

## Supplementary Funding Joint Working Group Report

### Executive Summary

The residents of the Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM) have a long-standing tradition of supporting public education through supplementary education funding and/or area rates. This additional education funding is above and beyond the provincial funding and the mandatory municipal contribution towards for public education. Supplementary education funding provides significant benefits to the students of the Halifax Regional School Board ("the School Board").

While there is strong support for ensuring that students within HRM receive a high quality education, the annual process of determining the amount and purpose of supplementary education funding has created tensions between the School Board and HRM for several years. These tensions reached a high point in the Spring of 2005 when HRM provided the School Board with notice of its intention to reduce supplementary education rates in Halifax and Dartmouth by 10% (with the intention of eliminating it completely over the next 10 years through similar reductions each year) and the decision to target area rate funding for music and arts.

Both parties recognized the need to develop a long-term strategy relating to supplementary education funding, in the interests of their shared constituents. They each named representatives to a Supplementary Funding Working Group ("the Working Group") and invited representation from all three provincial Parties. Both the Liberal and NDP Parties were represented on the Working Group. The Working Group held at least thirteen (13) meetings from June 2005 until early May 2006. After considering many different alternatives, the Working Group has reached consensus that relevant legislation should be amended to achieve the following:

- ♦ School boards in Nova Scotia should have the ability to levy an amount for supplementary education funding (to a maximum of 10% of the previous year's global school board budget) through corresponding rates set and collected by municipalities within their jurisdiction. School boards, through an annual business planning process involving public consultation, would develop a business case for the annual supplementary education levy. The amount required to be collected would then be communicated to the applicable municipal councils who would, in turn, determine the rate required to raise the supplementary education fund amount. The municipality would then collect and remit to the school board the annual amount specified for supplementary education funding. School boards would also be required to issue an annual report on the use of such funds to the public in order to ensure accountability.
- ♦ The municipalities would act as the collection agents for the school boards in relation to the supplementary education funding. Municipal units would not

be involved in setting or approving the supplementary education funding amount – they would simply determine the rate required to collect it (based upon annual assessments) and collect it in the same manner that they collect municipal taxes and remit the amount collected to the school board(s).

Why did the Working Group agree that this approach provides the best long-term strategy for supplementary education funding? The main reasons are:

- ♦ Education is a provincial responsibility. The Province of Nova Scotia has established regional school boards and the CSAP to govern and deliver public education. Giving school boards the responsibility for setting a supplementary education funding levy (up to a maximum amount) makes them directly (and the provincial Department of Education, indirectly) accountable to the electorate for the amount and use of these additional tax levies.
- ♦ It allows school boards to engage in long-term and multi-year business planning regarding the programs and services to be funded by supplementary education funding. This, in turn, should allow school boards to develop a variety of programs and services depending upon the needs of particular areas and to ensure broader equity of access to enriched educational offerings across the system.
- ♦ Tax payers will know who is responsible for setting the amount of supplementary funding and can make representations to a single elected body that is directly accountable for both the amount raised through municipal taxation and the use of those supplementary education funding revenues. This will avoid municipal councilors finding themselves caught in the middle.

In summary, the Working Group believes this approach to be a “win-win” solution for all interested stakeholders. It meets the following criteria:

- ♦ Increased access by students to services and programs that will result in measurable improvement in student achievement
- ♦ No loss of funds for the School Board’s students or schools
- ♦ Fewer demands on HRM councilors to explain/defend educational funding given that it is primarily a provincial responsibility
- ♦ Overall tax burden for municipal taxpayers is reasonable and there is an equitable allocation of the supplementary education funding tax burden
- ♦ No loss of programming in areas that have historically enjoyed it

- ♦ Elimination of references to former city boundaries in taxation discussions/debates
- ♦ Increased clarity among the parties and interested stakeholders regarding the educational goals of the School Board and the responsibilities for financing the education of students within HRM
- ♦ Simplified budgeting, accounting and reporting systems for the School Board
- ♦ Should lead to increased respect and collaboration between HRM and the School Board
- ♦ Long-term solution supports the concept of HRM as a SMART CITY
- ♦ It is a solution that could work for other school boards in the Province, not just HRSB
- ♦ A long-term sustainable solution that will enable the School Board to have the ability to plan based upon the predictability of available resources
- ♦ Fair to taxpayers and equitable among students in the region.

## **I. Introduction**

The residents of the Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM) have a long-standing tradition of supporting public education through supplementary education funding and/or area rates. This additional education funding is above and beyond the provincial funding and the mandatory municipal contribution towards for public education. Supplementary education funding provides significant benefits to the students of the Halifax Regional School Board ("the School Board").

While there is strong support for ensuring that students within HRM receive a high quality education, the annual process of determining the amount and purpose of supplementary education funding has created tensions between the School Board and HRM for several years. These tensions reached a high point in the Spring of 2005 when HRM provided the School Board with notice of its intention to reduce supplementary education rates in Halifax and Dartmouth by 10% (with the intention of eliminating it completely over the next 10 years through similar reductions each year) and the decision to target particular funding for music and arts.

Both parties recognized the need to develop a long-term strategy relating to supplementary education funding, in the interests of their shared constituents. They each named representatives to a Supplementary Funding Working Group ("the Working Group"). The Working Group was comprised of fourteen members representing the Halifax Regional School Board, the Halifax Regional Municipality, the Liberal and the NDP Parties. The Department of Education and the Progressive Conservative caucus were also invited to join the Group but declined. The Working Group held at least thirteen (13) meetings from June 2005 until early May 2006. The individuals on the committee were:

### *Halifax Regional Municipality Councilors*

David Hendsbee  
Becky Kent  
Jim Smith  
Debbie Hum  
Sheila Fougere  
Russell Walker

### *Halifax Regional School Board Members*

Wade Marshall  
Debra Barlow  
Gary O'Hara  
Bridgett Ann Boutilier  
Doug Sparks

*Liberal MLA - Diana Whalen*

*NDP MLA - Bill Estabrooks*

## **II. Mandate of Joint Working Group**

The Working Group defined its mandate as follows:

- To research and agree on the relevant facts and history relating to supplementary education funding in HRM (including use/application and inter-relationship with provincial funding formula)
- To investigate all of the options for supplementary funding (or its successor) and how they could be implemented, within the context of the overall P-12 system in Nova Scotia
- To make joint recommendations to our respective bodies and provincial DOE with respect to supplementary education funding that will enable:
  - Equitable distribution of funding to students of HRSB
  - Recognition of the educational opportunities (both existing and future) enabled by supplementary funding and the ability to offer equitable educational opportunities across the system
  - Sustainable solutions that improve the educational opportunities for all students in HRM
- To open and maintain respectful dialogue with each other (school board, HRM and provincial government) on this issue and any other issues that arise

## **III. Shared Principles and Definitions**

Early on in its process, the Working Group defined some shared principles to guide its work. Those shared principles were as follows:

- ♦ Education is important for the advancement of our capital region – workforce, active citizenship, culture, social and economic impact
- ♦ Education is a shared responsibility among many stakeholders – parents, communities, government -- it is a societal responsibility
- ♦ Education involves life long learning -- the essence of human survival
- ♦ Supporting education strengthens the success of schools, neighbourhoods and communities
- ♦ Resources should be shared across the school system according to need

The Working Group also adopted the following shared definitions to help with its work:

*Equitable* – perceived fairness across the system bearing in mind that different learners and /or areas have different needs or priorities and that all student should have a reasonable opportunity to access programs wherever offered within HRM; does not mean “the same” or “equal”

*Mandatory education funding* – provincial and municipal contributions to public education required under the *Education Act*

*Public School Program (PSP)* – public school program of education to be provided and administered by school boards, as defined by regulations of the Minister of Education under the *Education Act*

*Supplementary education funding* – additional monies over and above mandatory education funding for the purpose of enhancing the PSP to (a) augment existing PSP programs (e.g. access) or (b) develop new programs not covered under the PSP

*Sustainable solutions* – viable over a long term (e.g. financial, availability of resources, demographics/enrolment, etc.)

#### **IV. A Win-Win Solution**

The Working Group was also focused on developing a long-term solution that presented a win-win solution for those involved in or affected by supplementary education funding. It defined the characteristics of a win-win solution as follows:

- ♦ Increased access by students to services and programs that will result in measurable improvement in student achievement
- ♦ No loss of funds for the School Board’s students or schools
- ♦ Fewer demands on HRM councilors to explain/defend educational funding given that it is primarily a provincial responsibility
- ♦ Overall tax burden for municipal taxpayers is reasonable and there is an equitable allocation of the supplementary education funding tax burden
- ♦ No loss of programming in areas that have historically enjoyed it
- ♦ Elimination of references to former city boundaries in taxation discussions/debates
- ♦ Increased clarity among the parties and interested stakeholders regarding the educational goals of the School Board and the responsibilities for financing the education of students within HRM

- ♦ Simplified budgeting, accounting and reporting systems for the School Board
- ♦ Increased respect and collaboration between HRM and the School Board
- ♦ It is a solution that could work for other school boards in the Province, not just HRSB
- ♦ A long-term sustainable solution that is approved and implemented by HRM Council, the School Board and the Province that will enable the School Board to have the ability to plan based upon the predictability of available resources
- ♦ Public feedback on the Working Group's recommendations supports the solution as being fair to taxpayers and equitable among students in the region.

## **V. Issues**

The Committee framed its work by identifying nine issues that it should understand in its efforts to develop a long-term strategy for Supplementary Education Funding:

1. What HRSB programs and services are funded by the provincial/municipal mandatory education funding? How is this funding determined?
2. Should HRSB restrict itself to offering the level of programs and services funded the provincial/municipal mandatory education funding? Would this meet the shared expectations of the citizens of our region?
3. What programs are funded within HRSB through supplementary funding? Should HRSB provide enhanced educational opportunities? Should enhancements to the PSP benefit all areas within HRM?
4. If so, what are the options available to HRSB to secure the funding necessary to enhance the PSP in this region?
5. Which level(s) of government are responsible for funding public education (or the public school program)? What is the history and rationale for this arrangement?
6. Who has (or should have) the responsibility to fund enhancements? Who should decide what those enhancements are and where they are most appropriate?
7. If HRM should continue to provide supplementary funding, how can the burden of raising the funds be distributed throughout HRM on an equitable basis?

1. What should be the annual process for requesting, approving and monitoring supplementary funding?
2. How can we increase the public understanding of educational funding?

## **VI. An Overview of Education Funding**

Under the *Constitution Act*, 1867, the provinces were given legislative authority over public education. In Nova Scotia, the Province has enacted the *Education Act*, through which it has established eight regional school boards and the Conseil Scolaire Acadien Provincial as the planning, governance and delivery arms for the Province.

In 1954, the Province commissioned a *Royal Commission on Public School Finance in Nova Scotia*. The Pottier Report established the basic principles upon which education financing has developed since that time. There are two primary sources of funding for all school boards:

- (a) the Province of Nova Scotia, through the Minister of Education, as a result of a provincial budget allocation (generally raised through individual and corporate income taxes, user fees, and other revenues), and
- (b) municipal units obligated to support school boards in their regions through a minimum municipal contribution mandated by the Education Act (referred to herein as “mandatory education funding” from municipalities).

With respect to the mandatory education funding, the Province sets the dollar amount and the municipality must pay (using the education rate set on uniform assessment).

The Halifax Regional School Board has enjoyed the benefit of an additional stream of funding from the municipality, known as supplementary education funding. This funding stems from another piece of provincial legislation – s. 530 of the *Municipal Government Act*. The Working Group was unable to trace the definitive roots of this HRM-specific supplementary funding. However, the practice of levying and collective supplementary education funding or area rates for educational purposes has been in place within this region for decades.

Section 530 of the *Municipal Government Act* provides that the HRM Council must pay to the School Board at least the amount of “additional funding” that was provided to either the former Halifax District School Board or the Dartmouth District School Board in the fiscal year beginning April 1, 1995. Such additional funding can only be used by the School Board for the benefit of either the former City of Halifax area or the former City of Dartmouth area respectively. In other words, it must be spent by the School Board in the area in which it was raised. This additional funding is to be recovered through an area rate levied on the assessed value of the taxable property and business occupancy assessments. Finally, s. 530 allows HRM Council to decrease the amount of educational funding at a rate of 10% per year (or at a faster rate if agreed to by the School Board).



property and business occupancy assessments. Finally, s. 530 allows HRM Council to decrease the amount of educational funding at a rate of 10% per year (or at a faster rate if agreed to by the School Board).

As a matter of practice and since 2001, HRM Council has also been providing supplementary education funding to the School Board through area rates levied in Bedford and the former Halifax County.

## **VI. Business Planning and the Use of Supplementary Education Funding**

The current supplementary education funding scheme presents significant business planning challenges for the School Board:

- It must prepare **three separate business plans** for supplementary education funding - one for schools in the former City of Halifax, one for schools in the former City of Dartmouth and a third for Bedford-Halifax County;
- The legislated requirement to spend supplementary education funding only in those areas from which the area rates were collected results in significant **program/service inequities** within the School Board - for example, schools in the former City of Halifax received almost 10 times more supplementary education funding than schools in the areas of the former Halifax County and Bedford.
  - It should be noted that the geographical limitations also presents difficulties for residents of HRM. The tax calculation for Supplementary Funding is based upon both the residential and commercial tax base in each region of the municipality. The bulk of the commercial tax base is located in the former cities and it is this commercial tax base that provides the most significant supplementary education revenues. Yet, the demographic profile of the former Bedford and County of Halifax has changed considerably since the inception of supplementary education funding. There has been great pressure on the education system in these areas due to growth in family-oriented housing developments. Families with young children are a much more substantial portion of the population in these areas than in the past, when compared with the traditional communities. Equity of educational opportunity for these families is a concern.
- Another decision-making body, specifically HRM Council, has control over the amount of supplementary education funding to be raised through taxation and remitted to the School Board. This makes long-term planning for enhanced programs and services very difficult for the School Board.

- The **ability to achieve efficiencies** in order to free up resources to devote to additional programs and services across the system is impeded by the current geographic restrictions.

How is supplementary education funding being used by the School Board now? The Working Group benefited from a detailed presentation regarding the use of supplementary education funding by School Board representatives. In order to understand how supplementary education funding is used, it is important to have a basic understanding of what is covered by the mandatory education funding given to the School Board by the Province and the Municipality.

***What is covered by mandatory education funding from the Province and the Municipality?***

The School Board receives a general fund allocation and an allocation for targeted programs from the mandatory education received from the Province and the Municipality. With respect to the general fund, about 83% of this is allocated to staff salaries and benefits. The School Board has developed, over a period of years, a formula approach to the school staffing portion of the general fund; it has no discretion over the use of targeted program funding. The School Board uses the following approach to allocate its school-based staff complement across the system:

<b>Staffing Level</b>	<b>Allocation of Staff Complement</b>
<i>Teaching Staff</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Formula based on student enrolment</li> <li>▪ Formula based allocation of resource teachers</li> <li>▪ Consider additional staff based on school profile (e.g. elementary, junior high, high school, inner city, etc.)</li> <li>▪ Consider additional staff based on configuration requirements (e.g. single building vs. family of schools)</li> <li>▪ Consider additional staff based on Primary/Grade 1/Grade 2 Cap Guidelines</li> </ul>

**Staffing Level****Allocation of Staff Complement**

*School Leadership Staff*

- Formula for allocation of principals and vice-principals based on student enrolment
- Consider additional staff based on consolidated school arrangements

*Support Staff*

- Formula allocation of school secretaries based on type of school (e.g. elementary, junior or senior) and student enrolment

Staff allocations that are made from the General Fund but that are not determined on the basis of a formula are:

- Learning Centres assigned by Student Services based on identified needs within the school
- Educational Program Assistants (EPAs) assigned by Student Services based on identified needs of registered students, and
- Additional regional staff (e.g. speech pathologists, psychologists, SLD teachers, etc.) provided through the General Fund budget.

***What is covered by Supplementary Education Funding?***

The Working Group was advised that the School Board enhances opportunities for students through:

- Additional staffing for existing programs and services
- Enrichment of the Public School Program (PSP) and special programs beyond the PSP
- Funds for school instructional supply accounts

For a detailed analysis of the use of the General Fund and the Supplementary Education Fund, please see Appendix A.

**VII. Options**

The Steering Group identified a long list of possible solutions through a brainstorming exercise. It then began the task of evaluating each of the suggestions, against the criteria established for a "win-win" solution. Several possibilities were eliminated through this process. In the end the alternatives that

the Steering Group gave more serious consideration to fall into the following five themes:

Theme	Specific Proposal (s)	Comments
<b>1. Education is a provincial responsibility</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ The Province should bear the full cost of funding public education.</li> </ul>	<p>The 1974 Walker Royal Commission on Education, Public Services and Provincial-Municipal Relations had advocated this approach; it has never gained acceptance by provincial policy-makers.</p>
<b>2. Decision-Making and Accountability with the School Board</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ School Board to set the taxation rate (up to a prescribed cap) based on DOE-approved business case for the use of the Supplementary Funding.</li> <li>♦ Municipal units to act as collection agents and collect the tax rate on assessable value of taxable property and business occupancy assessments.</li> <li>♦ Elected school boards are directly accountable to the electorate for the level and use of Supplementary Funding.</li> </ul>	<p>This approach is in use in other jurisdictions in Canada (e.g. Toronto, Alberta).</p>
<b>3. Increased Use of Commercial Tax Base in HRM for Supplementary Funding.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ As the beneficiaries of employees with a quality education, the commercial tax base should bear the cost of HRM's investment in education.</li> </ul>	

Theme	Specific Proposal (s)	Comments
<b>4. Tax Harmonization Across HRM.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Harmonize the rate of municipal taxation for Supplementary Funding across all former city/district/county boundaries within HRM.</li> <li>♦ Apply a standard rate of "x" cents per \$100 of assessed value</li> <li>♦ Allow the School Board to use the Supplementary Funding across its entire system, without geographic restrictions on programs or services.</li> </ul>	<p>Currently, the rates are: (a) Halifax – 9.4 cents per \$100 of assessed value; (b) Dartmouth – 7.6 cents per \$100 of assessed value, (c) County-Bedford – 3.4 cents per \$100 of assessed value</p>
<b>5. Miscellaneous</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Raise Supplementary Funding through deed transfer tax.</li> <li>♦ Consider raising Supplementary Funding through a dwelling unit tax.</li> <li>♦ Use a "per-student" formula for determining taxation rates in various areas of HRM.</li> <li>♦ Have HRM assume responsibility for all School Board facilities.</li> <li>♦ Establish a Joint HRM-School Board to recommend to Council an annual rate for Supplementary Education Funding.</li> </ul>	<p>These suggestions arose through an attempt to: (a) have those who use the school system pay for the Supplementary Funding; (b) re-allocate School Board costs to eliminate the need for Supplementary Funding and (c) to increase understanding and reduce conflict regarding the annual Supplementary Funding request from the School Board, assuming that the current system remains in place.</p>

An analysis of the perceived strengths and weaknesses of various options considered is found in Appendix B to this Report.

In the end, the Working Group adopted elements from each of Themes (1), (3) and (5) highlighted above. It reached consensus that school boards (not municipalities) should have the authority and the accountability to determine an annual amount for

supplementary education funding. Municipal units should act as collection agents for the amount determined by the school board. Having said this, the Working Group also acknowledged the need to ensure that the overall tax burden on municipal residents remains reasonable.

It considered two possible approaches to setting maximum caps on the annual amount that could be set by a school board for supplementary education funding:

#### Approach 1

- Protect taxpayers by setting a cap of X cents per \$100 of assessed value – the school board’s business planning for supplementary education funding must be done within these parameters.

#### Approach 2

- Protect taxpayers by limiting the amount of supplementary education funding that a school board can raise annually to X % of its global\* budget for the previous year - that amount is communicated to HRM as part of its annual budget - Council then sets the rate to raise that amount.

\*Global budget - refers to all funding received by the School Board except supplementary education funding

In the end, the Working Group reached consensus that Approach 2 is the better one. Linking the funds required for supplementary education funding to school board cost drivers rather than fluctuating property assessments made more sense to us.

In the end, the Working Group reached consensus that relevant legislation should be amended to achieve the following:

- ◆ School boards in Nova Scotia should have the ability to levy an amount for supplementary education funding (to a maximum of 10% of the previous year’s global school board budget) through corresponding rates set and collected by municipalities within their jurisdiction. School boards, through an annual business planning process involving public consultation, would develop a business case for the annual supplementary education levy. The amount required to be collected would then be communicated to the applicable municipal councils who would, in turn, determine the rate required to raise the supplementary education fund amount. The municipality would then collect and remit to the school board the annual amount specified for supplementary education funding. School boards would also be required to issue an annual report on the use of such funds to the public in order to ensure accountability.
- ◆ The municipalities would act as the collection agents for the school boards in relation to the supplementary education funding. Municipal units would not

be involved in setting or approving the supplementary education funding amount – they would simply determine the rate required to collect it (based upon annual assessments) and collect it in the same manner that they collect municipal taxes and remit the amount collected to the school board(s).

### **VIII. Is this a “Win-Win” Solution?**

Does the Working Group’s proposal demonstrate the characteristics of a win-win solution, as defined by the Group early in its deliberations? We believe it does. Specifically,

- ♦ It enables the School Board to plan for and implement increased access by students to services and programs that will result in measurable improvement in student achievement.
- ♦ It should not result in a loss of funds for the School Board’s students or schools.
- ♦ There should be fewer demands on HRM councilors to explain/defend educational funding as the rate will be set by the School Board.
- ♦ Both HRM and the School Board will have to ensure that the overall tax burden for municipal taxpayers is reasonable; placing a maximum cap on the School Board’s rate-setting ability should help to ensure this.
- ♦ While the location of programs currently funded by Supplementary Funding may shift over time, there should be no loss of access to programming for those areas that have historically enjoyed enriched programming.
- ♦ The recommended approach supports the elimination of references to former city boundaries in taxation discussions/debates.
- ♦ Placing the authority to set the rate with the same body that must plan for, use and account for the use of Supplementary Education Funding should serve to increase clarity among the parties and interested stakeholders regarding the educational goals of the School Board and the responsibilities for financing the education of students within HRM.
- ♦ The School Board will be able to move to a single system-wide budget budgeting, accounting and reporting system for Supplementary Education Funding (versus the three systems it must now administer).
- ♦ While both HRM and the School Board will be sharing a tax base that is already feeling stretched, eliminating the annual “bun fight” over the amount for and intended use of Supplementary Education Funding and placing a

maximum cap on the School Board's rate setting authority should serve to increase respect and collaboration between HRM and the School Board.

- ♦ The proposed solution is one that could be extended to other school boards across the Province, if desired.
- ♦ We hope that our recommendations will be approved and implemented by HRM Council, the School Board and the Province so as to enable the School Board to plan based upon the predictability of available resources.
- ♦ We believe that the Working Group's recommendations are fair to taxpayers and equitable among students in the region.

## **IX. Next Steps and Responsibilities for Implementation**

The Working Group will present its recommendations to both HRM Council and the School Board. Both will be asked to support/agree with the recommendations outlined herein. Assuming that such approvals are secured, the recommendations will then be brought forward jointly by HRM Council and the School Board to the Minister of Education and the Legislature.

The Province of Nova Scotia has already indicated an intention to open/amend legislation affecting Supplementary Education Funding in response to litigation initiated by the Conseil Scolaire Acadien Provincial. This would present an opportune time for the recommendations of this Working Group to be translated into a proposed Bill and to work their way through the normal public process of bringing in new legislation. The law amendments process would provide a good opportunity for public feedback on the proposals.

Once the Working Group's recommendations have been passed as law, there could be a joint HRM-School Board Transition Team put into place to ensure a smooth transition between the current system and the new system for Supplementary Education Funding.

## **Conclusion**

While the solution proposed by the Working Group may not be perfect and may not alleviate all the future tensions that may creep into the relationship between HRM and the School Board, it should go a long way to providing:

- ♦ Enhanced educational opportunities for students in HRM
- ♦ Sustainable and predictable funding for the School Board
- ♦ A region-wide investment in accessible, high quality education that does not pit one area of the municipal region against another



- ♦ Better transparency and accountability for decision-making relating to Supplementary Funding
- ♦ Improved relationships between two parties that should be collaborating for the benefit of their mutual constituents.

We urge all decision-makers who will consider these recommendations to support them.

All of which is respectfully submitted this 5<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2006.

*Halifax Regional Municipality Councilors*

*Halifax Regional School Board Members*

*Sheila Fougere*

Sheila Fougere

Debra Barlow

*Debra Barlow*

David Hendsbee

Bridgett Ann Boutilier

*Bridget Ann Boutilier*

Debbie Hum

Wade Marshall

Becky Kent

Gary O'Hara

Jim Smith

Doug Sparks

Russell Walker

## Appendix A

### Allocation of General Funding and Supplementary Education Funding by the School Board

<b><i>Classroom and Junior High Specialists</i></b>	
<p>General Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Determined by formula</li> <li>▪ Elementary 1:26</li> <li>▪ Junior High 1:28</li> <li>▪ Senior High 1:22.8</li> </ul>	<p>Supplementary Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Halifax/Dartmouth: Additional teachers allocated by needs</li> <li>▪ Purpose to lower class size at all levels</li> <li>▪ Corresponding junior high specialist allocation within each junior high class</li> <li>▪ Halifax County/Bedford: schools "purchase" classroom teachers at their own discretion (on a menu of options for the use of supplementary funds)</li> </ul>
<b><i>French (Elementary)</i></b>	
<p>General Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Grades 4-5 allocated 120 minutes /six day cycle</li> <li>▪ Grade 6 allocated 150 minutes/six day cycle</li> </ul>	<p>Supplementary Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Halifax/Dartmouth: Grades 4-6 allocated 150 minutes/five day cycle (30 minutes for all classes/day)</li> </ul>
<b><i>Physical Education (Elementary)</i></b>	
<p>General Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Grades Primary-6 allocated 60 minutes/six day cycle</li> </ul>	<p>Supplementary Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Halifax/Dartmouth: Grades Primary-6 allocated 60 minutes/five day cycle</li> </ul>
<b><i>Music (Elementary)</i></b>	
<p>General Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Grades Primary-6 allocated 60 minutes/six day cycle</li> </ul>	<p>Supplementary Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Halifax/Dartmouth: Grades Primary-6 allocated 60 minutes/five day cycle</li> <li>▪ Halifax: 60 minutes allocated for choir/five day cycle</li> </ul>

<b><i>Fine Arts (Elementary)</i></b>	
<p>General Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Program delivered at elementary level through regular classroom instruction</li> <li>▪ Elective Music and Fine Arts at junior and senior high level</li> </ul>	<p>Supplementary Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ "All City Music" Program in Halifax/Dartmouth to enhance classroom music (Strings, All City Bands and Choir Programs)</li> <li>▪ 2 Fine Arts Consultants in Halifax</li> </ul>
<b><i>Art Instruction</i></b>	
<p>General Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Program delivered at elementary level by classroom teacher through regular classroom instruction</li> <li>▪ Elective art at junior and senior high level</li> </ul>	<p>Supplementary Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Halifax: Grades 4-6: 60 minutes/five day cycle delivered by Art Specialist</li> <li>▪ Halifax/Dartmouth Junior High: designated art allocation above general fund specialist allotment</li> </ul>
<b><i>English as Second Language (ESL) Support</i></b>	
<p>General Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No dedicated funding for ESL in Department of Education budget</li> </ul>	<p>Supplementary Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Halifax: 7.0 FTEs</li> <li>▪ Dartmouth: 2.5 FTEs</li> <li>▪ County: 2.0 FTEs</li> </ul>
<b><i>Youth Foundations</i></b>	
<p>General Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No dedicated programs for junior high "at risk" students outside of traditional school setting</li> </ul>	<p>Supplementary Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Halifax: 4.0 FTEs for the Youth Foundations Programs</li> </ul>
<b><i>Junior High Support Teachers</i></b>	
<p>General Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No specific funding for support staff in addition to PSP delivery for junior highs</li> </ul>	<p>Supplementary Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Designated junior high schools in Halifax/Dartmouth allocated 0.5 FTE to support "at risk" students within the school and to serve as liaisons between student/home/support services</li> </ul>
<b><i>Resource Teachers</i></b>	
<p>General Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Determined by formula</li> <li>▪ Elementary - 1:300</li> <li>▪ Junior High - 1:350</li> <li>▪ Senior High - 1:600</li> </ul>	<p>Supplementary Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Enhanced resource at Elementary and Junior High Schools in Halifax/Dartmouth/Halifax County-Bedford District</li> </ul>

<b>Special Congregated Classes</b>	
<p>General Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Schools allocated "learning centres" based on needs of registered students</li> </ul>	<p>Supplementary Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Halifax/Dartmouth: Congregated Special Education programs outside the neighbourhood schools to support students with special needs</li> <li>▪ Halifax: Swimming program for students with special needs</li> </ul>
<b>Social Workers</b>	
<p>General Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No designated funding for social workers</li> </ul>	<p>Supplementary Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Halifax: 4.0 FTEs</li> <li>▪ Dartmouth: 2.0 FTEs</li> </ul>
<b>Educational Program Assistants (EPAs)</b>	
<p>General Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Allocated by Student Services based on the profiles of students with special needs enrolled at each individual school</li> <li>▪ Criteria for allocation applied consistently across the system</li> <li>▪ Maximum regional allocation determined through the budget process</li> </ul>	<p>Supplementary Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Enhanced program support to schools in Halifax (30 FTEs) and Dartmouth (13 FTEs)</li> <li>▪ Allocation determined by Student Services</li> <li>▪ Support for Four Plus Program</li> <li>▪ Halifax County/Bedford District: schools "purchase" enhanced EPA support at their own discretion (from a menu of options for the use of supplementary fund allocations)</li> </ul>
<b>Behaviour Support and CDST</b>	
<p>General Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regional Behaviour Specialists provided through budget</li> </ul>	<p>Supplementary Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Halifax: 3.0 FTEs</li> <li>▪ Dartmouth: 1.0 FTE</li> </ul>
<b>Guidance</b>	
<p>General Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No guidance at elementary level</li> <li>▪ Determined by formula at junior high level (1:600)</li> <li>▪ Number determined by the principal within total staffing allocation at the high school level</li> </ul>	<p>Supplementary Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Halifax/Dartmouth: Guidance to provide counseling and support to students at designated elementary schools by needs</li> <li>▪ Halifax/Dartmouth: Enhanced guidance at designated junior high schools allocated by needs</li> </ul>

<b>Library Support Specialists</b>	
<p>General Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7.0 FTEs (regional)</li> <li>8.5 FTEs dedicated funding from DOE in 2005-06 (<i>is this in addition to 7.0?</i>)</li> </ul>	<p>Supplementary Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Halifax: 27.3 FTEs</li> <li>Dartmouth: 15.4 FTEs</li> <li>Halifax County-Bedford District: schools "purchase" library support at their own discretion (from a menu of options for the use of supplementary fund allocations)</li> </ul>
<b>Principals and Vice-Principals</b>	
<p>General Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Determined by formula</li> </ul>	<p>Supplementary Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Halifax: All elementary schools receive 40% administrative release time for vice-principal</li> <li>Halifax: Small school with teaching principal receives extra release time</li> <li>Halifax/Dartmouth: Schools with high needs receive extra vice-principal release time</li> </ul>
<b>Student Service Secretaries</b>	
<p>General Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assigned to support Student Services offices in school sites for personnel allocated through General Fund Budget</li> </ul>	<p>Supplementary Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assigned to support Student Services offices in school sites for personnel allocated through Supplementary Fund Budget (e.g. social workers, etc.)</li> <li>Halifax: 0.5 FTE</li> <li>Dartmouth: 0.2 FTE</li> </ul>
<b>Four Plus Program Teachers</b>	
<p>General Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No designated funds from DOE</li> </ul>	<p>Supplementary Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Halifax: 4.0 FTEs</li> <li>Dartmouth: 2.0 FTEs</li> <li>Halifax County-Bedford: 1.0 FTE</li> </ul>
<b>School Secretaries</b>	
<p>General Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Determined by formula</li> </ul>	<p>Supplementary Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Halifax/Dartmouth: Allocation enhanced for small schools</li> <li>Halifax County-Bedford: Schools "purchase" extra secretarial support at their discretion</li> </ul>

<b><i>Student Support Workers</i></b>	
<p>General Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ African-Nova Scotia Student Support Workers: 12.0 FTEs</li> </ul>	<p>Supplementary Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Student Support Workers support all "at risk" students</li> <li>▪ Halifax: 2.0 FTEs</li> <li>▪ Dartmouth: 1.0 FTEs</li> </ul>
<b><i>Instructional Supplies for Schools</i></b>	
<p>General Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Determined by formula</li> </ul>	<p>Supplementary Fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Halifax/Dartmouth: Enhanced funding to each school</li> <li>▪ Halifax/Dartmouth: Budget for "All City Music" program</li> <li>▪ Halifax County-Bedford: Schools can choose to allocate supplementary funds to the Instructional Supplies account</li> </ul>