



**CUS Advisory Committee  
Draft Minutes**

September 28, 2012  
Time: 10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

Present:  
Regrets:

Recorder: Parthee Siva (Committee Assistant)

Item	Information/Discussion	Action/Recommendation
1. Welcome	Meeting called to order by the Co-Chair, Trustee Glover @ 1005 followed by introductions of members and guests	
2. Approval of Quorum	Quorum was achieved and approved.	
3. Approval of Agenda	Moved by Trustee Kaplan; seconded by Lynn M; All in favour; carried.	
4. Overview of CUSAC	<p><b>Proposed Mandate</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. to facilitate ongoing feedback from community organizations on both the continued implementation of policy P.011, Community Use of Board Facilities and P.023 (Parent and Community Involvement - see appendices);</li> <li>b. to suggest improvements to the policy;</li> <li>c. to provide an opportunity to explore the concept of Integrated Service Delivery (ISD) with community agencies and groups;</li> <li>d. to assess the impact of CUS funding from the Ministry of Education on use of space and to make recommendations regarding that funding</li> <li>e. to make recommendations to the TDSB in order to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-increase the accessibility and use of school facilities by community groups</li> <li>-increase the concurrent use of school facilities by multiple community groups</li> <li>-increase revenues from the Province of Ontario to support CUS</li> <li>-improve and streamline the permit application process and reduce barriers to access.</li> <li>-ensure access and equity considerations re CUS</li> </ul> </li> <li>f. to consider and coordinate the work of other initiatives within TDSB as they impact on CUS: e.g. Model schools, Focus on Youth program, service integration pilot project, Continuing Education, access to pools, Toronto Lands corporation re: community use, full day kindergarten, Full Service Schools, Priority School Initiative, Facilities Partnership Agreements. This may also involve the TDSB speaking to the City of Toronto and Province in areas under their jurisdiction.</li> <li>g. To review the Recommendations of the Task Force on Community Use of Schools</li> </ul>	

Item	Information/Discussion	Action/Recommendation
	<p>(Appendix 1) adopted by the TDSB in November 2004, and the additions identified in November 2007, and determine if further action is required on outstanding items. (See attached list of adopted recommendations.)</p> <p><b>Motion:</b></p> <p><b>That the topic of the increase to the Permit Fees be referred to the Community Use of Schools Advisory Committee to address the following issues and report to the Operations and Facilities Management Committee:</b></p> <p><b>(i) Permit rates</b></p> <p><b>(ii) Categorization</b></p> <p><b>(iii) Impact on the budget on any forthcoming recommendations</b></p> <p><b>(iv) Customer service</b></p> <p><b>(v) Communications</b></p>	
5. Co-Chair Election	<p>Brian Keaney was nominated by Susan F; seconded by Morris B; all in favour; carried. No other nominations were put forward. Thus, nominations were closed. Brian Keaney of Toronto Youth Development was acclaimed as the new community co-chair</p>	
6. Permit Fee Increase	<p>Operations and Facilities Management Committee meeting took place a week ago</p> <p>In 2000, TDSB was under provincial supervision. This usually occurs when the Board does not meet its financial obligations and the Ont govt send someone to that takes over the control and the decision making of the Board. At that point permit fees were raised in order to get cost recovery for the services provided by the permit department. Subsequently, the Ont gover provided grants n oder to subsidize the fee that permit users pay to use tdsb facilities; General outline</p> <p>Tdsb decided to reduce the fees in half when they got the first grant around 3 M and another grant of 800000 was given in 2006 and the fees once again were reduced in half – ie classrooms were charged less than 1 per hr and paied caretaker 24-25 hr; to use the facility</p> <p>Clearly not covering the cost; it had a desired effect; Not only TdsB got their originals permit users that they lost when the permit fees increased during supervision, got many more other permit users coming into use the facilities but unfortunelty at the subsized rate which grew the deficit very significantly.</p>	

Item	Information/Discussion	Action/Recommendation
	<p>In 2010, had a consultant do an audit; (copies were made available for members/guests) the key message that comes out of the report (RMI was the we were running 11M deficit at the permit dept on an annual basis; tdsb has limited funding not link city where taxes can be increased; Thus, TDSB has limited budget and have to work within it. When a the Board runs on deficit on a program, it takes the money out of other programs. Thus money has to be taken from classrooms/services provided in the classroom); Needed to find ways to try to reduce the deficit; TDSB set up a permit working group which consisted of staffs of TDSB, trustees and it was chaired by Soo Wong; the group came up with number of recommendations to be phased over a period of time ; phase 1 of the recommendations was implemented in 2012 Jan 1 – where the permit fees were increased by 22%.</p> <p>The second phase was implemented in Sept 1, 2012, where tdsb re-categorize the permit users; and downsize the number of categories and clarified where users would fit in the categories. Heavily subsidized; less subsidized and; full payment categories. As a result it has had an impact on number of organizations.</p> <p>Even with these implementations of recommendations (proposed changes), it would still not cover the deficit in whole. (only some portion)</p> <p>That approval for categorization change was done in Feb;</p> <p>the Board discovered that it will be running 100 M deficit in the upcoming budget. As a part of the process lead by Vidya</p> <p>Vidya let process the board with the process of how to downsize the budget;</p> <p>The Board had to make some tough decisions, and but those tough decisions has to be made; as a result, Jan of 2013- there will be 43% increase on the permit fees;</p> <p>As a result of those deliberations , communications was sent to the community agencies; send out in Aug.</p>	
7. Reading of Motion from Operations, Facilities and Management Committee	<p>Read the motion from the OFMC; permit rates; cate Motion to the Board; moved by Tustee Glover; Seconded by Trustee Gough;</p>	
8. Response to Questions	<p>Q: The 2008 RMI report showed that the fee income and grant income were imbalanced for the expenses. How did it get so wrong to \$11M deficit in a couple of years?</p> <p>A: The last RMI report that was done in 2008 associated with the decision to reduce</p>	

Item	Information/Discussion	Action/Recommendation
	<p>Permit fees once again to deal with the additional \$800000 in revenues.</p> <p>TDSB had identified that there was increase in permit fees as result of the subsidized rates and the increase did not come in to the category; and the users kept using the subsidized rates;</p> <p>Q: How did the Board decide to re-categorize only religious groups/charities as no longer being in the same category as other charities?</p> <p>A: TDSB looked at what other Board was doing and surveys were done with 22 other Boards and to see how faith based groups were treated in terms of permit fees. 50 % charged full permit fees to faith based orgs; and other 50 % of the Boards charged free to various different subsidized rates. The TDSB reviewed this as compared to other Boards, and considered the huge deficit that it was facing and as a result of this deficit, those groups were moved to that particular category as the permits are being used on the weekends and the caretakers over time.</p> <p>Q: Religious/Faith groups are the largest stakeholders of the Board; suggestion was made to work with the board such as forming a committee.</p> <p>A: The TDSB Community Use of Schools Advisory Committee is the committee where communities can be part of the decision making process.</p> <p>The goal was to have the schools as community hub and the Board appreciates and recognizes the value and commitments from the permit groups.</p> <p>There are certain agencies/groups that are paying higher fees than the costs to provide service and that are subsidizing the low paying agencies/groups. If there are equity issues, then there must be a medium where all users must pay the same fees; trying to find accruable and equitable solutions is extremely very difficult.</p> <p>If the fees increase on the basis of religious groups and they are the Board's weekly stakeholders and they need weekly stability. Thus, a recommendation is that faith based groups be removed as a separate category/from the category.</p> <p>Q; How you arrived at the decision to have adult user groups to 3 schools/facilities and maximum 50 hrs?</p> <p>A: It was a struggle in determining local groups and businesses. There are 1000's of</p>	

Item	Information/Discussion	Action/Recommendation
	<p>permits users and the TDSB does not have the resources to go and check to ensure that permit users are not falsifying their information; was unable check auditable statements. Thus, the Board went to CUSAC for inputs; and the decision was made that the subsidized rate should go to the local groups and if you are using 3 or less facilities/schools, then you are considered a local group but if you are using more than 3 facilities/schools and more than 900 hrs, then you are not a local group; that was the judgment used to determine the categories. There are many other permit users in the same categories as the faith based groups are affected as well.</p> <p>Q: It take a big person to admitting that it was done improperly and want to correct it; it can result in net positive dollars for the DTSB but everyone has to be at the table and it has to be good faith discussions/process which has never been done in the past. The caretaker fees that in the contract for churches did not reflect the fees that care charged to the churches and it is not fair equitable when the board charge more from one group and in order to subsidize other group.</p> <p>A: caretaking is not the only cost, others include utilities, management, facility fees; but there is no premium on the caretaking fees.</p> <p>Memorandum from Ministry re: Community Use of Funding states that the Board provides priority access for Not-For-Profit Groups serving children/youth and low-income groups, in particular at-risk youth.</p> <p>Mistakes may have been made but are now under considerations by the Staffs and Trustees at the Board. But this does not imply financial subsidies. Suggestion was made to raise the rate to a median rate and eliminating all the categories is the best way to proceed (recommendation) as faith based groups is as any other local groups.</p> <p>Concern was raised that some groups are charged more than other groups to subsidize local groups who pay subsidize fees. If the church/faith groups change the way they do things, it can be categorized as local groups; because they are faith based – save families/save kids. It was also pointed out that the services that the faith based/church provides go along with ministry mandate.</p> <p>At CUSAC, your interest is looked after well and served because we are all charity. A call out for members was sent to permit users a year ago. The TOR of CUSAC would still allow for few more members. Interested members can connect with Parthee or visit <a href="http://www.tdsb.on.ca/cusac">www.tdsb.on.ca/cusac</a> for further information.</p> <p>Therefore, Trustee Glover’s motion which delays the categorical permit fee increase until Jan 1st will go through the Board on Wednesday for approval. If approved, it will give</p>	

Item	Information/Discussion	Action/Recommendation
	<p>CUSAC time to work on the recommendations. The outcome of the Board Meeting will be sent out to all the members/guests at meeting.</p>	
<p>8. Ways to Mitigate Fee Increases</p>	<p>Rick is here to help with the issues; try to speak to the impacted permit users; ie. collaborating 3 groups to use the school at the same time; thus sharing the cost; The board is looking at ways to reduces cost to the permit users; to Reach Rick, call the permit dept.  There are over 80 Steam plants in the system both in elementary and secondary schools</p> <p>Moved from gym to a smaller facility; reduced from 6hrs to 2hrs; the solutions do not match the service they provide.</p> <p>How do judge a caretaker when they file in the hrs needed to clean up the place after the permit users leave the facility;</p> <p>The charitable org when receive a grant – in the public school systems, everyone is welcomed and nobody’s faith is criticized.</p> <p>Faith based groups who does basket balls, pays the first category fee (lowest) and when they are in classroom for an hour for religious stuff, they are charged another fee under another category (higher)</p> <p>Charter of Rights and Freedom still applies regardless of the religion;</p> <p>The permit is for 5 hrs but caretaking is for 9 hrs for 3.5 hrs of use.</p> <p>The 43% increase will not balance the deficit; or breakeven</p> <p>How do you determine the priority users? Since there are 1000s of permit users, the board does not have the time to look at what each group do – the board only has the names of the org.  B13 under ministry website – guidelines</p> <p>Lack of understanding of the values that the church provides to the community</p> <p><b><i>Motion to move the motion that was passed by Trustee Glover; moved by Susan seconded by Lorna; all in favour; 1 oppose; carried;</i></b></p> <p>If the motion is approved at the meeting, the permit users will be refunded but of course</p>	

Item	Information/Discussion	Action/Recommendation
	<p>not right away; the goal is to continue issuing the permits; or will be credit it. (from Sept 1<sup>st</sup>)</p> <p>The issue is that permit holders who could not afford to pay the new fees; and if the motions gets through, the Aug fee (lower/old) fee will be charged;</p> <p>if permit users want to pull out of schools by Oct,</p> <p>Faith based groups have been discriminated; suggestion was made to have a legal rep from TDSB to see if faith based groups can be separate.</p> <p>470000 permit booking, 20000 permits; 3000 active permit holders.</p> <p><b><i>Motion that CUSAC recommends to the Board that Permit system be automated. Moved by Trustee Glover; seconded by Alison; all in favour; carried.</i></b></p>	
<p>9. Developing Recommendations for the Board of Trustees to fulfill the motion coming from OFMC.</p>	<p>Permit Rates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• subsidy is apply to all groups and all groups pay the same fee; eliminate categories</li> <li>• look at maintenance cost and ways to reduce them</li> <li>• Faith based groups be moved back to the subsidized category;</li> </ul> <p>Categorization:</p> <p>Impact.....:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All future negotiations on caretaking contracts to reduce over time Agenda item</li> </ul> <p>Customer Service:</p> <p>Communication:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Auto responders in email that the permits have been received and under consideration in a reasonable time on each and every permits</li> <li>• Move towards the electronic booking system will be more effective; as compared to the paper work that are currently in place.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>To utilize the expertise of the Community Outreach Staffs to with community groups in addressing focus of categorization..... moved by Susan’s motion – seconded</i></b></p>	

Item	Information/Discussion	Action/Recommendation
	<p><b>by Lynn; all in favour; 1 oppose; carried</b></p> <p><b>Schools don't have to put in their request until June 1<sup>st</sup>; but hardly any schools put in their reqs. With manual process, most times they are delayed. Even if permit users receive the permits and if the schools make changes, then it will be reflected and amended on the user.</b></p> <p><b>Thus, CUS recommends staffs to develop a timetable with the all the process by end of March. Schools by 1<sup>st</sup> of March, then Con Ed, FOY, and etc. *** Agenda itme</b></p> <p>Tdsb is parallel with tdsb. Best practises..... look at other boards are doing. **** Agenda itme</p> <p>Community Outreach coordinator works with PSI; in tdsb they've basically focused on increasing the permits of PSI. their expertise is in the communication.</p>	
10. Other Business	Oct 25	
11. Adjournment	Meeting adjourned @ 1232. moved by Susan; seconded by Lynn; all in favour; carried.	