budgets.

Our ***Adult and Continuing Education*** program continues to be a good news story for our system. A review of the growth in language classes over the past three years is but one example of how St. Louis continues to address community needs. For 2006/07 we had 6,528 language learners. This grew to 8,339 for 2007/08 and 9,785 as of March 2009. Our Adult and Continuing Education program is working with the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Colleges and Universities and the Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration to enhance and co-ordinate

our program offerings.

Our **Information Technology** grant was reduced by the Ministry by \$300,000 this year and for 2010-2011. This reduction was part of the Ministry's contribution to the overall decline in the economy. At our local level, however, we have lease obligations and other information technology commitments that meant we covered the grant decline this year and will do so next year rather than remove necessary equipment. As the 2009-2010 budget year unfolds we will continue to upgrade our servers and replenish computer leases to ensure we have access to quality equipment. We will be introducing some new software applications but not as many as we would have wanted to given the reduction in grant.

BOARD ADMINISTRATION AND GOVERNANCE – Roger Lawler - Lead

The **Board Administration and Governance budget** of **\$6,347,907** represents 3.0% of the school board *operating* budget. Of this total, **\$4,935,175** or 77% of the Board Administration budget is for human resource costs.

Board Administration and Governance funding is provided to cover the costs of operating the board office, central office staff and the needs of trustees. The revenue for Board Administration and Governance is the maximum amount that a board may expend in administration and governance. The funding is divided into trustees, director and supervisory officers, board administration. The focus of board administration expenditures for 2009-2010 will be to address the areas outlined in the 2008 Operational Review of our school board that will enhance our level of services.

At the conclusion of the development of the board administration budget, a surplus of **\$302,418** in board administration and governance was transferred to the Learning Services portion of the budget.

REDUCTIONS FROM THE 2008-2009 BUDGET AND Grants that have ended and are not reflected in 2009-2010 budget.

The following items were cut from the 2008-09 budget in order to reach a balanced 2009-2010 budget. In many cases the reduced spending in an area is the result of eliminating teacher release time for professional development activities during the school day; activities that are board initiated or the result of system committee work. If a particular grant contains provisions for teacher release time, the release time will go ahead as part of the grant criteria.

Budget Item	Amount	Explanation
Board of Trustees budget	\$9,500	Reduction in various categories to reflect planned costs for 2009-2010.
Reduction in supervisory officers costs	\$74,299	Impact of not replacing one supervisory officer, engaging new supervisory officers at lower rates, and covering P.D. costs through one-time grant from Council of Directors of Education (CODE).
Program Consultants	\$180,000	Reduction of 1.5 positions
Program coordinator	\$16,980	Reduction
Special Education	\$74,000	Reduction in overall spending in supplies and professional development.
Numeracy JK-6	\$3,145	Reduction
OFIP funding	\$230,548	Reduction in grant from 2008-09; This reduction impacts school release time.
MISA funding	\$173,622	Reduction in grant from 2008-09; management of information for student achievement.
FSL	\$17,605	Reduction
Technology	\$50,150	Reduction
Research and Accountability	\$28,150	Reduction
Literacy JK-6	\$49,347	Reduction
Family Life	\$13,305	Reduction
Equity	\$1,113	Reduction
Religion	\$12,445	Reduction
Resource Centre	\$890	Reduction
Leadership Development	\$7,550	Reduction
Athletics –elementary	\$11,384	Reduction
Resource Development Office	\$94,951	Reduction
Total	\$1,048,984	

GRANTS WE RECEIVED AS PART OF THE 2008-09 BUDGET THAT HAVE ENDED AND THUS RESULT IN REDUCED SPENDING FOR 2009-2010	AMOUNT
Special Education Literacy and Numeracy	\$42,401
CODE Special Education Partnership	\$98,781
Special Education OPA Grants	\$46,896
Special Education P.A. Day Grant	\$10,000
FSL Renewal Grant	\$239,054
Literacy & Numeracy	\$14,147
Newly Appointed Leaders Grant	\$20,000
Schools On the Move	\$14,206
CODE ESL Literacy Grant	\$11,820
STEPS	\$7,387
TPA – Role of the Principal	\$7,369
TPA – Experienced Teachers	\$6,310
Turn Around Schools	\$5,729
CODE ESL English Language Learners	\$4,876
Character Education	\$42,317
CODE Environment Grant	\$19,419
Total amount for Grants that have ended	\$590,712
Total spending and grant reductions 2008/09 to 2009/10	\$1,639,696

BUDGET REQUESTS NOT ADDED INTO THE BUDGET

The following areas were requests that were not added to the budget. In many cases there was not sufficient revenue to provide for the request and still maintain a balanced budget. In other situations, some other aspect of the budget beyond the reductions outlined above would need to be reduced to accommodate the request. Senior administration did not support the addition of these items as it would require reductions in other areas; reductions that in the scope of the overall budget would not be in the interests of the overall system; that is, one that addresses student learning and maintains the necessary infrastructure to operate the system within available resources.

Request	Source of Request	Amount of Request
5 additional elementary Vice Principals	Elementary administrators	\$562,525
17.5 additional Special Education Teachers	Elementary administrators	\$1,365,000
5.65 additional Special Education Teachers	Secondary administrators	\$449,700
New requests from Program Services	Program Consultants	\$500,000
Funding for school signs (per year for 4 yrs)	Maintenance	\$20,000
Waste management upgrades	Maintenance	\$60,000
Total		\$2,957,225

NEW GRANTS FOR 2009-2010

The following additions were made to provincial grants for education for 2009-2010 onward:

1. Funding to cover the costs for school boards to hire an internal auditor to support the Ministry initiative mandating that school boards establish Audit Committees.
2. Funding in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 for school boards to engage in energy audits and establish practices that result in energy efficiency as part of the province's environmental sustainability and energy conservation strategy. Our share of the funding for 2009-2010 is **\$1,799,666**. A further \$2,452,879 will be allocated to the board in 2010-2011.

CONCLUSION

As we move into the 2009-2010 school year, the following initiatives will address needs that have arisen as part of the budget process:

- Paul Tratnyek and John Klein will lead a process examining how we do and can nurture our Catholic community;
- Rick Boisvert and Michael Whitehead will lead a process examining how we do and can address poverty;
- There will be a forensic audit of the deployment of all Special Education resources to assess appropriate level of resources and use;
- Senior administration and school administrators will engage in the development of a succession plan for board leadership.

The foregoing budget is balanced and operates within available resources to provide programs and services to learners. The budget complies with the *Education Act* and Regulations and the Board of Trustees budget policy. It is the recommendation of the Director of Education on behalf of senior staff that the Board of Trustees consider the motions outlined below:

**BUDGET MOTION
'A'**

BUDGET MOTIONS

Moved by:

Seconded by:

*THAT the Board of Trustees approve the Employee Assistance Program portion of the 2009-2010 school year budget in the amount of **\$125,000**.*

**BUDGET MOTION
'B'**

Moved by:

Seconded by:

*THAT the Board of Trustees approve the Learning Services planning area portion of the 2009-2010 school year budget in the amount of **\$179,516,967**.*

**BUDGET MOTION
'C'**

Moved by:

Seconded by:

*THAT the Board of Trustees approve the transportation, board administration, capital and school operations portions of the 2009-2010 school year budget in the amount of **\$48,907,985**.*

**BUDGET MOTION
'D'**

Moved by:

Seconded by:

*THAT the Board of Trustees instruct the CEO to file with the Ministry of Education a balanced budget in the amount of **\$228,424,952** of which \$213,537,496 is operational and \$14,887,456 is capital.*

**Respectfully
Submitted**

Roger D. Lawler -- *Director of Education & Secretary to the Board*

Shesh Maharaj -- *Superintendent of Business & Treasurer of the Board*

Rick Boisvert -- *Superintendent of School Support Services*

Gerry Clifford -- *Superintendent of Community Development*

Heather Cullen -- *Superintendent of Instruction & Assessment*

Bryan Mahn -- *Superintendent of Human Resource & Facility Services*

Bruce Rodrigues -- *Superintendent of Student Success*

Glenn Sheculski -- *Superintendent of Leadership and Faith Development*

Dave Bennett -- *Senior Manager of Planning*

Gytis Grabauskas -- *Senior Manager of Human Resources*

Laura Isaac -- *Senior Manager of Business & Financial Services*

Sandra Quehl -- *Chief Information Officer*

John Shewchuk -- *Senior Manager of Public Affairs / Executive Officer*

Arnie Wohlgemut -- *Senior Manager of Facility Services*