



**CUS Advisory Committee  
Minutes**

November 22, 2012  
Time: 10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

**Present:** Trustee Chris Glover (Co-Chair); Brian Keaney (Co-Chair, Toronto Youth Development); Lynn Manning (Girls Guide Canada, Ontario Council); Lesley Johnston (Social Planning Toronto); Lorna Weigand (Middle Childhood Matters Coalition); Gerry Lang (Citizens for Life Long Learning); Iris Rivas (Salvation Army); Allison Boughner (Big Brothers Big Sisters of Toronto); Julian Freeman (Grace Fellowship Church); Alan Hrabinski (Scarborough Basketball Association); Njoba; Nbada (Manager, Community Use of Schools); Namita Aggarwal (Program & Budget Manager, Con.Ed); Margaret Kent (Manager, ; Kitty Leung (Facility Permitting Coordinator); John Long (TDSB Facility Services); Rick Diagle; Trustee Sam Sitoropoulos; Alli Debbie (Parent and Community Involvement); Salin John (Community Use of Schools)

**Regrets:** Trustee Howard Kaplan; Susan Fletcher (Applegrove Community Complex); Leigh Coffey (YMCA of GTA);

**Recorder:** Parthee Siva (Committee Assistant)

Item	Information/Discussion	Action/Recommendation
1. Welcome	Meeting called to order by the Co-Chairs, Trustee Glover & Brian Keaney @ 1005 followed by introductions of members and guests	
2. Approval of Quorum	Quorum was achieved and approved.	
3. Approval of Agenda	Motion to Approve the Agenda; moved by Allan H; Seconded by Judy G; all in favour; carried.	
4. Approval of Nov 8 Minutes	Motion to Move the minutes; Julian F; Seconded by Lynn M; all in favour; carried.	
5. Update from the Working Group	<p>The Working Group presented an updated Permit Fee Category from their last meeting. There have been changes to the categories, mainly the definitions.</p> <p>Type 1 – Children/Youth were classified as up to 18 yrs of age (18 and under) except for participants with disability to be under the age of 28 and under – also included LOW INCOME and RECENT IMMIGRANTS (comes from the reporting requirement from the ministry)</p> <p>If a user falls is in multiple categories, they would be classified under the most favorable category. (least rate)</p> <p>\$3.8M subsidy to be divided into 3 groups will be decided later on. If an organization cannot be defined, will they be moved to the more favorable category, or the least</p>	Send out the Permit Fee categories to the group as soon as its received from Lynn M

Item	Information/Discussion	Action/Recommendation
	<p>favorable category (not-for-profit or charitable)</p> <p>To come up with clear definition of the categories is challenging as they may overlap. It was suggested to remove “public agencies” from the definitions. (consider government agencies only)</p> <p>Point was raised to Focus on what the organization’ services are: are they serving children, youth, seniors etc.</p> <p>Always been challenging to access the Fee (charge) that an organization charges its members. There is no good solution to access the fee and depending on the fee the participants pays, the permit department can maybe evaluate a fee for that organization.</p> <p>75% residing in Toronto – This is another factor that the permit dept has difficulty accessing. Organizations have known to submit previous year’s membership list although they may or may not even show up that year. How does the permit department deal with this?</p> <p>Point was raised as follows: A not-for-profit may put on a show and sell ticket to public, how do the permit department charge that user (under which category)</p> <p>There are no ways to evaluate if a user is falsifying information to fit into the favorable category. It would be assumed that the user is honest.</p> <p>To enhance the program, an sports organization is charging a fee to each participants to pay for referees/equipments, and etc but they are classified under Type 2 although the programs they offer may fall into Type 1.</p> <p>If an organization is paying their employees, it was considered that they will not be eligible for the Type 1 fee category, ensuring that they charge no fees beyond materials and permit associated costs.</p> <p>It was suggested that paying employees enhances their program, although they may have have volunteers.</p> <p>Trying to achieve fair and workable definitions about the category is the most important thing.</p> <p>If an organization permits a gym for the entire day for a tournament, they should be</p>	

Item	Information/Discussion	Action/Recommendation
	<p>charged the commercial rate but it has been noticeable that some pay the subsidized fee and make profit.</p> <p>Permit dept will now be accessing the permit on the purposes of the services that is being offered by the organization. (ie Church providing Sunday services vs. sports)</p> <p>Concern was raised that limiting Youth to 18 is problematic, as the ministry and the school defines youth to the age of 24 and sometimes 29. Thus, it was suggested that the relevant age for the youth is 24 rather than 18. (they may fall into the other definitions such as marginalized/disable)</p> <p><u>Point was raised that all groups can be classified under 3 categories:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Charitable Organizations - with a CRA Reg #</li> <li>2. Not-For-Profit – can hold and manage assets</li> <li>3. Corporations – commercial / events</li> </ol> <p>Fundraising events are ways to recover costs for most organizations. If the purpose is for fundraising, then they would fall into the cost recovery pricing strategy.</p> <p>Concern: How does the permit office determine the tournaments/coaches clinics’ purposes in order to quality for the right rates?</p> <p>Suggestion to add “Toronto Based” entities all of the categories in order to eliminate any organizations from out of Toronto permitting Toronto schools spaces.</p> <p>Some argued that the Board is transparent and if the purpose of the services is in line with the definitions, then any organizations regardless of their origin may be allowed to use TDSB space.</p> <p>Thus, it was recommended to add “Toronto Based” for the first 3 categories; 1 Oppose (keep 75% of those residing in the City of Toronto)</p> <p>Local community group serving young children such as a group of University students providing science tutorials to students twice a week. What category will they fall into? It was suggested that the best approach for this is to have a partnership with the school principal.</p> <p>Faith Based fall in to Type 3 (Charitable) for religious purposes and their programs will fall into Type 1 or 2 depending on the purpose and program.</p>	

Item	Information/Discussion	Action/Recommendation
	<p>It was suggested to have Faith Based Youth Programs be added to the Type 1 category.</p> <p>Some argued that the religious services by Faith based group should be under Type 4.</p> <p>Regardless of who is providing the youth services, they would qualify for the Type 1 category.</p> <p>Suggestion was made to eliminate Category 3 all together.</p> <p><b><i>Motion to Eliminate Type 3 - Charitable and merge with Type 4 - Not-For-Profit category; moved by Lorna; Seconded by Allison B; 2 in favour; 9 oppose; motion not carried (failed)</i></b></p> <p>Thus far, there have not been any discussions on the \$3.8M subsidy and how it will be divided among the categories.</p>	
<p>5. Draft Recommendations to the Board</p>	<p><b><i>Motion:</i></b>  <b><i>An ombuds position be created to oversee the resolutions of permits and/or the application conflicts. Moved by Lynn M; seconded by Lesley J; 6 in favour; 1 oppose; carried.</i></b></p> <p>Creating an ombudsperson will have cost involved and it has be decided where that will come from. Thus, the ombudsperson must be created as part of the Board and part of his/her mandate would be resolving permit fees issues.</p> <p><b><i>Motion to reopen the recommendation; moved by Lesley J; moved by Lynn M;</i></b></p> <p><i>It was recommended to create an Ombudsperson for the Board.</i></p> <p><b><i>CUSAC recommends the Board create an ombudsperson position and if such a position is created, then one of his/her duties would bes to oversee the resolution of Community Use of Schools; all in favour; carried.</i></b></p> <p>Motion to extend the meeting to another 15 min; moved by Lorna W; seconded by Judy G; all in favour; carried.</p> <p>It was suggested that the \$3.8 M Subsidy be divided 75% 50% 25% respectively for Type 1, 2, 3 categories.</p>	

Item	Information/Discussion	Action/Recommendation
	<p>Another suggestion was made that the Board set aside an amount annually to the marginalized groups (ie \$20,000)</p> <p>Please note that the <i>Categories changes have been delayed till Sept 2013</i>. This Approved at last night's Board Meeting.</p> <p>Discussion will be continued at the next Working Group Meeting scheduled for Dec 6 and will be shared with the Committee on Dec 13<sup>th</sup> Meeting.</p>	
7. Other Business	CUSAC Extends its wishes to Kitty Leung on being the recipient of the TDSB Award of Excellence.	
8. Next Meeting Date	<p>Dec 6 – Working Group Meeting</p> <p>Dec 13 – Location TBD</p>	
9. Adjournment	Motion to adjourn @ 1232; moved by Lesley J; seconded by Gerry L; all in favour; meeting adjourned.	