Report of Senior Administration to the Board of Trustees

March 14, 2011

A. Business Arising for Board Action

I. Presentations
II. Human Resources
III. Secretary-Treasurer
1. 2011/2012 Final Budget 1
IV. Superintendent of Schools
V. Senior Administration Response to Trustee Inquiries

B. Administrative Information

I. Human Resources
1. Personnel Report 3
II. Secretary-Treasurer
1. Sale of Fleming School 3
III. Superintendent of Schools
1. School Information
School Visits (February 24 – March 9, 2011) 3
A. Quality Learning
- Quality Learning at Linden Lanes School 3
B. Quality Teaching
- Quality Teaching at St. Augustine School 4
- Teachers' Institute on Parliamentary Democracy / April 16 – 19, 2011 5
C. Quality Support Services
- Quality Support Services at Earl Oxford School 6
D. Administrative and Statistical Information
- Suspensions 7
- Suspension Report – Semester One – 2010/2011 7
2. Divisional Initiatives
A. Quality Learning
- Principal Preparation Program – Session 6 "Stewardship Leadership" / February 15, 2011, and Principal Mentorship 7
- High Ability Learner Enrichment Program (HALEP) Steering Committee Meeting / March 4, 2011 8

... /2

3. **Community Connections**
   - **Community Based Meeting on Immigration Sponsored by the Minister of Labour and Immigration, Jennifer Howard..... 8**

This report from members of the Brandon School Division Senior Administration is submitted respectfully for your consideration, action, and information.

Dr. Donna M. Michaels
Superintendent of Schools/
Chief Executive Officer

A. Business Arising for Board Action

I. PRESENTATIONS

II. HUMAN RESOURCES

III. SECRETARY-TREASURER

1. 2011/2012 FINAL BUDGET

For Action.....G. Barnes

Further to the Budget deliberations at the Special Board Meetings held February 22, 2011 and March 7, 2011, included in the Agenda for the Board's final consideration upon completion of your budget discussions is a motion to finalize the Budget for the 2011-12 fiscal year and the Special Levy for the 2011 municipal and calendar year.

A revised 4 Year Business Plan reflecting the 2011-12 Budget deliberations/decisions and adjustments to the Special Requirement in order to retain the current amount of undesignated accumulated surplus will be reviewed by the Finance Committee and subsequently submitted to the Board for consideration of long-term planning discussions. Included is a 2011 Special Levy calculation reflecting a $2,614,881 or 8.9% increase.

Attached are revised schedules (Appendix A*)* with changes directed by the Board at the February 22, 2011 Budget Meeting reflecting net expenditure additions of $1,526,800 and the Special Requirement increase of $2,587,500. These revised schedules and budget totals include an adjustment of $23,800 for the payroll tax and the offsetting Provincial General Support Grant resulting in no change to the special requirement or special levy. The following recommendation reflects these changes.

Attached as Appendix B are the public presentations that were presented at the Special Board Meeting held on March 7, 2011.

If you have any questions with respect to the foregoing or the attached schedules, please call or have them discussed at the Board of Trustees meeting. This item is referred to Business Arising for discussion.

RECOMMENDATION:
That the Final Budget for 2011-12 and the 2011 Special Levy be approved as follows:

Total Operating Expenditures	*$72,482,400*
Total Capital Expenditures	*$ 2,296,600*
Total Expenditures	*$74,779,000*
2011-12 Special Requirement	*$35,144,400*
2011 Special Levy to be raised from Municipalities	$32,064,035

IV. SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

V. SENIOR ADMINISTRATION RESPONSE TO TRUSTEE INQUIRIES

B. Administrative Information

I. HUMAN RESOURCES

1. PERSONNEL REPORT

For Information ..... B. Switzer

Included in the agenda package as Confidential #1 is the Personnel Report, a listing of resignations and employment approved by the Superintendent of Schools and Secretary-Treasurer since the last meeting.

II. SECRETARY-TREASURER

1. SALE OF FLEMING SCHOOL

For Information ..... G. Barnes

In further reply to previous Trustee inquiries, this is to advise that the Division has received confirmation from Sioux Valley First Nation and Indian & Northern Affairs Canada that financing arrangements are in place for the purchase of Fleming School in the amount of $300,000. This matter has been referred to the Division solicitor for finalization of a sales agreement. This is provided as information.

III. SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

1. SCHOOL INFORMATION

For Information ..... D. Michaels

SCHOOL VISITS (FEBRUARY 24 – MARCH 9, 2011)

- February 28, 2011 / Crocus Plains

A. QUALITY LEARNING

QUALITY LEARNING AT LINDEN LANES SCHOOL
Report prepared by Ms. Kathy Brigden, Principal, Linden Lanes School

Linden Lanes School continues to provide quality learning experiences supported by quality teaching by creating classroom cultures of thinking, questioning and understanding. Professional development opportunities have been planned to support this goal as outlined in our school development plan for 2010/2011.

Literacy development, with a focus on the acquisition of *writing traits,* has been an area of professional development over the past two years. Teachers have shared samples of student writing that demonstrate these traits, discussed the development of writing, learned about strategies in the teaching of writing, and

implemented a common language across the grades. This builds consistency with a common teaching language and provides valuable feedback to students.

Professional Development sessions led by Linden Lanes teachers (January and February, 2011) continued to further deepen our understanding of comprehension by looking at three critical areas –Thinking *within* the text, Thinking *beyond* the text, and Thinking *about the* text. These areas were in direct relation to the selection of texts for interactive read-alouds and literature discussions. Teachers shared strategies they had tried in their classrooms, reviewed library resources and generated ideas for further study.

Several teachers have benefitted from the opportunity to participate in professional development sessions (Faye Brownlee, Sharon Taberski, Early and Middle Years Literacy Support) and have taken leadership roles in sharing this information with the school team. The opportunities to dialogue, share examples of student work, observe and reflect upon student learning all contribute to quality teaching and learning experiences.

Numeracy development, with a focus on essential strategies for developing addition, subtraction, multiplication and division continues. Further sessions to look at the development of algebraic reasoning, particularly at the grade 1 to 4 area, will be planned.

B. QUALITY TEACHING

QUALITY TEACHING AT ST. AUGUSTINE SCHOOL

Report prepared by Ms. Betty Howell, Principal, St. Augustine School

The area of our school plan on which I will focus this report is English as an Additional Language (EAL) instruction. This year in our school we have thirty-three students out of two hundred and ten students, varying from Stage 1 – Stage 4 learners. Language acquisition is a lengthy process, and although younger students quickly acquire the basic communication skills, the development of academic language requires ongoing support.

The early language development for those learners in Stage 1 and 2 focuses on the BICS – basic language skills for communication. The students participate in activities to assist them in understanding the language necessary to make their needs known. For those learners beyond the Stage 1 and 2, the instruction shifts to include more instruction in the literacy area and support for content area learning.

One program resource that we have found to be very helpful in literacy instruction is the Fountas and Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention program. We have purchased the grade 1 version of the program specifically to support literacy development with early language learners, as well as for use in the literacy support program. The gradual gradient of text difficulty provides support and successful learning for the

EAL learners. Also, the texts provide many opportunities to extend the language discussion, therefore meeting the ongoing need to expand the English Language knowledge, while building literacy skills. Once the students have passed the Stage 1 and 2 level, we have found that gaining a beginning level of literacy becomes the next important step for success in the classroom. Programming to develop the letter sound association for English is also important, and the *Letterland* program has been one of the resources we have used to meet this need.

For some of our Middle Years EAL learners, we have found a resource entitled " Edge: Reading, Writing and Language" which integrates English Language learning with some of the content which is addressed in the Middle Years curricula. This provides and age appropriate integrated reading and writing experience for the Middle Years learners.

The ongoing challenge in EAL instruction, is discerning whether the difficulties a learner is experiencing are due to language delays, or due to another learning difficulty. As we have more experience in EAL instruction, we are beginning to understand more about the expected milestones of growth in English language acquisition and also to be alert to those students whom we feel are experiencing another form of learning difficulty. The search for assessments that can be administered in first language to provide a fair assessment of the child is an ongoing need.

TEACHERS' INSTITUTE ON PARLIAMENTARY DEMOCRACY / APRIL 16 – 19, 2011

Kevin Grindey, Teacher, Vincent Massey High School has been accepted to attend the Teachers' Institute on Parliamentary Democracy April 16 – 19, 2011.

The Teachers' Institute is a Legislative Assembly of Manitoba program, hosted and coordinated by the Office of the Speaker with the support of all Members of the Legislative Assembly and the Department of Education.

Mr. Grindey will have the chance to see the role of an MLA in their constituency and within the Legislative Assembly Chamber and Committees. One of the highlights will be the opportunity to visit Government House for a tour and coffee with the Lieutenant Governor and Her Honour, as well as tour the Law Courts and have discussion with one of Manitoba's Provincial Court Judges.

Congratulations to Mr. Grindey on his acceptance.

C. QUALITY SUPPORT SERVICES

QUALITY SUPPORT SERVICES AT EARL OXFORD SCHOOL

Report prepared by Mr. Ian Carkener, Acting Principal, Earl Oxford School

At Earl Oxford we have accessed several areas of Quality Support Services. Our Early Years team has engaged in several professional development sessions with the Numeracy Specialist, engaging in training in topics such as Origo Math, moving beyond traditional algorithms, SmartBoard math possibilities, and a school wide assessment concept. As well, they have discussed the possible use of a numeracy specialist in the school to work with struggling students.

Our K-8 school teams have worked with the divisional Literacy Specialist working on student engagement, reading strategies and more focus for writing projects.

We have had the English as an Additional Language (EAL) department involved with training and translating for new students and parents as well as helping to set up our EAL educational assistants and teachers.

Professional development opportunities such as Winterball, Sexuality Education, and CPR/First Aid have been accessed through the Physical Education Consultant.

Our school has benefitted from our Social Worker in dealing with home issues for a number of struggling students. She has also been beneficial in setting up our Tragic Events Support Team to deal with the possibility of the death of a student in our care.

The divisional Aboriginal Education Counselor has been involved with small groups of students, working to keep them focused and in school.

Earl Oxford's Home School Liaison works closely with the Attendance Officer, keeping on top of students for whom attendance is an issue.

The school Resource Teacher works closely with the Psychologist to assess and program for student needs.

All of these areas were identified in our school plan and we are working hard to meet the needs of a diverse and growing school population.

D. ADMINISTRATIVE AND STATISTICAL INFORMATION

SUSPENSIONS

SCHOOL	NO./STUDENTS	NO./DAYS	REASON
Crocus Plains	10	3, 5, 30	Assaultive, Drug and Alcohol, Unacceptable
J. R. Reid	1	5	Unacceptable Behaviour
Linden Lanes	1	3	Unacceptable Behaviour
Neelin	3	3, 5	Drug and Alcohol, Unacceptable
Vincent Massey	4	5, 30	Unacceptable Behaviour

SUSPENSION REPORT – SEMESTER ONE – 2010/2011

There were 189 suspensions reported in the first semester of 2010/2011; thirteen (13) in elementary schools and one hundred seventy six (176) in senior high schools.

Appendix C includes details of the school suspension breaking down by category and days of consequence.

2. DIVISIONAL INITIATIVES

For Information..... D. Michaels

A. QUALITY LEARNING

PRINCIPAL PREPARATION PROGRAM - SESSION 6 "STEWARDSHIP LEADERSHIP" / FEBRUARY 15, 2011, AND PRINCIPAL MENTORSHIP

Report prepared by Mr. Jaime Lombaert, Vice Principal George Fitton School

Principal Preparation Program

On Tuesday, February 15, 2011 Principal Preparation Program Session #6 took place. The facilitators were Donna Kormilo (former principal of Green Acres School and O'Kelly School) and Ron Cruickshank (Vice Principal, Crocus Plains Regional Secondary School) and the topic was; Stewardship Leadership (with review of Brandon School Division policy and practices).

The main themes included:

- Debrief January Mentorship Visits to Schools
- Opening Remarks/Principal's Responsibilities
- Provincial Legislation
- Divisional Policies, Collective Agreements
- Workplace Safety and Health Inspection
- Hiring/interviews
- Evaluation Criteria
- Scavenger Hunt of Policies
- Managing Finances

This session was very interesting and informative.

Principal Mentorship

The Principal Mentorship Opportunity is a key component in the Principal Preparation Program. During the week of January 24-28, 2011 participants had their second opportunity for principal mentorship. Twenty nine out of thirty one participants in the Principal Preparation Program signed up to take part in the mentorship opportunity. Each participant had the opportunity to be mentored by a principal in Brandon School Division for half or full day. Principal Mentorship will continue to give participants in the program the opportunity to link practice with theory from the course. There are two more principal mentorship opportunities in the course in March and April. Participants had an opportunity on February 15, 2011 to share their experiences with other participants in the program.

HIGH ABILITY LEARNER ENRICHMENT PROGRAM (HALEP) STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING / MARCH 4, 2011

The most recent meeting of the High Ability Learner Enrichment Program (HALEP) Steering Committee was held on March 4, 2011.

The Professional Development Plan for HALEP Teachers was reviewed. HALEP Teachers have commenced a book study of The School-Wide Enrichment Model: A How To Guide for Educational Excellence, by Joseph Renzulli and Sally Reis.

In the future it is anticipated that administrators and teachers who have attended Confratute will be able to supply a mentorship-based professional development program to staff in the Division who are new to HALEP.

As part of the discussion regarding the implementation of the School-Wide Enrichment Model (Joseph Renzulli) in Brandon School Division, Bruce Shamray, the Principal of Kirkcaldy Heights School spoke about the implementation of Enrichment Clusters at Kirkcaldy Heights School. Students were surveyed on topics of interest, and it is hoped to have the Enrichment Clusters in place by April 2011.

The next meeting of the HALEP Steering Committee is scheduled for May 13, 2011.

3. COMMUNITY CONNECTIONS

For Information ..... D. Michaels

COMMUNITY-BASED MEETING ON IMMIGRATION SPONSORED BY THE MINISTER OF LABOUR AND IMMIGRATION, JENNIFER HOWARD

Ms. Howard's invitation to this roundtable meeting on immigration stated that "the purpose of this roundtable meeting is to seek local input from key business, immigrant, and community representatives on Manitoba's approach to immigration and to look at

ways to strengthen the Manitoba Provincial Nominee and its settlement/integration strategy".

Ms. Howard welcomed participants to the session.

Background

Background was provided on Manitoba's Action Strategy for Growth based on the inclusion of immigrants in the Province's population. In 2010 Manitoba welcomed 15,803 immigrants with the goal being 20,000 within the next few years. Manitoba's Provincial Nominee Program (PNP) is an economic program that selects skilled immigrants for successful establishment in Manitoba. To be noted for Brandon: there were 83 immigrants in 2003; in 2009 there are 1149 immigrant peoples.

Ninety-three percent of Brandon's immigrants have come through the Provincial Nominee Program (PNP).

Reference was made to the reasons for the success of the PNP including: persons selected for skills, preparation for VISA processes and immigration change, mentorship and coaching, English language development in Brandon.

Roundtable Discussion

Following the background presentation roundtable discussions took place. These questions formed the basis of the discussions:

a) Should we continue to grow immigration?
b) How do you think the MPNP is working?
c) How can we improve to help ensure more immigrants are employable and job-ready?
d) How can we build on the success of the PNP?

Summary of the Key Messages

The following is a summary of the key messages from the discussions:

a) Should we continue to grow immigration?

Yes, we should continue to grow immigration – understanding that increased funding is required for the governmental and communal infrastructure necessary to include immigrants in the active life of the community. This includes increased funding for teaching immigrant children English as an Additional Language. Greater support is required for immigrant families to access services in Brandon. Both anticipation and response are required.

b) *How do you think the MPNP Program is working?*

Yes, as an "arrival stream" but not as a support system.

c) *How can we improve to help ensure more immigrants are employable and job-ready?*

- Increased language acquisition "English, English, English" with provision of more English classes on the weekend.
- PNP is not just an economic initiative – it is about human development. This would promote greater understanding on the part of Brandon citizens as to what immigration means and requires.

d) *How can we build on the successes achieved through Manitoba's settlement and integration strategy?*

As a community we need to work together to include our newcomers effectively.

Appendix A

BRANDON SCHOOL DIVISION

PROPOSED BUDGET

2011-2012

BRANDON
SCHOOL DIVISION
"Accepting the Challenge"

BRANDON SCHOOL DIVISION
BUDGET TOTALS
2011-2012

	Operating Expenditures	Capital Expenditures	Total Expenditures	Special Requirement
2011-2012 Budget Totals	$ 72,482,400	$ 2,296,600	$ 74,779,000	$ 35,144,400
2010-2011 Budget Totals	$ 67,589,600	$ 2,109,300	$ 69,698,900	$ 32,556,900
Increase (Decrease)	$ 4,892,800	$ 187,300	$ 5,080,100	$ 2,587,500
	7.2%	8.9%	7.3%	7.9%

COST PER PUPIL

							Program Support Per Eligible Pupil
2011/2012 Budget	$ 72,736,900	÷	7,548.0	=	$	9,637	$ 4,653
2010/2011 Projected	$ 67,881,300	÷	7,393.0	=	$	9,182	$ 4,548
2009/2010 Actual	$ 64,137,777	÷	7,055.5	=	$	9,090	$ 4,543
2008/2009 Actual	$ 60,636,269	÷	6,948.0	=	$	8,727	$ 4,492
2007/2008 Actual	$ 56,808,904	÷	6,765.5	=	$	8,397	$ 4,355
2006/2007 Actual	$ 54,554,780	÷	6,743.5	=	$	8,090	$ 4,187
2005/2006 Actual	$ 52,219,895	÷	6,924.0	=	$	7,542	$ 4,048
2004/2005 Actual	$ 50,110,108	÷	7,064.5	=	$	7,093	$ 3,980
2003/2004 Actual	$ 49,343,592	÷	7,109.0	=	$	6,941	$ 3,844
2002/2003 Actual	$ 47,026,179	÷	7,292.0	=	$	6,449	$ 3,734
2001/2002 Actual	$ 45,540,580	÷	7,400.5	=	$	6,154	$ 3,678
2000/2001 Actual	$ 43,764,085	÷	7,633.5	=	$	5,733	$ 3,577

BRANDON SCHOOL DIVISION
SCHEDULE OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES
2011/12 BUDGET

	2010/2011 BUDGET	2010/2011 ESTIMATED ACTUAL	2011/2012 BUDGET	BUDGET INCREASE (DECREASE)	
REVENUES					
Provincial Government	42,363,200	43,041,700	44,943,400	2,580,200	6.1%
Federal Government	23,900	12,100	23,900	-	0.0%
Municipal Government	24,335,000	24,335,000	26,578,700	2,243,700	9.2%
Other School Divisions	187,400	223,700	222,200	34,800	18.6%
First Nations	257,000	289,900	283,200	26,200	10.2%
Private Organizations and Individuals	649,000	772,700	607,400	(41,600)	-6.4%
Other Sources	28,600	83,900	78,100	49,500	173.1%
	67,844,100	68,759,000	72,736,900	4,892,800	7.2%
EXPENDITURES					
Regular Instruction	39,542,200	39,854,800	42,221,200	2,679,000	6.8%
Student Support Services	14,537,900	14,325,300	16,178,500	1,640,600	11.3%
Community Education and Services	157,700	224,300	245,300	87,600	55.5%
Divisional Administration	2,034,100	2,037,700	2,116,400	82,300	4.0%
Instructional & Other Support Services	1,965,100	1,968,100	2,034,900	69,800	3.6%
Transportation	1,749,900	1,770,200	1,795,600	45,700	2.6%
Operations and Maintenance	6,416,300	6,280,800	6,634,700	218,400	3.4%
Fiscal	1,186,400	1,165,600	1,255,800	69,400	5.8%
	67,589,600	67,626,800	72,482,400	4,892,800	7.2%
Transfers To Capital	254,500	254,500	254,500	-	0.0%
	67,844,100	67,881,300	72,736,900	4,892,800	7.2%
EXCESS (DEFICIENCY) OF REVENUES OVER EXPENDITURES	-	877,700	-	-	

BRANDON SCHOOL DIVISION
CAPITAL BUDGET
2011-2012

	2010-2011 Budget	2010-2011 Estimated Actual	2011-2012 Budget
REVENUE:			
Provincial Government			
Debt Servicing	$1,854,800	$1,870,700	$1,792,100
Transfers			
From Operating	254,500	254,500	254,500
From Reserves	-	-	250,000
Grants & Reserves		17,300	
Long Term Debt	-	-	-
TOTAL REVENUE	$2,109,300	$2,142,500	$2,296,600
EXPENDITURES:			
Debt Servicing			
Debenture Debt Interest	$ 715,200	$ 799,300	$ 759,100
Debenture Debt Principal	1,194,100	1,125,900	1,087,500
	$1,909,300	$1,925,200	$1,846,600
Capital Assets & Allocations			
School Buses	200,000	217,300	300,000
Computer Infrastructure	-	-	150,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	$2,109,300	$2,142,500	$2,296,600

BRANDON SCHOOL DIVISION
REVENUE ANALYSIS BY FUNCTION

	2008-2009 Actual	%	2009-2010 Actual	%	2010-2011 Budget	%	2011-2012 Budget	%
Provincial Government	$37,436,749	62.2%	$40,701,311	63.0%	$ 42,363,200	62.4%	$ 44,943,400	61.8%
Federal Government	24,953	0.0%	56,264	0.1%	23,900	0.0%	23,900	0.0%
Municipal Government	21,364,238	35.5%	22,416,877	34.7%	24,335,000	35.9%	26,578,700	36.5%
Other School Divisions	198,252	0.3%	258,621	0.4%	187,400	0.3%	222,200	0.3%
First Nations	272,048	0.5%	249,788	0.4%	257,000	0.4%	283,200	0.4%
Private Organizations & Individuals	917,733	1.5%	915,829	1.4%	677,600	1.0%	685,500	0.9%
	$60,213,973	100.0%	$64,598,690	100.0%	$ 67,844,100	100.0%	$ 72,736,900	99.9%

EXPENDITURE ANALYSIS BY FUNCTION

	2008-2009 Actual	%	2009-2010 Actual	%	2010-2011 Budget	%	2011-2012 Budget	%
Regular Instruction	$34,674,900	57.2%	$36,442,275	56.8%	$39,542,200	58.3%	$42,221,200	58.0%
Student Support Services	13,144,295	21.7%	13,867,763	21.6%	14,537,900	21.4%	16,178,500	22.2%
Community Education	196,831	0.3%	214,317	0.3%	157,700	0.2%	245,300	0.3%
Administration	1,974,891	3.3%	1,907,240	3.0%	2,034,100	3.0%	2,116,400	2.9%
Instructional & Other Support Services	1,713,696	2.8%	1,934,004	3.0%	1,965,100	2.9%	2,034,900	2.8%
Transportation of Pupils	1,538,589	2.5%	1,650,482	2.6%	1,749,900	2.6%	1,795,600	2.5%
Operations & Maintenance	5,881,063	9.7%	6,146,467	9.6%	6,416,300	9.5%	6,634,700	9.1%
Fiscal	935,019	1.5%	1,146,145	1.8%	1,186,400	1.7%	1,255,800	1.7%
	60,059,284		63,308,693		67,589,600		72,482,400	
Transfer to Capital	576,985	1.0%	829,084	1.3%	254,500	0.4%	254,500	0.3%
	$60,636,269	100.0%	$64,137,777	100.0%	$67,844,100	100.0%	$72,736,900	99.8%

Revenue Analysis by Function.xls

BRANDON SCHOOL DIVISION
OPERATING FUND - EXPENDITURE BY FUNCTION AND BY OBJECT
JULY 2011 - JUNE 2012

Objects	Salaries	Employee Benefits & Allowances	Services	Supplies & Materials	Debt Services	Transfers	Total	%
Functions								
Regular Instruction	$ 36,543,200	$ 1,943,200	$ 508,800	$ 3,071,300	$ -	$ 154,700	$ 42,221,200	58.3%
Student Support Services	14,481,700	1,212,600	348,400	135,800	-	-	16,178,500	22.3%
Community Education & Services	150,000	19,300	41,000	35,000	-	-	245,300	0.3%
Administration	1,358,600	166,800	521,800	69,200	-	-	2,116,400	2.9%
Instructional & Other Support Services	1,306,600	84,600	549,200	94,500	-	-	2,034,900	2.8%
Transportation	1,086,800	158,700	219,300	330,800	-	-	1,795,600	2.5%
Plant Operations and Maintenance	2,761,900	398,200	2,812,400	662,200	-	-	6,634,700	9.2%
Fiscal					15,500	1,240,300	1,255,800	1.7%
TOTALS	$ 57,688,800	$ 3,983,400	$ 5,000,900	$ 4,398,800	$ 15,500	$ 1,395,000	$ 72,482,400	100.0%
	79.6%	5.5%	6.9%	6.1%	0.0%	1.9%	100.0%	

Operating Fund 2011-12.xls

BRANDON SCHOOL DIVISION
BUDGET VARIANCE ANALYSIS
2011-2012

	Salaries Benefits & Allowances	Services	Supplies & Materials	Other/ Fiscal	Total
2011/2012 Budget	$ 61,672,200	$ 5,000,900	$ 4,398,800	$ 1,410,500	$ 72,482,400
2010/2011 Budget	$ 57,463,200	$ 4,821,200	$ 3,962,800	$ 1,342,400	$ 67,589,600
Increase (Decrease)	$ 4,209,000	$ 179,700	$ 436,000	$ 68,100	$ 4,892,800
	7.3%	3.7%	11.0%	5.1%	7.2%

BRANDON SCHOOL DIVISION
BUDGET VARIANCE SUMMARY
2011-2012

OBJECTS	Salaries & Employee Benefits	Services	Supplies & Materials	Interest	Transfers	Total	
Regular Instruction	$ 2,292,500	($7,900)	$ 395,700		($1,300)	2,679,000	6.8%
Student Support Services	1,689,500	(34,400)	(14,500)			1,640,600	11.3%
Community Education & Services	56,700	-	30,900			87,600	55.5%
Administration	40,100	44,700	(2,500)			82,300	4.0%
Instr. & Other Support Services	17,700	46,300	5,800			69,800	3.6%
Transportation	26,300	3,300	16,100			45,700	2.6%
Plant Operations & Maintenance	86,200	127,700	4,500			218,400	3.4%
Fiscal				(15,800)	85,200	69,400	5.1%
	4,209,000	179,700	436,000	(15,800)	83,900	4,892,800	7.2%
Transfers to Capital					~~100,000~~	~~100,000~~	~~39.3%~~
	$ 4,209,000	$ 179,700	$ 436,000	($15,800)	$ 83,900	$ 4,892,800	7.2%

Budget Variance Summary 2011-12.xls

THE BRANDON SCHOOL DIVISION
WORKING PAPER
ESTIMATED TOTAL EXPENDITURES & SPECIAL TAX
2011/2012 BUDGET

	OPERATING EXPENDITURES	CAPITAL EXPENDITURES	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	SPECIAL REQUIREMENT
2011/2012 BUDGET TOTALS	$ 70,831,800	$ 2,146,600	$ 72,978,400	$ 32,556,900
Board Budget Revisions				
Increases (Decreases)				
- to balance budget				1,060,700
Staff Adjustments				
Salaries				
Teachers 17.75 x $68,800	1,247,200		1,247,200	1,360,800
HALEP 2.00				
Grade 3/4 Transition/MY Literacy 4.00				
Full Day/Every Day Kindergarten 3.50				
Reading Recovery 2.25				
Literacy Support 0.50				
Resource 0.50				
Principal/Vice-Principal 2.00				
Numeracy Support 0.75				
Counsellors 1.25				
Grade 8/9 Transitional 3.50				
EAL 3.50				
Lunchroom Supervision - High Schools 3.00				
High School Prep Time (10.00)				
Support				
Early Childhood 1.40	24,600		24,600	
Welcome to Kindergarten 0.40	15,800		15,800	
Production Chef 1.00	52,600		52,600	
Educational Assistants - AEP 7.00	144,900		144,900	
Library Technician - Neelin 0.50	11,900		11,900	
Custodial 1.00	35,100		35,100	
Trustee Indemnity	(4,000)		(4,000)	
Payroll Adjustment	(268,800)		(268,800)	
Employee Benefits				
Teachers - 5.0%	61,500		61,500	
Support - 14.0%	40,000		40,000	
Payroll Tax				
2.15% x				
SUB-TOTAL	$ 72,192,600	$ 2,146,600	$ 74,339,200	$ 34,978,400

THE BRANDON SCHOOL DIVISION
WORKING PAPER
ESTIMATED TOTAL EXPENDITURES & SPECIAL TAX
2011/2012 BUDGET

	OPERATING EXPENDITURES	CAPITAL EXPENDITURES	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	SPECIAL REQUIREMENT
BALANCE FORWARD	$ 72,192,600	$ 2,146,600	$ 74,339,200	$ 34,978,400
Other Budget Adjustments				166,000
Services				
Translator Services EAL	4,000		4,000	
Aging Buildings	31,000		31,000	
Mechanical Services	10,000		10,000	
Y and School	(30,000)		(30,000)	
Supplies/Equipment				
Early Childhood	5,900		5,900	
Welcome to Kindergarten	25,000		25,000	
Full Day/Every Day Kindergarten	4,000		4,000	
Capital & Maintenance per pupil	14,700		14,700	
Mobile Computing	130,400		130,400	
School Bus Allocation		(100,000)	(100,000)	
From Reserve		100,000	100,000	
Computer Infrastructure - Crocus Plains		150,000	150,000	
Professional Development				
Grade 3/4 Transition	200		200	
Full Day/Every Day Kindergarten	5,000		5,000	
Vice-Principal	300		300	
Empower Reading	12,000		12,000	
NVCI/First Aid/CPR - Teaching	45,000		45,000	
Education Assistants	8,500		8,500	
BUDGET REVIEW TOTALS	$ 72,458,600	$ 2,296,600	$ 74,755,200	$ 35,144,400
Final Adjustments				
Payroll Tax	$ 23,800		$ 23,800	$ 23,800
Payroll Tax Grant				(23,800)
FINAL ADJUSTED TOTALS				

Brandon School Division
Budget Sustainability Items for Consideration
Summary 2011-2012

Enhancements	**Staff Positions**	**Approximate Amount**
		$ 1,060,600
Board Member/Committee Requested	18.20	~~$ 1,353,600~~
	29.63	**2,145,500**
Senior Administration Requested	~~37.38~~	~~2,607,900~~
		3,206,100
	47.83	~~$ 3,499,100~~
	~~55.58~~	~~3,961,500~~
Reallocations/Reductions		
Board Requested	(0.25)	$ (66,300)
Senior Administration Requested	(4.13)	(488,200)
	(4.38)	(554,500)
Net Increase	43.45	$ 2,651,600

Brandon School Division
Budget Sustainability Requests - Board
2011-2012

Board Committees	Staff Positions	Approximate Amount	Appendix
Quality Learning			
Early Childhood Education	1.40	$ 34,000	1
Welcome to Kindergarten	0.80	43,000	2
High Ability Learner Enrichment (HALEP)	2.00	144,500	3
Grade 3-4 Transition - Middle Years Literacy	4.00 ~~4.25~~	289,000 ~~307,300~~	4
Full Day/Every Day Kindergarten Incentive	3.50	261,700	5
Quality Teaching			
Reading Recovery Teachers	2.25	162,400	6
Quality Support Services			
Translator Services - EAL		4,000 ~~2,000~~	7
Capital & Maintenance - per pupil allocation		14,700	8
Capital & Maintenance - aging building support - staff washrooms		31,000 ~~50,000~~	9
Capital & Maintenance - mechanical services		10,000	10
	13.95 ~~18.20~~	994,300 ~~$ 1,353,600~~	

Brandon School Division
Budget Sustainability Requests - Senior Administration
2011-2012

Senior Administration Requests	Staff Positions	Amount	Appendix	Priority
Quality Learning				
K-8 Literacy Support - King George	0.50	$ 36,100	11	3
Resource	~~0.13~~	~~9,000~~	12	
	0.50	**36,100**		
	~~0.63~~	~~45,100~~		2
Resource	~~0.50~~	~~36,100~~	13	
Assistive Technology In The Classroom		~~15,400~~	14	2
Diversified Mobile Computing		130,400	15	2
Senior Years Life Skills		~~2,500~~	16	
Pre-school - Riverview		~~1,000~~	17	
Aboriginal Learning Specialist	~~1.00~~	~~85,200~~	18	3
Quality Teaching				
		60,000		
Production Chef - Culinary Arts	1.00	~~72,200~~	19	1
French Immersion Program - O'Kelly	~~0.12~~	~~9,000~~	20	
Literacy Intervention Kits - Riverview		~~5,500~~	21	
Optimal Learning Model - Waverly Park	~~1.00~~	~~72,200~~	22	
Early Years Literacy Support	~~2.00~~	~~144,400~~	23	1
Principal Positions	1.50	128,500	24	1
	0.50	**43,300**		
Vice-Principal Positions	~~1.25~~	~~108,300~~	25	1
Numeracy Support Teacher	~~1.00~~	~~72,200~~	26	
	0.75	**54,200**		3
Numeracy Support Teacher	~~0.50~~	~~37,100~~	27	
Counsellors	~~0.50~~	~~36,100~~	28	
	1.25	**90,200**		3
Counsellors	~~0.75~~	~~54,100~~	29	
Instructional Support - O'Kelly	~~0.63~~	~~45,500~~	30	
Discretionary Support - O'Kelly	~~1.50~~	~~108,300~~	31	
Official Languages Program	~~1.00~~	~~72,200~~	32	
	6.00	**$ 578,800**		
	~~9.13~~	~~$ 832,800~~		
Page 1 Totals	~~14.88~~	~~$ 1,281,300~~		

Brandon School Division
Budget Sustainability Requests - Senior Administration
2011-2012

Senior Administration Requests	Staff Positions	Amount	Appendix	Priority
Quality Support Services				
Educational Assistance Support - AEP	7.00 **1.00** ~~2.00~~	$ 165,200 **84,200** ~~168,400~~	33 34	1 2
Empower Reading				
Grade 8/9 Transitional Support	3.50	252,700	35	1
NVCI/Threat Assessment/First Aid/CPR		45,000	36	3
Professional Development - Educational Assistants		8,500	37	3
EAL Teachers	3.50	252,700	38	1
Culinary Arts Support Staff Support		~~67,000~~	39	
Staff Development and Differentiation Specialist - Riverheights	~~0.50~~	~~36,100~~	40	
Library Technician - Neelin	0.50	13,600	41	2
Student Services Secretary - Vincent Massey	~~1.00~~	~~37,600~~	42	
Human Resources Clerk - Support Staff	~~0.50~~	~~17,600~~	43	
Computer Infrastructure Upgrade - Crocus Plains		~~150,000~~	44	1
Custodial Services	1.00	40,000	45	3
Lunchroom Supervision - High Schools	3.00	216,600	46	1
	25.50 ~~29.63~~ ~~37.38~~	**1,657,300** ~~2,145,500~~ ~~$ 2,607,900~~		

BRANDON SCHOOL DIVISION
ANALYSIS OF FUNDING SUPPORT

	2008-2009 Actual		2009-2010 Actual		2010-2011 Budget		2011-2012 Budget	
TOTAL OPERATING EXPENDITURES		$ 60,636,269		$ 64,137,777		$ 67,844,100		$ 72,736,900
LESS:								
Categorical Grants		6,789,674		6,775,925		6,855,200		7,232,000
Other Provincial Funds		9,947,082		12,623,515		14,017,500		15,461,200
Federal Government		24,953		56,264		23,900		23,900
Other School Divisions		198,252		258,621		187,400		222,200
First Nations		272,048		249,788		257,000		283,200
Private Organizations & Individuals		917,733		915,829		677,600		685,500
Balance of Funding Required	70.1%	42,486,527	67.4%	43,257,835	67.5%	45,825,500	67.1%	48,828,900
Provincial Support Base	34.1%	20,699,993	33.2%	21,301,871	31.7%	21,490,500	30.6%	22,250,200
Municipal - Special Requirement	35.2%	21,364,238	35.0%	22,416,877	35.9%	24,335,000	36.5%	26,578,700
SURPLUS (DEFICIT)	(0.7%)	$ (422,296)	0.7%	$ 460,913	0.0%	$ -	0.0%	$ -

FundAnalysis 2011-12.xls

BRANDON SCHOOL DIVISION
SPECIAL REQUIREMENT INCREASE

	2006/2007	2007/2008	2008/2009	2009/2010	2010/2011	2011/2012
GROSS EXPENDITURE INCREASE	$2,195,100	$2,010,300	$3,275,900	$4,658,400	$3,939,600	$ 4,892,800
LESS: Other Revenue Increases						
Provincial Government	684,300	497,700	1,607,800	2,987,600	1,819,300	2,580,200
Federal Government	2,300	1,200	3,000	-	2,300	-
Municipal Government					(530,300)	(343,800)
Other School Divisions	(36,000)	9,000	(1,200)	19,500	(6,000)	34,800
First Nations	25,500	20,100	26,600	14,100	(44,200)	26,200
Private Organizations & Individuals	10,700	79,200	64,800	(80,800)	18,400	7,900
Deficit Budget Increase	-	30,000	20,000	(50,000)	-	-
SPECIAL REQUIREMENT INCREASE	$1,508,300	$1,373,100	$1,554,900	$1,768,000	$2,680,100	$ 2,587,500

BRANDON SCHOOL DIVISION
TEACHING STAFF - BUDGET

	2008/2009 Budget	2009/2010 Budget	2010/2011 Budget	2011/2012 Budget
Regular Instruction				
Principals	24.00	24.00	24.75	**26.75** ~~24.75~~
Teaching - Regular	323.07	338.26	352.01	**370.58** ~~377.08~~
- Music		2.02	1.97	2.00
- HALEP		3.25	3.25	**5.25** ~~3.25~~
- Business/Marketing	9.50	8.37	9.00	7.88
- Vocational/Technology	21.88	22.25	22.50	23.50
- Clinicians	-	-	-	0.75
High School Lunchroom Supervision	-	-	-	**3.00**
Assistants - 1 to 3.0 Ratio - Regular (1.42)	-	0.40	0.38	0.47
Assistants - Vocational/Technology (4.77)	0.45	0.45	1.36	1.59
Student Support Services				
Administration & Management	1.75	1.75	1.75	0.75
Clinicians	11.00	11.00	11.25	12.25
Teaching - Special Classes	20.00	21.00	21.00	18.00
- Reading Recovery/Literacy	14.75	16.25	18.00	**23.25** ~~19.50~~
- Numeracy				**0.75**
- Resource	26.50	26.00	24.00	**23.13** ~~22.63~~
- EAL	6.50	12.25	15.75	**19.75** ~~16.25~~
- Elementary SSP/LD Specialist	1.00	2.00	2.00	1.00
- Grade 3 to 4 Transition Support		0.25	1.25	**5.25** ~~1.25~~
- Grade 8 to 9 Transition Support				**3.50**
Teaching Counsellors	12.63	15.38	13.75	**16.63** ~~15.38~~
Administration				
Superintendents	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Instructional & Other Support Services				
Management & Curriculum	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Teaching Consultants	0.63	0.63	1.63	1.50
Teaching Librarians	9.00	8.37	9.13	8.83
Staff Development	2.62	2.62	2.13	2.00
	489.28	519.50	539.86	**581.36** ~~563.61~~
Less:				
Vocational	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50
French	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25
EAL/AAA	4.27	5.81	7.30	9.69
Students at Risk	5.70	5.31	3.95	3.33
Early Literacy	3.74	3.77	3.77	4.36
Sparsity Support	1.26	2.52	1.38	1.37
Assessment	-	1.00	1.00	1.00
Regional Health Authority	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50
	468.06	494.84	516.21	**555.36** ~~537.61~~

BRANDON SCHOOL DIVISION
SUPPORT STAFF - BUDGET

	2008-2009 Budget	2009-2010 Budget	2010-2011 Budget	2011-2012 Budget
Regular Instruction				
Administrative Assistant	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
School Secretaries	26.50	26.50	26.50	26.50
AAA Teacher Assistants	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
French Monitor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Other	0.36	0.36	0.36	1.09
Lunchroom Assistants	14.86	16.73	15.77	16.55
Computer Technicians & Director	6.00	7.00	6.00	6.00
Work Placement Coordinator	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
				5.43
Food Service Workers/Nursery/Storekeeper	4.43	4.43	4.43	~~4.43~~
Student Support Services				
Secretaries	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.46
				212.40
Teacher Assistants	192.60	207.64	205.00	~~205.40~~
Literacy Assistants	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00
Home School Liaison Workers	12.45	12.55	12.45	12.18
Career Assistants	1.00	2.00	2.00	1.50
Community Education And Services				
Early Childhood Education				**1.40**
Welcome to Kindergarten				**0.80**
Pre-Kindergarten Education	-	-	0.60	2.60
Administration				
Secretary-Treasurer, Assistant Secretary-Treasurer, Director of HR, Director of MIST	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00
Payroll & Utility	1.51	1.51	1.51	1.65
Secretaries & Clerical	12.25	12.05	12.07	11.89
Instructional & Other Support Services				
				4.00
Library Technicians	3.50	3.50	3.50	~~3.50~~
Attendance Officer	0.64	0.64	0.64	0.64
Breakfast Program	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55
Technology Assistant	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Transportation				
Supervisor & Assistant	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Secretary	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
Bus Drivers, Mechanic & Assistant	34.36	33.54	33.75	33.45
Operations & Maintenance				
Supervisor, Assistant & Workplace Safety	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00
Secretary/Clerical	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
				25.62
School Custodians	24.62	24.62	24.62	~~24.62~~
School Custodial Assistants	19.18	19.31	19.31	19.25
Maintenance Workers	18.03	18.03	18.03	18.03
Other Building Custodians	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50
Other Building Custodial Assistants	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25
				431.74
	400.59	418.71	416.84	~~420.04~~

BRANDON SCHOOL DIVISION
COMPARATIVE SCHEDULE OF SPECIAL REQUIREMENT
FISCAL YEAR BASIS

Year	School Assessment	Special Requirement	Special Requirement Mills	Mill Increase or (Decrease) #	Mill Increase or (Decrease) %
1992/1993	$ 706,784.06	$ 8,643,400	12.23	0.91	8.0
1993/1994	$ 696,572.45	$ 8,643,400	12.41	0.18	1.5
1994/1995	$ 747,026.84	$ 8,992,600	12.04	(0.37)	(3.0)
1995/1996	$ 801,475.51	$ 9,739,500	12.15	0.11	0.9
1996/1997	$ 807,178.86	$ 10,139,500	12.56	0.41	3.4
1997/1998	$ 811,322.83	$ 10,939,500	13.48	0.92	7.3
1998/1999	$ 856,488.10	$ 12,357,000	14.43	0.95	7.0
1999/2000	$ 875,767.76	$ 13,657,000	15.59	1.16	8.0
2000/2001	$ 928,428.26	$ 15,357,000	16.54	0.95	6.1
2001/2002	$ 946,062.39	$ 16,657,000	17.61	1.07	6.5
2002/2003	$ 1,032,832.36	$ 17,931,500	17.36	(0.25)	(1.4)
2003/2004	$ 1,043,394.56	$ 18,869,600	18.08	0.72	4.1
2004/2005	$ 1,056,277.82	$ 20,142,400	19.07	0.99	5.5
2005/2006	$ 1,070,831.72	$ 21,720,600	20.28	1.21	6.4
2006/2007	$ 1,265,033.22	$ 23,219,800	18.36	(1.92)	(9.5)
2007/2008	$ 1,306,413.29	$ 24,602,100	18.83	0.47	2.6
2008/2009	$ 1,324,851.27	$ 27,418,700	20.70	1.87	9.9
2009/2010	$ 1,360,393.91	$ 29,961,800	22.02	1.32	6.4
2010/2011	$ 1,893,949.05	$ 32,556,900	17.19	(4.82)	(21.9)
2011/2012	$ 1,957,265.86	$ 35,144,400	17.96	0.77	4.5

The following schedules in this section are calculated on the "Municipal Year Special Levy" basis.

BRANDON SCHOOL DIVISION
CALCULATION OF 2011 SPECIAL LEVY

A. Special Requirement: 2010/2011 Budget	$ 32,556,900	
B. Amount Related to 2010/2011 Included in 2010 Special Levy	14,162,251	
C. Balance of 2010/2011 to be Raised in 2011 (A - B)		$ 18,394,649
D. Special Requirement: 2011/2012 Budget	35,144,400	
E. Amount Included in 2011 Special Levy (43.5% of D)		15,287,814
F. Surplus (Applied)/Raised (not included in the Special Requirement)		
G. 2011 SPECIAL LEVY FOR DIVISION (C + E + F)		33,682,463
H. 2011 SPECIAL LEVY FOR D.S.F.M. (from Q below)		229,585
I. 2011 SPECIAL LEVY ADJUSTMENT FOR D.S.F.M. (from G Adjustment form)		
J. 2011 TOTAL SPECIAL LEVY (G + H + I)		33,912,048
K. Less: Tax Incentive Grant		1,848,013
L. 2011 TOTAL SPECIAL LEVY (J-K) (3)		32,064,035
2010 Special Levy		29,449,154
Increase		2,614,881
		8.9%

2010 SPECIAL LEVY FOR D.S.F.M.

M. 2011 Special Levy for Division (from G above)	33,682,463	
N. Resident Non-D.S.F.M. pupils at September 30, 2010	7,335.5	
O. Special Levy per resident pupil (M/N)	4,591.71	
P. Resident D.S.F.M. pupils at September 30, 2010	50.0	
Q. 2011 Special Levy for D.S.F.M. (O x P)		229,586

BRANDON SCHOOL DIVISION
CALCULATION OF 2012 SPECIAL LEVY

A. Special Requirement: 2011/2012 Budget	$ 35,144,400	
B. Amount Related to 2011/2012 Included in 2011 Special Levy	15,287,814	
C. Balance of 2011/2012 to be Raised in 2010 (A - B)		$ 19,856,586
D. Special Requirement: 2012/2013 Budget	35,144,400	
E. Amount Included in 2012 Special Levy (43.5% of D)		15,287,814
F. Surplus (Applied)/Raised (not included in the Special Requirement)		
G. 2012 SPECIAL LEVY FOR DIVISION (C + E + F)		35,144,400
H. 2012 SPECIAL LEVY FOR D.S.F.M. (from Q below)		239,550
I. 2012 SPECIAL LEVY ADJUSTMENT FOR D.S.F.M. (from G Adjustment form)		
J. 2012 TOTAL SPECIAL LEVY (G + H + I)		35,383,950
K. Less: Tax Incentive Grant		1,848,013
L. 2012 TOTAL SPECIAL LEVY (J-K) (3)		33,535,937
2011 Special Levy		32,064,035
Increase		1,471,902
		4.6%

2012 SPECIAL LEVY FOR D.S.F.M.

M. 2012 Special Levy for Division (from G above)	35,144,400	
N. Resident Non-D.S.F.M. pupils at September 30, 2010	7,335.5	
O. Special Levy per resident pupil (M/N)	4,791.00	
P. Resident D.S.F.M. pupils at September 30, 2010	50.0	
Q. 2012 Special Levy for D.S.F.M. (O x P)		239,550

THE BRANDON SCHOOL DIVISION
COMPARATIVE SCHEDULE OF SPECIAL LEVY FOR THE YEARS 1999 - 2011

		Mill Value Balanced Assessment	Special Levy	Special Levy Mills	Education Support Levy Mills	Total Mills	Mill Increase or (Decrease) #	Mill Increase or (Decrease) %
1999	Residential	875,767.76	12,922,500	14.76	7.92	22.68	1.27	5.9
	Other			14.76	18.06	32.82	1.27	4.0
2000	Residential	928,428.26	14,396,500	15.51	7.92	23.43	0.75	3.3
	Other			15.51	18.06	33.57	0.75	2.3
2001	Residential	946,062.39	15,922,500	16.83	7.92	24.75	1.32	5.6
	Other			16.83	18.06	34.89	1.32	3.9
2002	Residential	1,032,832.36	17,086,400	16.54	6.64	23.18	(1.57)	(6.3)
	Other			16.54	16.50	33.04	(1.85)	(5.3)
2003	Residential	1,043,394.56	18,339,600	17.58	5.28	22.86	(0.32)	(1.4)
	Other			17.58	16.50	34.08	1.04	3.1
2004	Residential	1,056,277.82	19,423,200	18.39	4.56	22.95	0.09	0.4
	Other			18.39	16.50	34.89	0.81	2.4
2005	Residential	1,070,831.72	20,892,731	19.51	2.42	21.93	(1.02)	(4.4)
	Other			19.51	16.50	36.01	1.12	3.2
2006	Residential	1,268,997.40	22,442,924	17.69	-	17.69	(4.24)	(19.4)
	Other			17.69	16.08	33.77	(2.24)	(6.2)
2007	Residential	1,312,562.73	23,926,069	18.23	-	18.23	0.54	3.1
	Other			18.23	16.08	34.31	0.54	1.6
2008	Residential	1,333,111.92	25,995,453	19.50	-	19.50	1.27	7.0
	Other			19.50	16.08	35.58	1.27	3.7
2009	Residential	1,369,665.06	28,727,643	20.97	-	20.97	1.47	7.5
	Other			20.97	16.08	37.05	1.47	4.1
2010	Residential	1,907,303.82	29,449,154	15.44	-	15.44	(5.53)	(26.4)
	Other			15.44	12.33	27.77	(9.28)	(25.0)
2011	Residential	1,970,606.91	32,064,035	16.27	-	16.27	0.83	5.4
	Other			16.27	12.33	28.60	0.83	3.0

BRANDON SCHOOL DIVISION
DOLLAR INCREASE IN TOTAL EDUCATION LEVIES, SPECIAL LEVY PLUS EDUCATION SUPPORT LEVY (E.S.L.)

	2004	2005	Increase $	Increase %	2006	Increase $	Increase %	2007	Increase $	Increase %
E.S.L.	$ 9,384,156	$ 8,088,603	$ (1,295,553)	(13.8)	$ 7,787,053	$ (301,550)	(3.7)	$ 7,983,888	$ 196,835	2.5
Special Levy	$ 19,423,200	$ 20,892,731	$ 1,469,531	7.6	$ 22,442,924	$ 1,550,193	7.4	$ 23,926,069	$ 1,483,145	6.6
	$ 28,807,356	$ 28,981,334	$ 173,978	0.6	$ 30,229,977	$ 1,248,643	4.3	$ 31,909,957	$ 1,679,980	5.6

	2007	2008	Increase $	Increase %	2009	Increase $	Increase %	2010	Increase $	Increase %
E.S.L.	$ 7,983,888	$ 8,001,474	$ 17,586	0.2	$ 8,323,434	$ 321,960	4.0	$ 8,051,121	$ (272,313)	(3.3)
Special Levy	$ 23,926,069	$ 25,995,453	$ 2,069,384	8.6	$ 28,727,643	$ 2,732,190	10.5	$ 29,449,154	$ 721,511	2.5
	$ 31,909,957	$ 33,996,927	$ 2,086,970	6.5	$ 37,051,077	$ 3,054,150	9.0	$ 37,500,275	$ 449,198	1.2

	2010	2011	Increase $	Increase %
E.S.L.	$ 8,051,121	$ 8,241,763	$ 190,642	2.4
Special Levy	$ 29,449,154	$ 32,064,035	$ 2,614,881	8.9
	$ 37,500,275	$ 40,305,798	$ 2,805,523	7.5

DollarIncrease 2011-12.xls

2010 SCHOOL LEVIES TAX SUMMARY

	Special Levy	Education Support Levy	TOTAL
Residential			
2010 Mill Rate	15.44	-	15.44
2009 Mill Rate	20.97	-	20.97
2010 Increase (Decrease) in Mills	(5.53)	-	(5.53)
2010 Percentage Increase (Decrease)	(26.4%)	-	(26.4%)
Other Properties			
2010 Mill Rate	15.44	12.33	27.77
2009 Mill Rate	20.97	16.08	37.05
2010 Increase (Decrease) in Mills	(5.53)	(3.75)	(9.28)
2010 Percentage Increase (Decrease)	(26.4%)	(23.3%)	(25.0%)

2011 SCHOOL LEVIES TAX SUMMARY

	Special Levy	Education Support Levy	TOTAL
Residential			
2011 Mill Rate	16.27	-	16.27
2010 Mill Rate	15.44	-	15.44
2011 Increase (Decrease) in Mills	0.83	-	0.83
2011 Percentage Increase (Decrease)	5.4%		5.4%
Other Properties			
2011 Mill Rate	16.27	12.33	28.60
2010 Mill Rate	15.44	12.33	27.77
2011 Increase (Decrease) in Mills	0.83	-	0.83
2011 Percentage Increase (Decrease)	5.4%		3.0%

SchoolLevies 2011-12.xls

BRANDON SCHOOL DIVISION
TAX EXAMPLE - 2011

RESIDENTIAL
EXAMPLE

	2011 Market Value - $100,000 Assessed Value - $45,000			2011 Market Value - $200,000 Assessed Value - $90,000		
	Special	E.S.L.	Total	Special	E.S.L.	Total
2011 Education Tax @ 16.27 mills	$ 732	$ -	$ 732	$ 1,464	$ -	$ 1,464
2010 Education Tax @ 15.44 mills	$ 695	$ -	$ 695	$ 1,390	$ -	$ 1,390
Increased Education Taxes/year	$ 37	$ -	$ 37	$ 74	$ -	$ 74
Increased Education Taxes/month	$ 3	$ -	$ 3	$ 6	$ -	$ 6

NOTE #1:
Mill rates are based upon the portioned School Assessment for the total Division (8 municipalities). The actual mill rate on the tax bill is based upon the taxable assessment (excludes tax exempt properties) of each municipality and will vary somewhat from the above figures.

NOTE #2:
The foregoing does not take into account the property tax rebate received by homeowners on their tax notice and by renters on their income tax return. The rebate increased $50 to $650 in 2009.

BRANDON SCHOOL DIVISION
TAX EXAMPLE - 2011

COMMERCIAL

	Commercial Market Value - $100,000 Assessed Value - $65,000			Commercial Market Value - $500,000 Assessed Value - $325,000		
	Special Levy	Education Support Levy	Total	Special Levy	Education Support Levy	Total
2011 Education Tax @ 28.60 mills	$ 1,058	$ 801	$ 1,859	$ 5,288	$ 4,007	$ 9,295
2010 Education Tax @ 27.77 mills	$ 1,004	$ 801	$ 1,805	$ 5,018	$ 4,007	$ 9,025
Increased Education Taxes/Year	$ 54	$ -	$ 54	$ 270	$ -	$ 270
Increased Education Taxes/Month	$ 5	$ -	$ 5	$ 22	$ -	$ 22

BRANDON SCHOOL DIVISION
MARKET VALUE ASSESSMENTS BY MUNICIPALITIES

2010

Municipal Corporation	Residential	Farm	Other	Total	Ratios	2010 Special Levy	Increase $	Increase %
Cornwallis	74,573,400	16,649,630	10,241,870	101,464,900	0.05320	$ 1,566,638	$ (30,619)	(1.9)
Daly	1,774,780	1,206,940	40,050	3,021,770	0.00158	46,657	$ 5,289	12.8
Elton	4,644,620	3,433,580	3,418,790	11,496,990	0.00603	177,516	$ 12,332	7.5
North Cypress	5,815,090	-	70,605,690	76,420,780	0.04007	1,179,952	$ (200,986)	(14.6)
Oakland	7,424,290	4,219,960	100,050	11,744,300	0.00616	181,334	$ (1,374)	(0.8)
South Cypress	-	1,087,070	14,955,130	16,042,200	0.00841	247,695	$ (41,018)	(14.2)
Whitehead	39,579,890	13,975,310	6,761,930	60,317,130	0.03162	931,309	$ 99,932	12.0
City of Brandon	1,076,288,590	3,660,580	546,846,580	1,626,795,750	0.85293	25,118,053	$ 877,955	3.6
	$ 1,210,100,660	$ 44,233,070	$ 652,970,090	$ 1,907,303,820	1.00000	$ 29,449,154	$ 721,511	2.5

2011

Municipal Corporation	Residential	Farm	Other	Total	Ratios	2010 Special Levy	Increase $	Increase %
Cornwallis	77,271,810	16,431,790	10,178,090	103,881,690	0.05272	$ 1,690,416	$ 123,778	7.9
Daly	1,753,860	1,163,930	40,050	2,957,840	0.00150	48,096	1,439	3.1
Elton	4,690,880	3,410,630	4,183,600	12,285,110	0.00623	199,759	22,243	12.5
North Cypress	5,815,090	-	70,529,970	76,345,060	0.03874	1,242,161	62,209	5.3
Oakland	7,427,520	4,223,590	135,540	11,786,650	0.00598	191,743	10,409	5.7
South Cypress	-	974,050	14,955,130	15,929,180	0.00808	259,077	11,382	4.6
Whitehead	40,607,850	13,945,880	7,139,000	61,692,730	0.03131	1,003,925	72,616	7.8
City of Brandon	1,120,906,890	3,551,400	561,270,360	1,685,728,650	0.85544	27,428,858	2,310,805	9.2
	$ 1,258,473,900	$ 43,701,270	$ 668,431,740	$ 1,970,606,910	1.00000	$ 32,064,035	$ 2,614,881	8.9

Appendix B

Good evening Trustees, Senior Administration and other guests,

Under more normal circumstances, BTA in the past has given feedback to the Board on their proposed budget in three forms. The BTA president, Education Finance Chair and Principals representative have all taken time to highlight areas of the proposed budget. All BTA members agree this year that there should be one voice and one clear message to Trustees. That message is simple - Reducing any teachers prep time would have serious negative consequences on education in Brandon School Division.

The conversation about prep time in this year's budget process is a very serious situation for teachers and students. It is obvious that the process has spawned more questions than it has answered.

1. Do high school teachers have the right amount of prep time and contact time? When was the last time the people working at this level were asked this question? Why are Brandon High School teachers expected to do more than their counterparts in similar urban high schools? Why should students not have the same opportunity in our 3 high schools as in Winnipeg? Please refer to table comparing workloads across urban high schools.
2. What about the K-8 Level? BTA believes that the proper question here is the comparison of contact time, not prep time. Contact time levels in Brandon are very similar across levels, as shown by the attached table.
3. How will this reduction of prep time affect the relationship between BTA and BSD? A relationship is only valuable when 2 sides are willing to listen to each other, and BTA has spoken out loud and clear on this issue. Many trustees have mentioned that respect between BTA and BSD is extremely important to ensure the best possible level of education for students in Brandon School Division. Please respect the opinion of the collective of BTA with thousands of years of combined teaching experience. If BSD is not willing to listen then that speaks volumes about the value of the relationship. Last year when the Board accepted the TIG, BTA could have been very critical of that decision. BTA has made every effort to be reasonable with the Board, and we are expecting that the Board will listen to our opinion and be reasonable now.
4. How does a decision such as this affect bargaining? Contact time and work load have been on the bargaining table in the past, and BTA would like the opportunity to continue to establish the parameters of working conditions through this established process.
5. Vocational Teachers will be impacted greatly by a decrease in prep time. Many of these teachers are working on a different teaching certificate and are only able to teach within their area of expertise, and are not able to teach an academic class. There are already difficulties in attracting and retaining teachers in these highly specialized positions. Decreasing prep time will magnify the difficulties that already exist, and may result in lay-offs of vocational teachers
6. A decrease in prep time will have a negative impact on the time that teachers have to spend on the extra activities that are so important to students and school atmosphere at the high school level. Are these activities not being valued by this

board? These activities are part of the fabric of Brandon and are important to parents and students. The board will own their decision, and have to explain to families why teachers don't have time to spend time with these extras – they now need that extra time to do the jobs they have been hired to do. For many students, these opportunities are not extras. Many students have success at school because of the influence that extra-curricular activities and organizers have on their character and courses at school.

7. There has been no consultation with any member of BTA on this matter. The hope of BTA is that we were can work together to provide the best educational opportunities for the students as possible.
8. The work that teachers do with education students as student teachers within their classrooms is incredibly valuable for the student teachers, co-operating teachers and high school students alike. The effectiveness of teachers to help prepare these university students would be severely impacted in a negative way if prep time decreases. Many teachers may decide that they simply don't have time to take on the responsibility of a student teacher.

The current level of prep time that high school teachers have is needed to continue to offer educational opportunities at their current level. High school prep time is not an area to look for efficiencies, and if any citizen of Brandon doubts that then ask a teacher what they do with their prep time. A presentation on explaining what teachers do in their prep time would take an entire evening. If prep time is reduced the quality of education at the high school level will decrease.

An unfortunate reality in this situation is that meaningful feedback regarding the rest of the budget has been lost so that this one incredibly important situation can be dealt with.

Words mean nothing if they are not backed up by action. The past statements from the Board about working together and valuing the input of teachers will be meaningless if the concerns of BTA members are not listened to now. The good news is that the Board still has time to change the budget and continue to provide to high school teachers the current level of prep time. Teachers need this time so that they can continue to educate the students of BSD in the same great way.

Darren Hardy
President
BTA

Division	School	Workload
St. James-Assiniboia	Sturgeon Heights	8 of 10
St. James-Assiniboia	Westwood	8 of 10
St. James-Assiniboia	St James	8 of 10
St. James-Assiniboia	John Taylor	8 of 10
Louis Riel	College Beliveau	7 of 10
Louis Riel	College Jeanne Sauve	7 of 10
Louis Riel	Dakota	7 of 10
Louis Riel	Glenlawn	7 of 10
Louis Riel	JH Bruns	7 of 10
Louis Riel	Nelson McIntyre	7 of 10
Louis Riel	Windson Park	7 of 10
Pembina Trails	Fort Richmond	7 of 10
Pembina Trails	Oak Park	7 of 10
Pembina Trails	Shaftesbury	7 of 10
Pembina Trails	Vincent Massey	7 of 10
Winnipeg	Daniel McIntyre	7 of 10
Winnipeg	Tec Voc	8 of 10
Winnipeg	Argyle	8 of 10
Winnipeg	Kelvin	7 of 10
River Eat Transcona	Pierre Elliot Trudeau	7 of 10
River Eat Transcona	Kildonan East	7 of 10
River Eat Transcona	Miles Macdonell	7 of 10
River Eat Transcona	Murdoch Mackay	7 of 10
River Eat Transcona	River East	7 of 10
River Eat Transcona	Transcona	7 of 10
Seven Oaks	Maples	6 of 8
Seven Oaks	Garden City	6 of 8
Seven Oaks	West Kildonan	6 of 8
Brandon	Crocus Plains	8 of 10
Brandon	Neelin	8 of 10
Brandon	Vincent Massey	8 of 10

School	Minutes
Betty Gibson	1575
Crocus Plains	1560
George Fitton	1580
Green Acres	1580
Harrison	1560
JR Ried	1570
Kirkaldy	1575
Linden Lanes	1560
O'Kelly	1560
Meadows	1560
St Augustines	1560
Valleyview	1590
Vincent Massey	1560

Mr. Deveryn Ross, concerned parent:

- "What is your position on increasing school taxes?" Those elected to the Board said they would raise taxes, those who said they would reduce taxes did not win the election.

- Current Board is keeping their promise to the public.

- Division's budget process is exemplary. The volume of information provided to the public was very valuable.

- Tax Incentive Grant designed to divide the community and pit stakeholders against each other.

- Congratulated the Board on rejecting the TIG noting the budget is about the children. Community needs to stop fighting amongst itself and to start fighting together for the funds needed to educate students in the Division.

- This is the budget that the public said they wanted at the public forum.

March 7, 2011

Presentation to the Brandon School Division Board

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to express my opinion here tonight.

Unlike the chair I do support the board's decision in not taking the tax incentive grant. The purpose of introducing the tax incentive grant was the Provinces' way to address the public's issue with education funding on property taxes and to keep Manitoba affordable. It wasn't to pit one school division against another nor one group against another.

I don't believe that it is conducive to compare the decision of our school division in taking the grant or not with other school divisions. Needs vary among communities and differ from year to year. Therefore it's important that we stay focused on identifying the needs of Brandon for the upcoming school year.

Perhaps what needs to change is our attitudes, as taxpayers, towards funding our children's education with property taxes. Collectively we as a community share the role in ensuring the learning and well-being of children so they grow into responsible, productive adults.

Although the grant promotes prudency, taking the tax incentive grant should not be at the expense of providing quality education. And I'm confident that the Government of Manitoba would agree with that.

Jim says he would have rather taken the Province up on its offer and he doesn't believe that a lot of those add-ons were necessary. I say how we can not afford to support a budget that provides the necessary means to deliver valuable programming and services to our children. Spending taxpayer's money on our youth now will reduce costs in healthcare, crime, addictions and unemployment later on. It will address labour shortages and ensure that there will be skilled employees in the future. It means more young people will be going to school instead of committing crimes and joining gangs.

I was very pleased that the additional funding supports early childhood initiatives such as the full day kindergarten pilot and I applaud the Brandon School Division for offering this new initiative. As you know there are many benefits to offering full day kindergarten. For the students it provides an increased opportunity to develop literacy and social skills. For parents it offers stability and economic benefits related to childcare. Teachers would have more time to address learning challenges.

I hope the residents of Brandon will appreciate this important project and the other additional funding requests and really see the value in it.

To conclude, families in Brandon and throughout the Province are looking for leadership to be their advocate. They really do want someone looking out for the best interests of their children.

Board members have defended this budget. For instance Mark Sefton said "....all things considered, we've done a good job of putting this together." However, chair Jim Murray said that he would rather take the Province up on its offer. By saying this and not backing the board's decision on not taking the grant I query if he is now here to please the Province since he is seeking the NDP nomination in Brandon West. School trustee is suppose to a non partisan role. Is it not a conflict of interest to be a nominated candidate with a provincial party while still being a member of a school board? There are also ethical concerns by getting endorsement from the President of the Teacher's Association.

If Jim really does care about the interests of the 7000+ students and their families, teachers, support staff, admin, fellow colleagues and not his own interests, he would step down to allow someone else fill the role of school trustee. Between March and September is over 5 months that the new trustee can be learning the ropes. So Jim, if you become the NDP candidate on March 21, will you be stepping down as school trustee on March 22 to pursue this political opportunity and let a new trustee represent the best interests of the children and their families?

Sincerely,

Vanessa Hamilton

From: "Nathan Peto" Tue, Mar 08, 2011 10:23:10 AM

Subject: Budget Submission

To: **Sheri Bailey**

Attachments: Attach0.html 13K

- On behalf of the Brandon Chamber
- thank the Brandon School Division Trustees for meeting with our Board of Directors during our joint committee and budgetary consultations.

- The meetings have been very informative and have helped our Board understand the complicated nature of the funding structure and challenges facing our local education system.

With these challenges in mind, we encouraged the Trustees to focus additional spending on assisting new immigrants with their transition into our educational system. We also strongly believe in funding early years reading and numeracy support. New spending initiatives in these areas have proven to be important investments resulting in significant measurable success.

While promoting investment in these spending programs, we also cautioned moderation in spending and tax increases as a whole. We must take into consideration the tenuous world/national economic situation and a low inflation environment. In other words, the economy is still very delicate and we should invest with this in mind.

- The last TIG offer would allow the BSD to spend over $1.1 million on new programming while maintaining its status quo budget increases and, importantly, benefiting from increases in property assessment revenue growth. To accept this TIG, Trustees would need to remove $800,000 in new spending initiatives. Failing this, local taxpayers will be hit with a 5+% increase in their education levy.

- Frankly, we believe this to be fair offer that allows for over a million dollars of new spending on important areas. It also mitigates the need for a tax increase. We encourage the Trustees to seek further information on the TIG formula from the Province of Manitoba. We need to know how the Brandon School Division qualifies based on student needs.

- We ask that Trustees reconsider their stance on the current TIG offer and seek further funding while looking to trim their new spending to accommodate it. Accepting the TIG will allow Brandon taxpayers to enjoy the same tax freeze the vast majority of Manitobans are enjoying while also investing in new important initiatives to help our children.

Nathan Peto | General Manager
Brandon Chamber of Commerce

| www.brandonchamber.ca

I BRANDON

Brandon School Division Budget 2011/2012

Date : Mar 07,2011

Year	Assessment (land&building)	School Mill Rate	%Gross of total tax	%Increase school tax	% Total Net taxes
2008	$193,400.00	19.745	$1718.41	-------	-------
2009	$194,300 (900)	20.97	$1833.62 (115.21)	6.7%	5.7%
2010	$290,800(96,500)	15.44	$2020.48 (186.86)	10.19%	13.48%

OBSERVATIONS:

1) Province,school board, city of Brandon, and property tax payer(all four players Party to tax bill.
2) The school board proposed budget is out of sink with the (money) pie.The proposal wishes to make the (money) pie grow larger.
3) If one assumes on $100,000.00 property that the school tax levy is$37.00,then a $300,000.00 should be $37.00 x 3= $111.00 at 5.3% tax hike.
4) The argument between provincial assessments of property vs. city of Brandon MILL RATE increases on Net Tax Bills goes on.
5) Property assessment values changed from 2003 to 2008 values. The adjustment changed from every FOUR years to TWO.
6) Meanwhile, Net Taxes bill are increasing.

Submitted by,

Robert Janz

From: "Rick and Joanne" 26/02/2011 4:24:35 PM

Subject: Proposed tax hike of 5.3%

To: **Sheri Bailey**

Attachments: Attach0.html 2K

Chairperson of the Board:
I am writing this letter in hopes that you and your board will give more thought to this upcoming proposal. I and many others find it a bit ridiculous in these times of cutbacks, rising costs for groceries, gasoline and hydro that the board would even consider such a huge increase. I am a retired school teacher having taught for 31 years so I know what it takes to educate a child, but I am also a taxpayer and now on a fixed income. Sometimes we can't have all that what we want. There were many times when I was teaching in a rural setting with a double grade classroom and no aides that I wished things were easier, but I managed and believe I gave all the students in my room a good education. I am concerned too with the very real possibility of terrible flooding this year that is going to cost a lot of money. I believe that education should not be placed on the backs of the taxpayer. What was wrong with the government proposal? Please consider doing some pencil sharpening. a concerned taxpayer
Joanne Brooking

From: "Moira Main' Mon, Mar 07, 2011 4:07:58 PM

Subject: school division taxes

To: **Sheri Bailey**

Attachments: Attach0.html 2K

Re : Proposed 5.3% SD tax increase and refusal to take the offered 1.2 m grant.
For our seniors and people on fixed income this increase is crippling. Most had homes that were reassessed considerably last year . Their pensions certainly won't raise to cover this .Please listen to the public voice and practise some restraint. You were elected to speak for the people that voted for you.Take the grant offered and defer some of these requests until the upcoming year.School trustees should speak for the people who elected them.
M.Main
S.Newman
M.Cochrane
S.Carnegie
T.Munn

March 2, 2011

To: Mr. Jim Murray and the Board of Trustees

I am a proud teacher of the Brandon School Division. I am currently finishing a maternity leave, but am excitedly looking forward to returning to a job that I love at one of our city's finest high schools. I have been following the proposed 2011-2012 budget that the Board of Trustees has constructed and I am extremely dissatisfied with your decision regarding the cut to prep time for high school teachers.

In 2009, I left my career with a prestigious employer to take a position as the AP Biology teacher at Vincent Massey. I left behind a very "comfortable" salary (much more than I'll ever make as a teacher), an incredible benefits package and pension plan, and a job that allowed me to leave my work at work when it came to the end of the day. For me, it was an easy decision; teaching is my passion and it's what I feel I was meant to do.

As a new teacher, there is no shortage of work. I can honestly tell you that for the entirety of my time at Massey, my week days consisted of a **minimum** 10 hours at school. This time was spent preparing labs, calling or meeting with parents, creating tests or exams, working on lessons for the next day, helping students, marking tests and assignments, supervising the bus students, and putting together my resources so that I was prepared for my students. Being a science teacher, I consider part of my responsibility to my students to include staying abreast of the latest in the ever-evolving realm of what's new in the science community. Sadly, professional development was left to the wayside because there just wasn't enough hours in the day.

But wait...my day did not end there. I would then go home, maybe grab a bite to eat (if I felt I had the time), and either continue working at home or head back to the school until I was too exhausted to do anything more. I was actually mistaken to be a janitor a few times because of how many hours I spent at the school. I did not have weekends; everyone else's "Saturday and Sunday" were almost regular work days at school for me. I was not even involved in any of the extra-curricular activities or clubs that teachers are expected to oversee/coach as part of our "job"; I couldn't have gotten involved even if I tried. I literally survived on a day-to-day basis. I barely slept, ate, or took any time for myself and sadly, what I'm describing is not a situation unique to me. Many of my dedicated colleagues, especially those that have been teaching for less than 6 or 7 years in the same subject area, put in countless hours outside of the paid "work day". Why? For me, I cannot do my job with any less effort than what I expect of my students. I have high standards for them and I better well be a prime example if I'm going to demand it from them.

Every year, teachers are burdened with more work. The amount of overtime expected of us increases but unlike other professions, we never see a single penny for it and nothing else gets taken off our plates in lieu of what is being added. I've often heard teachers say "If my job was just to teach, I'd be a much better, healthier, and happier teacher" and I can see how it's true. Teachers get painted into a corner of having to fulfill multiple roles, almost to the point where the actual "teaching" part seems overshadowed by the rest of it. As much as we'd like to think we can do it all, we cannot and it's starting to show in the number of teachers claiming stress leave, sick time, or just plain leaving the profession. And trust me, the teachers that you'll force out of the profession will be some of the better ones, the individuals that care about how good of a job they've done at the end of the day.

You may think that cutting prep time by 8% is peanuts, barely worth discussing, but I will politely agree to completely disagree. You are essentially saying my time is worthless but I will tell you that my time is valuable. How valuable? Just ask my AP students who would regularly come for help before or after class, to study for the AP exam or for the Toronto Biology competition that our school placed 6th out of approximately 3500 schools. Ask the worried parents that would come in to devise a plan to try and help their son/daughter pass the course, or even just show up to class during the week. Ask my family who barely got to see me as I flew out the door to go finish my prepping during the evenings. What is the value of an hour? More than you'll ever know. The value of an hour a day can add up to the difference between burnout and energy; between stress leave and sanity; between a poor family life and a healthy one; between an open door with a willing teacher and a closed one with no help available outside of class hours.

Will students be impacted? Most definitely and I hope that you, as a Board, are willing to accept the consequences for your decisions. You will lose some of the best teachers, because you are taking way another piece of scaffold from an already shaky structure. You will cause us to choose between our jobs and our families and you will promote half-hearted effort because that's all we can give with the weight of the demands being placed on us. And the saddest part of all is that it's not because we want to, but because we have no other choice.

I sincerely urge you to take the perspective of a teacher, or better yet a student, and to give some serious thought to your proposal.

Respectfully,

Lindsay N. Metruk

From: "Marcia Hamm Wiebe" 07/03/2011 10:10:39 AM

Subject: budget consultation

To: **Sheri Bailey**

Attachments: Attach0.html 2K

greetings to the trustees and senior administration:
I have been following the events of this budget and I am concerned that the people of Brandon are being manipulated by the Province in this situation with the TIG grant process. I agree that the province should increase the funding to the students in our school division. I think that playing the division against the department of education is wrong, the students end up losing. All of the budget items that were discussed at the previous consultation are for much needed programs in our division. I have stated publicly before and will continue to state that I am willing to invest my tax dollars in the education of future generations in our community. I believe that the TIG process distracts the community from the real needs of students and confuses the public about what is actually being offered to our division. We all lose in the end if we do not focus on educating our children. Please continue to push the province to fund our division at the needed levels. Do not give in to this manipulation. I am willing for my taxes to increase as long as the education of children and youth in our community remains the priority.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this meeting,
Marcia Hamm Wiebe
parent of the New Era school community

Appendix C

K-12 Suspension Report Semester 1 2010/2011

Category of Suspension				
School	**Assault**	**Drug/Alcohol**	**Unacceptable Behaviour**	**Total # of Suspensions**
Alexander	1	0	1	2
Betty Gibson	0	0	0	0
Crocus Plains	34	15	71	120
Earl Oxford	4	0	0	4
George Fitton	4	0	1	5
Green Acres	0	0	0	0
Harrison	0	0	0	0
J.R. Reid	0	0	0	0
King George	0	0	1	1
Kirkcaldy Heights	0	0	0	0
Linden Lanes	1	0	0	1
Meadows	0	0	0	0
Neelin	6	18	13	37
New Era	0	0	0	0
O'Kelly	0	0	0	0
Riverheights	0	0	0	0
Riverview	0	0	0	0
St. Augustine	0	0	0	0
Valleyview	0	0	0	0
Vincent Massey	4	4	11	19
Waverly Park	0	0	0	0
Combined Total for K-12 Schools	**54**	**37**	**98**	**189**

Total Number of K-12 Suspensions, According to # of Days Consequence

# of Days Consequence	K-8 Schools	Crocus Plains	Neelin	Vincent Massey	Total By # of Days
3 Days	7	48	0	0	48
4-6 Days	4	61	19	17	97
7-10 Days	1	7	7	0	14
11-15 Days	0	2	1	2	5
16-20 Days	1	1	5	0	6
21-30 Days	0	1	5	0	6
Total # of K-12 Suspensions	**13**	**120**	**37**	**19**	**176**
Grand Total (Total # of Suspensions K-12)	**189**				