

Not Responsive

From: MacFarlane, Paige EDUC:EX
Sent: September-12-14 10:08 AM
To: Roberts, Mike X EDUC:EX; Allen, Roderick EDUC:EX
Subject: FW: Update- essential services- teachers

Keeping you in the loop on this.

From: Bond, Allison MCF:EX
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2014 10:04 AM
To: MacFarlane, Paige EDUC:EX
Subject: FW: Update- essential services- teachers

Updates for your information. Thanks for the call yesterday

From: Osborne, Tim MCF:EX
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2014 10:01 AM
To: Bond, Allison MCF:EX
Cc: Kamper, Carolyn J MCF:EX; Angel, Lenora MCF:EX
Subject: RE: Update- essential services- teachers

Hi, this morning I had a call with Rick Faoro from Youth Custody, Tom Jensen from Maples and Selina Lew from the PSA about the status of the Rick/Tom's conversation with their local school superintendents.

Good new first- PG is able to provide one teaching support for PGYCS starting Monday- they will work 2 full time days and 1 half day. Normally they have 3 instructors.

Regarding Maples and Burnaby YCS- both Tom and Rick have had discussions with a local administrator earlier this week but have not heard back from them on resources they may be able to deploy. Both are following up with the Burnaby school district today for an update.

Rick advised that the school districts were unable to provide a resource for Camp Trapping in the north and Am'ut. We have not heard back from the Surrey school district on Waypoint and Daughters and Sisters, though we expect it will receive the same answer.

Rick indicated that without school programming there has been a rise in incidents with the youth as staff to try to find alternate programming. Tom reported no increase in incidents however as expected there has been a strain on resources as they do need to keep their youth occupied (ie., yesterday they went on a field trip to Grouse Mountain). In addition, as teachers at Maples are involved in the education portion of their youth's careplans (it results

in funding for the local school district) five youth have chosen to delay their entry to the Response program till the strike resolves and the careplan can be completed.

PSA will be arranging a call for us on Monday morning with Mike Roberts from the BCPSEA to give him an update on our discussions with school districts and challenges we are facing as the teachers strike continues.

Sounds like the bargaining principals are in discussion today so maybe there will be developments over the weekend.

From: Osborne, Tim MCF:EX
Sent: Thursday, September 4, 2014 4:16 PM
To: Bond, Allison MCF:EX
Cc: Kamper, Carolyn J MCF:EX
Subject: essential services- teachers

This morning Tom Jensen, Rick Faoro, myself and Selina Lew from the PSA had a conference call with Mike Walker, CEO, BC Public Schools Employer Association (BCPSEA) and Karen Jewell, legal counsel for the BCPSEA.

s. 13, s. 17

Mike Walker was going to contact the superintendents after the call about making contact with Rick and Tom.

Mike also suggested that the ministry contact Paige Macfarlane, ADM at the Ministry of Education. She has involvement/conduct with this file and influence on the school districts. He thought it important that we make our case to her directly so that the Ministry of Education understands the importance of the issue and can assist in

s. 13, s. 17

s. 13, s. 17

Can you contact Paige directly on this Allison? I can provide you with background material on our essential services rationale if you would find that helpful.

Tim Osborne | Director, Strategic Workplace Initiatives

People and Workplace Strategies

Ministry of Children and Family Development

Phone: 250-387-2466 | Mobile: s. 17

Not Responsive

From: Fayad, Deborah EDUC:EX
Sent: September-17-14 8:14 AM
To: Roberts, Mike X EDUC:EX; Zacharuk, Christina PSEC:EX
Cc: Abbott, Kim EDUC:EX
Subject: Start up/Ratification

Hi, can you tell me when the teacher's settlement will receive final ratification if members approve on Thursday and when the first day that teacher's would be back on pay?

Deborah Fayad, CPA, CGA
Assistant Deputy Minister, Resource Management Division
Ministry of Education
Phone: s. 17

Not Responsive

From: Roberts, Mike X EDUC:EX
Sent: September-14-14 12:36 PM
Subject: Job Action Issues Update - Sept 14, 2014

Superintendents and Secretary-Treasurers

Please see attached.

Mike Roberts

Superintendent - Liaison

Ministry of Education - Vancouver

s. 17 (c)

Kennedy, Debbie EDUC:EX

From: Roberts, Mike X EDUC:EX
Sent: Friday, September 26, 2014 8:42 AM
To: Kennedy, Debbie EDUC:EX
Subject: FW: Strike Savings Reclamation Update
Attachments: Strike Saving Reclamation Update.pdf

Importance: High

Mike Roberts
Superintendent - Liaison
Ministry of Education - Vancouver
(604)562-0045 (c)

From: l_educ_superintendents-bounces@lists.gov.bc.ca <l_educ_superintendents-bounces@lists.gov.bc.ca> on behalf of Education Funding Department EDUC:EX <Education.FundingDepartment@gov.bc.ca>
Sent: September-12-14 5:03 PM
To: 'l_educ_st@lists.gov.bc.ca'
Cc: 'l_educ_superintendents@lists.gov.bc.ca'; teresa.rezansoff@sd51.bc.ca; l_educ_chair@lists.gov.bc.ca; shansen@bcsta.org; sraider@bcsta.org
Subject: Strike Savings Reclamation Update

Please find attached, an important letter from Deborah Fayad, Assistant Deputy Minister, Resource Management Division, Ministry of Education.
Thank you.

Not Responsive

From: Allan Reed <areed@sd57.bc.ca>
Sent: September-11-14 7:26 PM
To: Graham, Chris CSCD:EX
Cc: Roberts, Mike X EDUC:EX; Brian Pepper
Subject: Canada Winter Games - February 13 to March 1, 2015

Good evening:

I am writing with respect to the potential impact of the current strike by members of the British Columbia Teachers' Federation on the Canada Winter Games being held in Prince George February 13 to March 1, 2015.

The Board of Education adopted its 2014-2015 Calendar at its Regular Meeting on February 25, 2014. In recognition of the Canada Winter Games and a commitment made by a previous Board of Education in 2010, that calendar includes a two-week "spring break" inclusive of February 16 to 27, 2015. This spring break is of course outside of and for this school district replaces the regular spring break taken by most school districts in the province in March.

I am advising the Games Secretariat of this and requesting that the commitment of our Board of Education to the 2015 Canada Winter Games be considered in any discussions related to changes to the school year in response to instructional time lost due to the current teacher strike.

I would be happy to answer and questions.

Allan Reed, CPA, CA
Secretary-Treasurer
School District No. 57 (Prince George)
2100 Ferry Avenue
Prince George, BC
V2L 4R5
(250)561-6800 Local 246

Not Responsive

From: Chris Van der Mark <ch-vandermark@sd54.bc.ca>

Sent: September-17-14 11:29 AM

To: Bobbie Kingsmill; Michael McDiarmid; Dave Margerm; Roberts, Mike X EDUC:EX

Cc: Andrew Samoil; Angus Wilson; Brian Pepper; Cam MacKay; Candy Clouthier; Charlene Seguin; Cindy Heitman; Claire McKay; Cynthia Bernier; Dave Bartley; Dave Sloan; Deb Mah; Diana Samchuk; Ernie Mannering; Eugene Marks; Gerry Brennan; Harg Manhas; Jerome Beauchamp; Kathy Sawchuk; Ken Minette; Leslie Lambie; Lisa Carson; Manu; Mark Thiessen; Mike Gordon; Michael McDiarmid; Nancy Wells; Norma Hart; Philippe Brulot; Randy Curr; Ray Asai; Rick Pooley; Rob Dennis; Rob Taylor; Sandra Jones; Stephen Petrucci; Sue Ellen Miller; Susan Johnston; Susan MacDonald; Tina Jules; Tom Paterson; katherine.mcintosh@cmsd.bc.ca; Cathy Vandermark; Matthew Monkman

Subject: Draft letter to parents

September 17, 2014

PROVINCIAL TENTATIVE AGREEMENT

Dear Parent/Guardian:

As you will have heard, a tentative agreement has been struck between the BCTF and BCPSEA that, if ratified, would see schools open in short order. We would like to express our thanks to all parties for their efforts in working towards a negotiated settlement. We are particularly appreciative for the patience of parents and students throughout this dispute and look forward to our teachers once again doing the great work with students that they love to do.

It is important to note this is a tentative agreement. There is a process to follow for the agreement to be ratified and, as such, it is still difficult to predict an exact return to school date. Given that teachers will be voting on Thursday, September 18, it is unlikely the results of the vote will be known until late Thursday evening, making it practically impossible to communicate and implement a Friday start for students.

Consequently, in the event of a successful ratification vote, ***School District #54 is planning for all schools to be in session and all buses to run on Monday, September 22.*** We are treating this as the first day of school to permit the same routines and orientation that schools, students and parents are familiar with. Some key details include:

■ Monday, September 22 is a half day as per usual

■ Kindergarten gradual entry has been shortened. All kindergarten students will be attending full time by Friday, September 26.

The District will be working to balance the semesters to minimize lost time at secondary school.

Again, we are delighted that this tentative agreement has been reached and pending successful ratification on Thursday, we look forward to seeing students fill our hallways again!

We will provide any additional update as necessary.

Job Action Issues

LIAISON MINISTRY UPDATE – September 14, 2014

- For LRB rulings and latest information on teacher bargaining please see [BCPSEA website](#)
- For additional information please see [Ministry newsroom](#)

Employers' Proposal E80

There has been much discussion and misinformation circulating with respect to BCPSEA proposal E80. "E80" is simply the BCPSEA proposal on learning and working conditions, also commonly referred to as the employer proposal on class size and composition.

For more information, the BC Public School Employers' Association has recently posted a [backgrounder on employers' proposal E80](#) on their website.

Handbook of Procedures for the Graduation Program

- The 2014/15 **Handbook of Procedures for the Graduation Program** is now posted: www.bced.gov.bc.ca/exams/handbook/. The Ministry recognizes that the start-up of the 2014-2015 school year is exceptional due to the labour situation therefore may create the need for amendments.
- The 2014/15 Grad Planner is posted in both English and French at www.bced.gov.bc.ca/graduation/grad_certificate.htm.
- Schools are reminded, as per the exam schedule published last January, that there is no longer a provincial exam session in October.
- The design of the Handbook has changed this year. Please help us by completing a short survey to provide feedback on the design and utility of the Handbook. The online survey will be available until October 17, 2014 at <http://fluidsurveys.com/s/grad-handbook>.

If you have questions please contact the Student Certification Branch by emailing Student.Certification@gov.bc.ca

Ministry Reporting Requirements

In recognition of the challenges that administrators face at this time, the Ministry of Education is committed to working with school districts and to being as flexible as possible when it comes to ministry reporting requirements.

The ministry has also been working through school start-up considerations.

We will be providing more detailed information to districts as soon as we're able. Thank you for your patience as we finalize details.

MyEducation BC Implementation

The original schedule for the implementation of MyEducation BC is being adjusted in light of the job action. We are in the process of consulting with districts to establish dates that will have the least impact on school district operations. Thanks for the valuable input we have received from your district staff.

Reminder: Live Tutoring Available through LearnNow BC

Amongst the services provided by LearnNow BC to students is access to live tutoring five nights per week from 6 – 10 pm. Other resources include the Charged-Up streaming video lessons for Math, as well as self-assessment tests through Success Checker. These resources are freely accessible through www.learnnowbc.ca

Reminder: Parent information website

Government has launched a [new website for parents](#), with information on teacher bargaining, parent support, student achievement and learning resources.

Thank you for your continued commitment to BC students during this challenging period.



September 12, 2014

Ref: 177297

To: All Secretary-Treasurers
All School Districts

The purpose of this letter is to update you on the progress made since I last communicated with you on August 29, 2014, regarding the approach for reporting and reclaiming strike savings. Thank you for all your hard work, flexibility and assistance working together with the Ministry during these extenuating circumstances.

My staff and I have worked with the BCASBO Executive to better understand potential savings and additional costs that school districts may experience due to strike activity starting in September. This work was valuable in demonstrating that while there are many similarities amongst district savings, there is a wide variation in the incremental financial impacts of the strike. Due to these differences, we will ask you to report on areas of your budgets where spending was planned, but did not occur during each monthly reporting period that job action occurs. Ian Aaron, Director of School District Financial Reporting, will send a detailed reporting template with instructions to you no later than Friday, September 19, 2014.

Beginning with the September 2014 reporting, the Ministry will reclaim all strike savings, including but not limited to the following areas:

- Teacher wages
- Teacher wage sensitive benefits
- Teacher non-wage sensitive benefits
- Staff replacement costs
- Utility and other facility costs
- Transportation
- Professional development
- Travel
- Supplies

You are asked to report monthly savings to the Ministry where spending is not being deferred to a later time. Also, you will be asked to provide details of incremental strike costs experienced during the month in areas such as international student programs, dues and fees, rentals and leases, and First Nations/LEA reductions.

... /2

If school districts are experiencing particular financial difficulty as a result of the job action and strike recoveries, the Ministry will work with districts on a case-by-case basis to recognize any reasonable incremental costs, factoring in the district's financial situation.

Please contact Ian Aaron at (250) 415-1073 or Kim Abbott, Director of Funding and Allocation at (250) 896-3680 if you have any questions.

Thanks again to everyone for the extra effort and understanding during this uncertain time.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "D. Fayad", is positioned above the printed name and title.

Deborah Fayad
Assistant Deputy Minister

cc: Teresa Rezansoff, President, British Columbia School Trustees Association
Board Chairs, All School Districts
Superintendents, All School Districts

Not Responsive

From: Foster, Doug FIN:EX
Sent: Thursday, September 18, 2014 6:02 PM
To: Abbott, Kim EDUC:EX
Cc: Fayad, Deborah EDUC:EX
Subject: FW: Agreement Details
Attachments: DRAFT 2014 BCTF Costing CBS Base - Sept 16.xlsx

Deb and me spoke. Yes I did review with PSEC.
But would have been better to have me explain each piece.

s.13, s.17

We need to review the IS numbers again.
d.

-----Original Message-----

From: Fayad, Deborah EDUC:EX
Sent: Thursday, September 18, 2014 4:50 PM
To: Foster, Doug FIN:EX
Subject: FW: Agreement Details

Deborah Fayad, CPA, CGA
Assistant Deputy Minister, Resource Management Division Ministry of Education
Phone: s. 17

-----Original Message-----

From: Abbott, Kim EDUC:EX
Sent: Thursday, September 18, 2014 4:03 PM
To: Fayad, Deborah EDUC:EX; Fraser, Brian EDUC:EX
Subject: FW: Agreement Details

Here's what I have from PSEC, not final yet but it's draft. Apparently Doug has reviewed and okayed this.

Kim Abbott
Director, Funding and Allocation
Resource Management Division
Ministry of Education
T: (250) 896-3680 E: Kim.Abbott@gov.bc.ca

-----Original Message-----

From: Foweraker, Jonathan PSEC:EX
Sent: Wednesday, September 17, 2014 1:40 PM
To: Abbott, Kim EDUC:EX; Zacharuk, Christina PSEC:EX
Cc: Dawson, Ken PSEC:EX

Subject: RE: Agreement Details

Hi Kim,

Here is our draft costing - note I'm still awaiting the final language so this may change. The workbook should open at a summary tab.

s.13, s.17

Hope this helps - let me know of any questions - and I will update this as and when I have the information needed.

s.13, s.17

Cheers,

Jonathan

-----Original Message-----

From: Abbott, Kim EDUC:EX

Sent: Wednesday, September 17, 2014 1:13 PM

To: Zacharuk, Christina PSEC:EX

Cc: Dawson, Ken PSEC:EX; Foweraker, Jonathan PSEC:EX

Subject: Re: Agreement Details

Thanks, will need to have that discussion quickly, as DM will be expecting info on next steps and approach.

Sent from my iPad

> On Sep 17, 2014, at 12:58 PM, "Zacharuk, Christina PSEC:EX" <Christina.Zacharuk@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

>

> Not a problem - JF has an initial costing and we'll confirm the mechanics of LIF/Ed Fund when the language finalized. They are just finalizing this aft so we will have soon. There may be some changes required to the LIF regulation but that's separate from funding - I will organize a separate chat with you and Dave D on that...

>

> Sent from my iPhone

>

>> On Sep 17, 2014, at 12:52 PM, "Abbott, Kim EDUC:EX" <Kim.Abbott@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

>>

>> Yes, we had that discussion with Doug F earlier. Mainly just wanting clarification on costing on wages, benefits, and perhaps even the TTOC piece

s. 13, s. 17

- any funds that we may be flowing to Boards

of Education. Also, if there is clarity you can provide on the education fund piece that would be helpful for us (i.e. are we talking LIF increase, LIF repurposed, or something else)? Thx.

>>

>> Kim Abbott

>> Director, Funding and Allocation

>> Resource Management Division

>> Ministry of Education

>> T: (250) 896-3680 E: Kim.Abbott@gov.bc.ca

>>

>> -----Original Message-----

>> From: Zacharuk, Christina PSEC:EX

>> Sent: Wednesday, September 17, 2014 12:49 PM

>> To: Dawson, Ken PSEC:EX

>> Cc: Abbott, Kim EDUC:EX; Foweraker, Jonathan PSEC:EX

>> Subject: Re: Agreement Details

>>

>>

>> s.13, s.17

>>

>> Thanks, CZ

>>

>> Sent from my iPhone

>>

>>> On Sep 17, 2014, at 12:31 PM, "Dawson, Ken PSEC:EX" <Ken.Dawson@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

>>>

>>> Hi Kim

>>> Yes we can do that for you. We are just waiting for final package from BCPSEA - they are in discussions with BCTF on final items now. Shouldn't be long.

>>>

>>> Copying Jonathan.

>>>

>>> Ken

>>>

>>> Sent from my iPhone

>>>

>>>> On Sep 17, 2014, at 12:24 PM, "Abbott, Kim EDUC:EX" <Kim.Abbott@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> Hi ken,

>>>>

>>>> We're being asked to prepare materials for our DM on agreement impacts, especially with respect to independent schools. Can you send me the details (i.e. Costing) for how things ended up?

>>>>

>>>> K

>>>>

>>>> Sent from my iPhone

Pages 16 through 24 redacted for the following reasons:

s. 13, s. 17

Not Responsive

From: MacFarlane, Paige EDUC:EX
Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2014 6:58 AM
To: Allen, Roderick EDUC:EX; Mohoruk, Sherri EDUC:EX; Espe, Larry EDUC:EX; Unwin, Jan EDUC:EX; Dockendorf, Maureen EDUC:EX; Rongve, Ian EDUC:EX; Fayad, Deborah EDUC:EX; Kot, Jill EDUC:EX
Cc: Byng, Dave A EDUC:EX; Roberts, Mike X EDUC:EX; Pauliszyn, Robert GCPE:EX
Subject: Fwd: Letter from Peter Cameron, BCPSEA Chief Negotiator, September 10, 2014
Attachments: image001.jpg; ATT00001.htm; 00-PC-Letter to Trustees-September 10 2014.pdf; ATT00002.htm

FYI - useful for understanding E-80

Subject: Letter from Peter Cameron, BCPSEA Chief Negotiator, September 10, 2014

This e-mail was sent to Board Chairs, Trustee Representatives, Superintendents, Secretary Treasurers, HR Contacts.

Please find attached a letter from Peter Cameron, BCPSEA Chief Negotiator regarding Employer Proposal E80.

Thank you,

Lisa Nasu Executive Assistant

.....
direct 604.730.4544 cell s. 17 fax 604.730.0787
[BCPSEA on Twitter](#) | [BCPSEA on Facebook](#) | www.bcpsea.bc.ca

Date: September 10, 2014
To: School Trustees
C: Superintendents
Secretary Treasurers
From: Peter Cameron, Chief Negotiator
Re: **Employer Proposal E80**

I am writing to provide clarity on BCPSEA proposal "E80" and to correct misinformation that has been circulated by the British Columbia Teachers' Federation (BCTF).

"E80" is simply BCPSEA's proposal on learning and working conditions, also commonly referred to as the employer proposal on class size and composition. "E" stands for "employer proposal" and "80" indicates it is the 80th proposal tabled by the employer (see BCPSEA website for all proposals currently tabled).

The BCTF is engaged in a concerted public relations campaign to attack both the content of the proposal as well as the ability of employers to put forward *any* proposal for ongoing language to address learning and working conditions.

It remains a fundamental objective of BCPSEA to ensure the new collective agreement has appropriate, ongoing language with respect to working and learning conditions. We are prepared to negotiate with the union on the merits and details of our proposal, which is completely consistent with the explicit language of the BC Supreme Court decision.

My comments are in two parts. The first part deals with the relationship between the parties' proposals and court decisions. The second deals with the merits of the parties' respective proposals.

❖ **Ongoing Bargaining on Class Size and Composition**

Despite claims by the BCTF leadership, the employer proposal on working conditions in no way negates the matter before the courts.

As Justice Griffin explained in her second decision, while she restored certain language to the old collective agreement, this did "not guarantee that the language is clad in stone, as it can and likely will need to be the subject of ongoing collective bargaining" (paragraph 679). BCPSEA interprets Madam Justice Griffin to say that class size and composition can and should be the subject of bargaining. E80 is simply the employers' proposal to address the very language that the court decided should be the subject of ongoing collective bargaining.

The BCTF apparently hopes that the Court of Appeal will uphold Madam Justice Griffin's decision, with the effect that the old language is restored to the current collective agreement. In the BCTF's view, this relieves the union of the obligation to bargain class size and composition pending a decision from the Court of Appeal and further, that it can simply wait for the court to restore the old language rather than engage in bargaining the terms of a renewal collective agreement.

BCPSEA considers the BCTF's position to be contrary to the spirit of the very *Charter* protection on which the BCTF relies — the right to collective bargaining. In refusing to bargain provisions in a new agreement on the pretext of waiting for a court to restore the terms of a former agreement, the BCTF is not engaging in meaningful negotiation of working and learning conditions in this round of bargaining.

❖ Merits of the Parties' Proposals

BCPSEA proposes that the new collective agreement should address workload implications of any changes in class size, and provide flexible solutions and guaranteed funding to address working and learning conditions. However, it should not contain arbitrary limits or ratios.

The BCTF has proposed a workload fund as an interim measure, in case it loses in court. As noted, the BCTF is of the view that if the Province's appeal is unsuccessful, the old language would be reinserted into the existing collective agreement without the need for any bargaining. The intent of the union's proposal, therefore, is that the pre-2002 language could come back into the agreement without any need for the union to negotiate it or to justify it to the public.

The history of the old language, which traces back to the 1980s, is relevant to a full understanding of the dispute.

The Origin of the Pre-2002 Language

Before provincial bargaining, most (but not all) local agreements had some version of class size and composition language based on limits and ratios. Employers had come to realize that such provisions limited their ability to manage resources effectively to address the learning needs of their students.

With the advent of provincial bargaining, boards of education were determined that the provincial agreement should be free of those types of restrictions. In 1998, the determination of boards was demonstrated by voting down, by 85 percent, a proposal to include limits and ratios in the provincial agreement. Despite this, the government of the day legislated them into the collective agreement.

Between 1998 and 2002, there was some marginal bargaining about the legislated restrictions. In 2002, a new government legislated the provisions out of the agreement and also legislated away the union's right to bargain class size and composition. This began a series of court proceedings. The union was successful in regaining the right to bargain class size and composition. As a remedy for taking away this right, the decision of Justice Griffin restored the pre-2002 language into the old agreements. Although some aspects of Justice Griffin's decision are under appeal, the government agrees that the union has the right to negotiate class size and composition. The corollary, of course, is that the employers' association has the same right.

The Current Approach

Currently, as is the case in all other provinces, boards of education have significant flexibility to allocate resources in a manner that maximizes the learning opportunities for students. Further, union members and school management can also access the Learning Improvement Fund to address complex classroom needs and working conditions.

The restoration of pre-2002 language would take this flexibility away, to be replaced with antiquated formulas and arbitrary ratios. Class composition issues could only be addressed indirectly, as a potential but unguaranteed by-product of being forced to hire more teachers in predefined categories. By their very nature, these provisions do not allow boards of education to allocate the additional teachers in a way that properly matches the actual needs of classrooms and students in real-life situations.

It is important to note that the court's decision to restore pre-2002 language to past agreements does not amount to a conclusion of the court that those provisions were the best way to address the learning needs of students. In the first hearing on this matter, the BCTF agreed that Justice Griffin should not rule on issues of education quality. As noted above, the court recognized that the pre-2002 provisions could be addressed through collective bargaining.

After the pre-2002 provisions were removed in 2002, student outcomes improved dramatically — especially for aboriginal students, those with special needs, and those for whom English is a second language. Aside from poor outcomes, allowing the pre-2002 language to fall back into the collective agreement would leave employers open to human rights complaints — for example, as a result of denying access to elective programs on a basis of a student's disability (regardless whether the disability was relevant to the program or teacher workload).

The pre-2002 provisions would also prohibit flexibility in class sizes. For example, currently a principal, in consultation with teachers, can provide a smaller class for an inexperienced teacher who may need time to develop the skills needed to manage a complex classroom. In classes for grade four students and higher, a smaller class can be balanced from a cost perspective by a larger class taught by a highly-skilled experienced teacher. As a practical matter of affordability, the lack of flexibility in the union's preferred language would drive all classes to the maximum. In this context, it should be noted that the current averages for class sizes in BC are reasonable.

Ironically, the return of pre-2002 provisions would not address teacher workload in a way that includes teacher input — and therefore could actually result in *greater* workloads. For example, defined ratios could require hiring one teacher-librarian — instead of two education assistants to work directly with a teacher in the classroom.

Moreover, by denying any consultative role for teachers and management, the union would deny the ability of trustees to ensure that resources are allocated appropriately. It is trustees, not the BCTF, who are accountable by statute to government and the public for the success of the school system.

In summary, the BCTF wants a return of provisions because it would drive up union membership, and would actually prevent the deployment of teachers in a manner that best meets the learning needs of students and teacher working conditions because it is too prescriptive and is not reactive to classroom needs.

In contrast, the current BCPSEA proposal (E80) is based on the Learning Improvement Fund (LIF) approach. The LIF has worked well. It addresses workload and learning issues through consultation at the school and district levels.

The LIF approach recognizes that each student is a unique learner, with his or her own learning style and pace, gifts, and passions. The LIF process allows union members and senior educators to consult on the resource allocation and organizational structures that best meet the needs of students. The LIF imposes no barriers to the inclusion of students with special needs in classes, nor does it require deploying valuable resources ineffectively.

BCPSEA proposal E80 would enhance the LIF process, clarifying the consultation rights of teachers and the union, and putting those rights into the collective agreement for the first time.

BCPSEA has also proposed entrenching LIF funding into the collective agreement, again for the first time. This is important because it turns funding that is now subject to annual budgetary appropriation into an ongoing and binding commitment.

The government has already announced a 25 percent increase in the LIF in the 2014-15 school year. BCPSEA has indicated to the union that it has the mandate to negotiate modest enhancements to the announced LIF funding (as well as entrenching the larger amount in the agreement).

Labels and formulae cannot be relied on to determine classroom size and composition, or effective learning supports for students in the 21st century context. These determinations are better made at the local school level, with input from teachers, administrators, parents, and elected officials based on the actual needs of each student.

You may also wish to access the additional resources available on the BC Parent Info website: <http://bcparentinfo.ca/> including a [PowerPoint presentation](#) on key issues.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Peter Cameron', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Peter Cameron
Chief Negotiator

Not Responsive

From: MacFarlane, Paige EDUC:EX
Sent: Saturday, September 13, 2014 12:14 PM
To: Fayad, Deborah EDUC:EX
Subject: FW: Urgent

FYI Deb – this appears to be under control.
At least until we get the next question!

Tks

From: MacFarlane, Paige EDUC:EX
Sent: Saturday, September 13, 2014 12:12 PM
To: Miller, Claire EDUC:EX; Allen, Roderick EDUC:EX; Rongve, Ian EDUC:EX
Subject: RE: Urgent

Claire, this will work great.
Thank you so much – pls keep me posted as you are able to get the info for all 60 SD's assembled.

From: Miller, Claire EDUC:EX
Sent: Saturday, September 13, 2014 12:04 PM
To: MacFarlane, Paige EDUC:EX; Allen, Roderick EDUC:EX; Rongve, Ian EDUC:EX
Subject: RE: Urgent
Importance: High

Hi Paige, Rod and Ian

As an example of what I have by district, I have selected SD005. The instructions for the LIF are also below. The attachment referenced below for SD005 is attached to this e-mail. Please confirm this is what is needed and I will find a way of assembling it.

Thanks,

Claire s. 17

School District #

School District Name

2013/14 Learning
Improvement Fund (LIF)
Allocation

Support Staff Minimal
Obligation

Budgetted for Teacher
Staffing

Budgetted for Teacher
Professional Development s. 13, s. 17

Budgetted for Education
Assistants (EA)

Reserves

of EAs w/ extended hours

of new EAs w/ extended
hours

of new EAs w/ status quo
hours

Local Teachers Union
agreed?

Attachments SD5 Fall 2013 FINAL LIF plan.pdf

2013/14 Learning Improvement Fund (LIF) Grant Expenditure Plans

Districts seeking a grant under LIF must submit a plan consistent with the LIF Regulation no later than October 15 of each year.

The superintendent or designate may submit district plans using this page:

- 1. Before using the online form, you may want to test your figures by downloading and saving a copy of the excel test file to your computer. This excel file provides validation to check your figures against the total allocated amount. Once you are satisfied that it is correct, and your district plan document is ready to be submitted, return to this page.*
- 2. In the list (below), click on **your district number**. This opens the online form for your district.*
- 3. Click the **Edit** button in the top left corner of the form.*
- 4. **Enter** your details into the blank fields. (Tip: Open your Excel test file and copy/paste the information into the fields on the online form.)*
- 5. **Attach** your district plan document. To do this, click the **Attach File** button in the top right corner of the form, then browse to the document and upload it.*
- 6. Click the **Save and Close** button at the bottom of the online form. SharePoint submits your form along with the attached document, and adds it to the LIF Expenditure Plans list.*
- 7. If you find that you need to update your submission, open your online form again, click **Edit**, and make any required changes. This resubmits the information.*

From: MacFarlane, Paige EDUC:EX
Sent: Saturday, September 13, 2014 11:45 AM
To: Fayad, Deborah EDUC:EX; Rongve, Ian EDUC:EX; Allen, Roderick EDUC:EX
Cc: Miller, Claire EDUC:EX
Subject: Fwd: Urgent

To keep all updated - I have connected directly with Claire Miller who is trying to drum up this info.

Key question:

- LIF allocation by SD
- LIF report back to ministry on how this allocation was spent
- notably what amount/percentage on teachers; what amount/percentage on EA's (other)

Need to keep on this please til we get an answer - thanks, all.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "MacFarlane, Paige EDUC:EX" <paige.macfarlane@gov.bc.ca>
Date: 13 September, 2014 11:35:36 AM PDT
To: "Fayad, Deborah EDUC:EX" <Deborah.Fayad@gov.bc.ca>
Cc: "Rongve, Ian EDUC:EX" <Ian.Rongve@gov.bc.ca>
Subject: Fwd: Urgent

Deb - you may be able to help here? Just left vmail as well.
Needed ASAP - will keep looking. Please let me know if either of you have or can get this info

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "MacFarlane, Paige EDUC:EX" <paige.macfarlane@gov.bc.ca>
Date: 13 September, 2014 11:31:04 AM PDT
To: "Rongve, Ian EDUC:EX" <Ian.Rongve@gov.bc.ca>
Subject: Urgent

Hey Ian - need LIF spending report breakdown by SD - last year's LIF allocations, how spent by SD?

team needs this ASAP today - I think we have such a report - hoping you can get it??

Sent from my iPhone

Not Responsive

From: Aaron, Ian EDUC:EX
Sent: Saturday, September 13, 2014 1:27 PM
To: Fayad, Deborah EDUC:EX; MacFarlane, Paige EDUC:EX; Roberts, Mike X EDUC:EX
Cc: Rongve, Ian EDUC:EX; Miller, Claire EDUC:EX; Allen, Roderick EDUC:EX; Abbott, Kim EDUC:EX
Subject: RE: 45. Learning Improvement Fund attachment.xlsm
Attachments: LIF finals update February 2013.xlsx; 2012-13 LIF via AFS.XLSX
Importance: High

Spreadsheet titled "LIF finals update Feb 2013" is a summary of what school districts said they would spend on LIF.

Spreadsheet titled "2012-13 LIF via AFS" is an extract from the audited financial statements summarizing what school districts actually spent on LIF.

Thanks, Ian.

From: Fayad, Deborah EDUC:EX
Sent: Saturday, September 13, 2014 1:22 PM
To: MacFarlane, Paige EDUC:EX
Cc: Roberts, Mike X EDUC:EX; Rongve, Ian EDUC:EX; Miller, Claire EDUC:EX; Allen, Roderick EDUC:EX; Aaron, Ian EDUC:EX; Abbott, Kim EDUC:EX
Subject: Re: 45. Learning Improvement Fund attachment.xlsm

Hi, Ian Aaron is trying to find the 12/13 spending report he did for Rick Davis and will send to us all this afternoon.

Deborah Fayad, CPA, CGA
Assistant Deputy Minister,
Resource Management
Ministry of Education
Cellular: s. 17

On Sep 13, 2014, at 1:10 PM, "MacFarlane, Paige EDUC:EX" <paige.macfarlane@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

Rod is trying to connect w/ Rick

Otherwise Deb's team is looking at pulling actuals from 11/13 to complement the figures from Ian/Claire.

Thanks all

Sent from my iPhone

On 2014-09-13, at 12:59 PM, "Roberts, Mike X EDUC:EX" <Mike.X.Roberts@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

Does anyone have Rick's old files? Think he had the info.

Sent from phone of
Mike Roberts

On Sep 13, 2014, at 12:54 PM, "MacFarlane, Paige EDUC:EX"
<paige.macfarlane@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

Mike - I doubt it
Ian/ Claire??

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Roberts, Mike X EDUC:EX"
<Mike.X.Roberts@gov.bc.ca>
Date: 13 September, 2014 12:49:34 PM PDT
To: "MacFarlane, Paige EDUC:EX"
<paige.macfarlane@gov.bc.ca>
Subject: Re: 45. Learning Improvement Fund
attachment.xlsm

Paige
Is this document available with the actuals of what
districts spent as opposed to what they were allocated?
Mike

Mike Roberts
Superintendent Liaison - Ministry of Education
interim CEO - BCPSEA

On Sep 13, 2014, at 12:33 PM, "MacFarlane, Paige
EDUC:EX" <paige.macfarlane@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

Summary – will this work?
Do you need more beyond this – do we
need staff to keep working on SD by SD
summaries or is this enough?

From: Rongve, Ian EDUC:EX
Sent: Saturday, September 13, 2014
12:29 PM
To: MacFarlane, Paige EDUC:EX; Miller,
Claire EDUC:EX; Allen, Roderick
EDUC:EX
Subject: 45. Learning Improvement
Fund attachment.xlsm

Found this in the estimates package

Learning Improvement Fund (LIF) Approval Form results - All-Districts Summary, 2012/13

SD #	Ministry Allocations		Responses submitted by districts via LIF Approval form								Areas of concern	
	2012/13 Learning Improvement Fund	Support Staff Portion of LIF Total	Teacher Staffing Funding	Teacher Prof Devt Funding	Educ Assts Funding	Reserves	# of EAs w/ extended hrs	# of new EAs w/ extended hrs	# of new EAs w/ status quo hrs	Local Teachers Union agreed?	Shortfall in \$ where (1) the district's stated LIF allocation [A] is lower than MinEdu's, and (2) that difference is greater than \$10	Shortfall in \$ where (1) the district's stated EA spending [E] is lower than MinEdu's alloc, and (2) that difference is greater than \$10
			C	D	E	F	G	H	I	K		
005	\$635,216	\$81,545	\$267,254	\$0	\$317,289	\$50,673	55	7	1	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
006	\$396,603	\$50,913	\$144,216	\$5,289	\$195,179	\$51,919	21	0	6	No	No shortfall	No shortfall
008	\$626,190	\$80,386	\$426,939	\$0	\$182,661	\$17,000	113	0	0	No	No shortfall	No shortfall
010	\$93,221	\$11,967	\$81,159	\$0	\$12,063	\$0	15	0	0	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
019	\$127,866	\$16,415	\$111,451	\$0	\$16,415	\$0	26	0	0	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
020	\$455,880	\$58,523	\$349,812	\$13,150	\$64,523	\$28,395	56	1	0	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
022	\$898,789	\$115,380	\$488,272	\$0	\$151,688	\$143,829	161	0	0	No	No shortfall	No shortfall
023	\$2,236,720	\$287,135	\$1,832,750	\$8,900	\$386,170	\$0	150	0	4	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
027	\$678,942	\$87,158	\$196,740	\$13,882	\$368,238	\$100,082	66	16	0	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
028	\$451,251	\$57,928	\$300,900	\$6,353	\$76,600	\$9,470	75	3	0	No	No shortfall	No shortfall
033	\$1,384,951	\$177,790	\$381,260	\$0	\$620,578	\$205,324	41	22	7	No	No shortfall	No shortfall
034	\$1,963,590	\$252,072	\$1,449,000	\$0	\$346,248	\$168,342	408	2	0	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
035	\$1,930,749	\$247,856	\$1,031,706	\$0	\$810,362	\$88,681	314	5.08	16	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
036	\$7,163,622	\$919,616	\$3,510,853	\$94,758	\$3,052,128	\$505,833	914	62.4	*	No	No shortfall	No shortfall
037	\$1,641,900	\$210,776	\$1,294,324	\$102,000	\$236,884	\$15,292	255	0	1	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
038	\$2,223,824	\$285,479	\$1,551,000	\$339,000	\$285,479	\$48,345	296	0	0	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
039	\$5,767,887	\$740,442	\$4,993,539	\$0	\$740,442	\$93,906	558	3	0	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
040	\$698,679	\$89,692	\$422,100	\$137,636	\$138,944	\$0	161	0	0	No	No shortfall	No shortfall
041	\$2,442,761	\$313,585	\$888,920	\$139,905	\$1,146,377	\$267,559	347	11	13	No	No shortfall	No shortfall
042	\$1,468,294	\$188,489	\$849,620	\$0	\$429,052	\$1,133	141	0	9.86	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
043	\$3,106,338	\$398,770	\$2,350,000	\$218,046	\$398,770	\$150,000	310	1	0	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
044	\$1,572,137	\$201,820	\$613,647	\$20,000	\$998,441	-\$59,952	335	16	0	No	No shortfall	No shortfall
045	\$675,845	\$86,760	\$473,614	\$0	\$93,454	\$108,776	102	4	0	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
046	\$427,326	\$54,857	\$240,589	\$24,000	\$115,857	\$46,880	77	2	0	No	No shortfall	No shortfall
047	\$272,214	\$34,945	\$239,676	\$0	\$34,945	\$0	12	0	0	No	No shortfall	No shortfall
048	\$482,223	\$61,904	\$354,900	\$16,320	\$61,904	\$49,100	66	0	0	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
049	\$67,182	\$8,624	\$58,558	\$0	\$8,624	\$0	11	0	0	No	No shortfall	No shortfall
050	\$130,554	\$16,760	\$100,000	\$0	\$26,624	\$3,930	22	0	0	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
051	\$199,289	\$25,583	\$9,400	\$1,500	\$188,388	\$0	28	3	0	No	No shortfall	No shortfall
052	\$323,303	\$41,503	\$254,306	\$0	\$41,503	\$27,494	61	0	0	No	No shortfall	No shortfall
053	\$298,052	\$38,262	\$136,597	\$1,005	\$142,650	\$53,916	62	4	0	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
054	\$287,789	\$36,944	\$199,125	\$10,425	\$78,240	\$0	57	1	0	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
057	\$1,534,943	\$197,045	\$1,484,045	\$0	\$197,045	\$50,898	196	0	0	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
058	\$315,008	\$40,439	\$152,283	\$44,907	\$61,000	\$16,378	1	2	0	No	No shortfall	No shortfall

Learning Improvement Fund (LIF) Approval Form results - All-Districts Summary, 2012/13

SD #	Ministry Allocations		Responses submitted by districts via LIF Approval form								Areas of concern	
	2012/13 Learning Improvement Fund	Support Staff Portion of LIF Total	Teacher Staffing Funding	Teacher Prof Devt Funding	Educ Assts Funding	Reserves	# of EAs w/ extended hrs	# of new EAs w/ extended hrs	# of new EAs w/ status quo hrs	Local Teachers Union agreed?	Shortfall in \$ where (1) the district's stated LIF allocation [A] is lower than MinEdu's, and (2) that difference is greater than \$10	Shortfall in \$ where (1) the district's stated EA spending [E] is lower than MinEdu's alloc, and (2) that difference is greater than \$10
			C	D	E	F	G	H	I	K		
059	\$535,106	\$68,693	\$352,300	\$7,200	\$145,000	\$30,606	4	0	3	No	No shortfall	No shortfall
060	\$670,519	\$86,077	\$192,463	\$53,100	\$368,993	\$55,969	11	0	10	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
061	\$1,923,524	\$246,929	\$1,402,138	\$14,536	\$505,923	\$927	81	1	13	No	No shortfall	No shortfall
062	\$988,117	\$126,848	\$730,038	\$27,840	\$177,115	\$53,123	141	3	0	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
063	\$813,883	\$104,481	\$166,362	\$38,140	\$609,380	\$0	150	13	0	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
064	\$240,235	\$30,840	\$191,395	\$0	\$48,840	\$0	11	0	0	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
067	\$692,197	\$88,859	\$102,600	\$0	\$530,524	\$59,073	114	19	8	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
068	\$1,487,664	\$190,976	\$862,488	N/A	\$190,976	\$434,200	198	37	4	No	No shortfall	No shortfall
069	\$511,619	\$65,678	\$379,110	\$66,831	\$65,678	\$0	111	1	0	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
070	\$477,239	\$61,265	\$296,953	\$0	\$61,265	\$119,021	89	0	0	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
071	\$909,503	\$116,756	\$447,500	\$0	\$310,400	\$34,844	185	10.283	9.8	No	No shortfall	No shortfall
072	\$624,425	\$80,159	\$252,478	\$38,909	\$146,112	\$187,500	120	3	0	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
073	\$1,576,539	\$0	\$819,743	\$67,500	\$537,625	\$151,672	0	0	12.65	No	No shortfall	No shortfall
074	\$256,355	\$32,909	\$97,195	\$11,100	\$137,068	\$10,992	61	-	-	No	No shortfall	No shortfall
075	\$664,091	\$85,251	\$500,000	\$0	\$120,000	\$17,000	91	1	0	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
078	\$245,890	\$31,566	\$42,000	\$3,000	\$182,000	\$18,890	1	0	7	No	No shortfall	No shortfall
079	\$896,455	\$115,081	\$563,985	\$0	\$325,198	\$7,272	146	0	9	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
081	\$126,157	\$16,195	\$109,962	\$0	\$16,195	\$0	0	0	2	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
082	\$650,666	\$83,528	\$266,665	\$114,500	\$174,828	\$94,928	80	8	1	No	No shortfall	No shortfall
083	\$788,079	\$101,168	\$528,000	\$12,000	\$151,900	\$96,179	186	4	0	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
084	\$100,181	\$12,861	\$84,714	\$0	\$12,861	\$0	11	0	0	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
085	\$232,986	\$29,909	\$172,098	\$16,500	\$44,388	\$0	50	0.46	0	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
087	\$71,702	\$9,205	\$62,497	\$0	\$9,205	\$0	0	0	0	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
091	\$645,309	\$82,840	\$398,879	\$10,000	\$136,062	\$100,368	175	2	1	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
092	\$95,993	\$12,323	\$30,000	\$50,993	\$15,000	\$0	11	0	0	No	No shortfall	No shortfall
093	\$796,423	\$102,239	\$514,328	\$26,021	\$210,600	\$42,858	101	0	0	Yes	No shortfall	No shortfall
Total:	\$60,000,000	\$7,500,000	\$36,804,446	\$1,755,246	\$17,257,901	\$3,758,624	7641	269	138			

2012/2013 Learning Improvement Fund

School Districts	Provincial Grants	Investment Income	Total Expenses	Deferred Revenue	Additional Expenses funded by and reported in the Operating Fund
05 (Southeast Kootenay)	635,216	0	635,216	0	0
06 (Rocky Mountain)	396,603	0	396,603	0	0
08 (Kootenay Lake)	626,190	0	578,557	47,633	0
10 (Arrow Lakes)	93,221	0	93,221	0	0
19 (Revelstoke)	127,866	0	127,866	0	0
20 (Kootenay-Columbia)	455,880	0	455,880	0	0
22 (Vernon)	898,789	0	803,758	95,031	0
23 (Central Okanagan)	2,236,721	0	2,236,721	0	0
27 (Cariboo-Chilcotin)	678,942	1,265	543,683	136,524	0
28 (Quesnel)	451,251	0	435,099	16,152	0
33 (Chilliwack)	1,384,952	0	1,384,952	0	0
34 (Abbotsford)	1,963,590	0	1,963,590	0	0
35 (Langley)	1,930,749	0	1,929,444	1,305	0
36 (Surrey)	7,163,622	0	7,163,622	0	0
37 (Delta)	1,641,900	1,527	1,642,358	1,069	0
38 (Richmond)	2,223,824	0	2,221,788	2,036	0
39 (Vancouver)	5,767,887	0	5,734,045	33,842	0
40 (New Westminster)	698,679	0	698,679	0	0
41 (Burnaby)	2,442,761	0	2,435,780	6,981	0
42 (Maple Ridge- Pitt Meadows)	1,468,294	0	1,468,294	0	0
43 (Coquitlam)	3,106,338	0	3,106,338	0	0
44 (North Vancouver)	1,572,137	0	1,572,137	0	0
45 (West Vancouver)	675,846	0	675,846	0	0
46 (Sunshine Coast)	427,326	0	427,326	0	0
47 (Powell River)	272,214	0	272,214	0	0
48 (Sea To Sky)	482,223	0	482,223	0	18,720
49 (Central Coast)	67,182	0	67,182	0	0
50 (Haida Gwaii)	130,554	0	130,554	0	0
51 (Boundary)	199,289	0	199,289	0	0
52 (Prince Rupert)	323,303	0	323,303	0	0
53 (Okanagan-Similkameen)	298,052	0	298,052	0	0
54 (Bulkley Valley)	287,789	0	287,789	0	0
57 (Prince George)	1,534,943	0	1,534,943	0	0
58 (Nicola-Similkameen)	315,008	0	315,008	0	0
59 (Peace River South)	535,106	1,554	531,612	5,048	0
60 (Peace River North)	670,519	0	625,004	45,515	0
61 (Greater Victoria)	1,923,524	0	1,923,524	0	0
62 (Sooke)	988,117	0	948,822	39,295	0
63 (Saanich)	813,883	0	813,883	0	0
64 (Gulf Islands)	240,236	0	240,236	0	0
67 (Okanagan Skaha)	692,197	0	692,197	0	0
68 (Nanaimo-Ladysmith)	1,487,664	0	1,487,664	0	0
69 (Qualicum)	511,619	0	511,619	0	0
70 (Alberni)	477,239	0	477,239	0	0
71 (Comox Valley)	909,503	0	909,503	0	0
72 (Campbell River)	624,425	0	624,425	0	0
73 (Kamloops/Thompson)	1,576,539	0	1,576,539	0	0
74 (Gold Trail)	256,355	0	256,355	0	0
75 (Mission)	664,091	0	664,091	0	0
78 (Fraser-Cascade)	245,890	0	245,890	0	0
79 (Cowichan Valley)	896,455	0	896,455	0	0
81 (Fort Nelson)	126,157	0	126,157	0	0
82 (Coast Mountain)	650,666	0	650,666	0	0
83 (North Okanagan-Shuswap)	788,079	0	788,079	0	0
84 (Vancouver Island West)	100,181	0	100,181	0	0
85 (Vancouver Island North)	232,986	0	232,986	0	0
87 (Stikine)	71,702	0	71,702	0	0
91 (Nechako Lakes)	645,309	0	460,954	184,355	0
92 (Nisga'a)	95,993	0	95,993	0	0
93 (Conseil Scolaire Francophone)	796,424	0	796,424	0	EDU-2014-00134 0
99 (Provincial Summary)	60,000,000	4,346	59,389,560	614,786	Page 37 18,720

Not Responsive

From: Lowther, Brett GCPE:EX
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2014 3:10 PM
To: Fayad, Deborah EDUC:EX; Dawson, Ken PSEC:EX; Foweraker, Jonathan PSEC:EX
Cc: Jah, Tim PSEC:EX; Zacharuk, Christina PSEC:EX; Mike Roberts; Fraser, Brian EDUC:EX; Abbott, Kim EDUC:EX
Subject: RE: teacher examples

Thanks much. Have what I need for now.

brett

From: Fayad, Deborah EDUC:EX
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2014 3:02 PM
To: Dawson, Ken PSEC:EX; Foweraker, Jonathan PSEC:EX
Cc: Lowther, Brett GCPE:EX; Jah, Tim PSEC:EX; Zacharuk, Christina PSEC:EX; Mike Roberts; Fraser, Brian EDUC:EX; Abbott, Kim EDUC:EX
Subject: RE: teacher examples

s. 13, s. 17

Deborah Fayad, CPA, CGA
Assistant Deputy Minister, Resource Management Division
Ministry of Education
Phone: s. 17

From: Dawson, Ken PSEC:EX
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2014 2:47 PM
To: Foweraker, Jonathan PSEC:EX
Cc: Lowther, Brett GCPE:EX; Jah, Tim PSEC:EX; Fayad, Deborah EDUC:EX; Zacharuk, Christina PSEC:EX; Mike Roberts
Subject: Re: teacher examples

So with Rike r's caveat, do you have something to work with here Brett? Please advise.

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 12, 2014, at 2:36 PM, "Foweraker, Jonathan PSEC:EX" <Jonathan.Foweraker@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

s. 13, s. 17

From: Dawson, Ken PSEC:EX
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2014 2:23 PM
To: Lowther, Brett GCPE:EX; Jah, Tim PSEC:EX; Foweraker, Jonathan PSEC:EX
Cc: Fayad, Deborah EDUC:EX; Zacharuk, Christina PSEC:EX; Mike Roberts
Subject: Re: teacher examples

Copying Tim and Jonathan. They may have some approx numbers for us.

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 12, 2014, at 2:20 PM, "Lowther, Brett GCPE:EX" <Brett.Lowther@gov.bc.ca> wrote:

Hi there – We are looking for examples for the following:

s.13, s.17

Thanks
Brett