

Educational Governance Advisory Panel Review

PUBLIC CONSULTATION SURVEY RESULTS AND FEEDBACK

The following are the views and opinions submitted via letters to the consultation email. The comments appear verbatim with only minimal editing of information such as names, phone numbers, email addresses, profanities, defamatory statements, etc.

Town of Pense
PO Box 125 Pense, SK S0G 3W0
(P) 306.345.2332 (F) 306.345.2340
Email: townofpense@sasktel.net
www.pense.ca

January 19, 2017

K-12 Education Governance Review Advisory Panel,

Upon the review of the Educational Governance Review Report we have concerns on how this proposed change will affect our community.

While we agree and support maintaining and improving the quality of education being offered to all students equally and fairly, we also have concerns.

We do not support the proposal of having any appointed Board of Education members versus having our own locally elected boards. Being able to have a local voice is very important to rural communities.

We do not understand how a change in governance or by amalgamating school divisions can be a financial gain or be in the best interest of the students. Our school allows accessible education to the community; it contributes to the exceptional quality of life for residents, and maintains our competitiveness as a place to invest. Closing our school would immediately dismantle our community economically and socially.

We also have our concerns how this will affect our community long term. Concerns for the future of our school, which is so closely tied to our identity as a community, is paramount during these discussions and any changes that may come. Our school is the foundation for us to retain residents and grow and provides us with our compelling future to continue to do so. Our school in town truly allows current and future residents to "Come Grow With Us."

We fully support the School Community Council and the feedback provided by them to you. We look forward to hearing how you will support our school remaining open in town amongst the many proposed changes outlined in the report.

Regards,

Pense Town Council

January 21, 2016

Via Email: minister.edu@gov.sk.ca

k12govconsultations@gov.sk.ca

Saskatchewan Ministry of Education

Hon. Don Morgan, Minister

#2405 Legislative Drive

Regina, SK

S4S 0B3

Dear Minister Morgan,

RE: Educational Governance Review Report

My family and I have been residents of Lloydminster, AB since the fall of 2004. We were offered a relocation to Lloydminster in August 2004 from Grande Prairie, AB. With a young family of three children, our oldest son with a _____ my wife and I travelled to Lloydminster to evaluate the move for our family. During that visit we were able to speak with the Deputy Director, Micheal Diachuk, of the Lloydminster Public School Division(LPSD). That visit and the information shared by Micheal on the unique bi-provincial system offered by LPSD was the decision trigger to select Lloydminster as the choice of two relocation options offered at the time.

That decision was one of the best decisions we have made. As of June of this year, all three of my children will have graduated from high school in LPSD. My _____ struggled previously as a result of bullying, lack of educational evaluation, resources and overall success from grade K-5 in both BC and Alberta. His story is a success in large part from the systems and supports of LPSD. He is now a working as a _____ lives in Lloydminster, SK and has started a family of his own. My other two children have progressed through LPSD with high academic results. They have and will pressure post secondary education and contribute to future prosperity of the city and province.

LPSD is a unique Public School Board being the only bi-provincial operated system in the province. The local Lloydminster Charter supports LPSD to deliver seamless educational services to all student of Lloydminster fairly and equally regardless of which province of Lloydminster they are located in. This success has developed over its 84 year history. My

family is a recipient of its success. I fear changes to LPSD will jeopardize future success for others.

My goal in writing to you personally and sending copy to the provincial feedback email, is to ask that you consider this unique situation carefully. LPSD is a district with educational success both with my family personally and is at the top of the scale provincially in the success of its students. There are four options your department is considering. The goal of which have not been clearly communicated. I would like to see a response from you on why these changes are required. I am going to suggest that you consider one of two that I propose:

1. Create an exemption for LPSD to operate “as is” given its bi-provincial status and the 84 years of effort completed to foster the success it has seen.
2. Restructuring the School Divisions to a minimum of 14. Retain LPSD intact and incorporate surrounding SK communities carefully into LPSD.

Alternatively, I ask that you consider these changes carefully or seek alternate methods to achieve your desired results. For my perspective over the last 12 years living in Lloydminster, education is one of the cornerstones of success that has brought Saskatchewan the prosperity it current enjoys.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature consisting of two slanted, parallel lines.

CC: Premier Brad Wall
MLA Colleen Young
AB MLA Richard Starke



R.M. of Dufferin No. 190
Box 67
Bethune, Sask.
S0G 0H0

Telephone: (306) 638-3112
Fax: (306) 638-3102
Email: 190@sasktel.net

January 19, 2017

K-12 Education Governance Review Advisory Panel
Ministry of Education
Regina, Saskatchewan.

Dear Sir/Madam:

RE: Educational Governance Review Report

The Council of the Village of Bethune submits the following comments with regards to the Educational Governance Review Report and the proposed School Division consolidation recommendations contained therein:

- The Council does not support any of the three models presented in the report and feel it is the residents of the Village of Bethune to remain a part of Prairie Valley School Division
- There is unanimous support to maintain and improve the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP).
- As the sector of local government very close to residents of this Province, the Council feels it is imperative that school boards remain an elected entity and further would not support the concept of an appointed Board of Education.
- Current Prairie Valley School Division board members are very visible in our schools and community. Provincially appointed board members will not be as accessible, nor will they know or listen to rural communities' needs.
- Previous history of consolidation of administration and governance, ie Health District Amalgamation, has proven that there are very little or no tangible savings to be found in administration/governance consolidations and in the long term may be more expensive.
- The Council is sincerely concerned how any proposed changes may impact the current rural school closure threshold. Educational facilities in rural communities are key factors in having healthy vibrant communities that are growing and expanding. The potential changes and potential closing of schools will negatively impact rural communities in Saskatchewan.
- Neighboring community schools are full or near capacity, proposed changes may require large capital investment if school closures and increased busing of students is contemplated. As such the Council feels it is in the students best interests to be part of a smaller school, than being in overcrowded classrooms in larger centers.
- Smaller, yet efficient rural community schools are an enticement to people wanting to relocate to rural communities.



*R.M. of Dufferin No. 190
Box 67
Bethune, Sask.
S0G 0H0*

*Telephone: (306) 638-3112
Fax: (306) 638-3102
Email: 190@sasktel.net*

The Council respectfully requests that further consultation be considered with numerous other stakeholders, including SSBA, SASBO, SUMA and SARM.

Yours truly,

Administrator



January 19, 2017

K-12 Education Governance Review Advisory Panel
Ministry of Education
Regina, Saskatchewan.

Dear Sir/Madam:

RE: Educational Governance Review Report

The Council of the Village of Bethune submits the following comments with regards to the Educational Governance Review Report and the proposed School Division consolidation recommendations contained therein:

- The Council does not support any of the three models presented in the report and feel it is the residents of the Village of Bethune to remain a part of Prairie Valley School Division
- There is unanimous support to maintain and improve the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP).
- As the sector of local government very close to residents of this Province, the Council feels it is imperative that school boards remain an elected entity and further would not support the concept of an appointed Board of Education.
- Current Prairie Valley School Division board members are very visible in our schools and community. Provincially appointed board members will not be as accessible, nor will they know or listen to rural communities' needs.
- Previous history of consolidation of administration and governance, ie Health District Amalgamation, has proven that there are very little or no tangible savings to be found in administration/governance consolidations and in the long term may be more expensive.
- The Council is sincerely concerned how any proposed changes may impact the current rural school closure threshold. Educational facilities in rural communities are key factors in having healthy vibrant communities that are growing and expanding. The potential changes and potential closing of schools will negatively impact rural communities in Saskatchewan.
- Neighboring community schools are full or near capacity, proposed changes may require large capital investment if school closures and increased busing of students is contemplated. As such the Council feels it is in the students best interests to be part of a smaller school, than being in overcrowded classrooms in larger centers.
- Smaller, yet efficient rural community schools are an enticement to people wanting to relocate to rural communities.

Village of Bethune
507 Main Street, Bethune
Box 209, Saskatchewan, S0G 0H0
Phone: 1.306.638.3188 Fax: 1.306.638.3102
Website: <http://www.villageofbethune.com>
Email: villageofbethune@sasktel.net



The Council respectfully requests that further consultation be considered with numerous other stakeholders, including SSBA, SASBO, SUMA and SARM.

Yours truly, _____

Village of Bethune
507 Main Street, Bethune
Box 209, Saskatchewan, S0G 0H0
Phone: 1.306.638.3188 Fax: 1.306.638.3102
Website: <http://www.villageofbethune.com>
Email: villageofbethune@sasktel.net



TOWN OF MILESTONE

PO BOX 74 ~ 105 MAIN STREET ~ MILESTONE, SASKATCHEWAN ~ S0G 3L0

Phone 306-436-2130 ~ Fax 306-436-2051



e-mail: milcal@sasktel.net

Web Site: www.milestonesk.ca

To Premier Brad Wall, Elected Officials and the Education Consultative Committee,

I am writing with concern over the many proposed changes suggested by Mr. Dan Perrins in his commissioned report, Educational Governance Review Report. While I respect that the Provincial Government, Ministry of Education, along with the boards and trustees have some difficult decisions ahead I do not believe that any of Mr. Perrins' options are serving our communities in their best interest. As an elected official I myself, I recognize that decision making is not always easy. You can never satisfy one hundred percent of the public. However, we are elected to represent what is best for the majority. In my municipality I believe I speak for the majority in stating that none of Mr. Perrins' recommendations fair well for our public voice. I feel it will be a loss of voice in all of our smaller rural communities like my Village of Mclean.

Ten short years ago we saw a major restructuring of divisions by the Ministry of Education. Since that time we, as a community, have worked closely with Prairie Valley School District to establish a great working relationship with both our elected trustees and all employees within PVSD's administration. We have seen positive population growth and enrollment at Milestone School, our services within the school become more balanced, and the students in PVSD far surpassing provincial averages. Any further loss in numbers of districts or loss of elected officials could and would have large negative impact on these relationships and results.

I want you to know that we back the views taken by Prairie Valley School Division and our Saskatchewan School

Boards. I would ask that you take this very strong and clear message back to all members of our legislature.

We need to keep our school boards locally elected. We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. We do not support further amalgamations.

We do not support changes to our subdivision boundaries.

Thank you in advance for helping bring our voice to the legislature. Your support for our community is greatly appreciated!

Sincerely,

Jeff Brown
Mayor, Town of Milestone

January 17, 2017

Hon. Brad Wall
233 Central Ave. N
Swift Current, SK
S9H 0L3
bradwallmla@sasktel.net

Dear Honorary Brad Wall:

I understand changes are being considered in our education system. As the Premier of our province, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community.

Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support the ***North East School Division*** and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature:

1. We need to keep our school boards locally elected; and,
2. We need to keep decisions close to our communities.

Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

Sincerely,



January 22, 2017

Dear Government of Saskatchewan and Government of Alberta,

After attending the Lloydminster Public School Division consultation I am writing to inform you that not one of the amalgamation options is acceptable for Lloydminster. The only option for Lloydminster is to leave our community status quo. We are a very unique community who receives financial support from both the Saskatchewan and Alberta governments. The thought of losing our local voice (locally elected school board) and the possibility of an appointed board is unacceptable. This would not allow for the best interests of our children and students of Lloydminster Public School Division. As an Alberta resident this would allow me no ability to voice my concern about my child's education. This is an infringement on my democratic rights.

Moving supports away from over 4,000 students is in no way going to have a positive influence on student learning. A few years back we needed some support in regards to a decision made for our son with autism. Within hours of request we had a meeting with all of his student services team, ourselves as parents and central office staff to make a quick resolution. Unfortunately if we move to a regional model the office staff will not be able to help resolve situations quickly which will increase stress for all members of a child's support team.

The Saskatchewan government's move to change the way education is governed in Saskatchewan is short sighted and with very little to no cost savings. I can see the changes affecting students in the ways of less time with supports including speech and language pathologists,

occupational therapists, behaviour specialist as they will be spending more time driving than in direct therapies with children. There will be less time to spend with teachers, educational assistants and service support teams to help them better understand the needs of their students. The lack of supports will have a direct effect on student literacy and numeracy rates. We all know that until the basic building blocks of a child's learning are strong they are unable to reach their full potential. With fewer services we will not be able to make the significant impact in children's lives that we currently are able to. The lack of services offered in a student's early years will mean more services need in their later years. Data shows us that students who are not supported during their Pre-K to Grade 12 with a strong education often need social assistance, increased reliance on or health system due to drug and alcohol dependence in their later years. An education is one of the most important tools we have available to all students to help them avoid later years of being a pressure on our system. Please Saskatchewan Government you need to consider how these changes would be disastrous for students in the Lloydminster and in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Yours in Public Education,

To the Honorable Mr. Morgan, & Honorable Mr. Cox and the Governance Review Panel

Thank you for the opportunity to add my thoughts to the discussion regarding the proposed reorganization of the school division boundaries.

As a panel, and as cabinet members, you are tasked with gathering the facts and determining the truth/evidence in the information you are provided. We know it is a difficult position you have in trying to represent all of the constituents of the province who have diverse opinions regarding what is best for the students of Saskatchewan.

You may be considering all the things my friends, colleagues and I have been talking about lately but....maybe notso as part of that true "open debate"...could you add these thoughts to your discussion? I am a speech-language pathologist and work with students on a daily basis. My role ties directly to social and academic success in schools.... I may have another slant for you....

Motivation for Change – It is not clear to the public exactly why changes are being initiated at this time.

The timing appears to be associated to with the recent budget deficits. If that is so....then what exactly would the cost savings be? The expense of amalgamating to most of us cancels out any cost benefits. Are you trying to eliminate the higher paid employees at the senior management level, redundancies in staff?, positions that have no measured outcomes?, out-of-scope positions? Higher salaried positions? Could you share with the public those discussions? What are the savings? What are costs? Our Education system must have financial parameters of course but huge decisions such as governance should not be made for financial reasons....there's far too much at stake....

Time – It seems the timeline to gather, review and debate all the relevant data collected is extremely limited and a decision regarding the best division boundaries may not be possible in the timeframe you have allotted. True democracy values freedom of speech and opinions and although it may not always be efficient, I and many of my colleagues don't want you to give up that principle for the sake of making a quick financial decision. I trust, as you're sitting at the table, you will take the time or insist on the time to review all the information carefully.

Alternate Income - Savings in healthcare and education of course would be the most obvious spots to look at cutting services however because we are not privy to the government's thoughts on revenues then have you considered establishing Charitable organizations/foundations in education as the government has had to do in the past with healthcare to assist in shoring up the revenues for capital expenditures? What about going back to a system that would allow mill rate hikes when faced with situations like this? Have you considered an overall PST increase? I lived in South Carolina for a period of time and ALL of the revenues for gambling at that time went to education!!!! Now that might solve a few problems!!! SaskEd Lottery tickets....Not possible you say? Other governments have done it.... !! Ireland did!

Improving Student Outcomes - If the motivation is to improve student outcomes what would those be? What is the evidence and how are you determining changes in governance would improve student outcomes? It is related to reading? Overall academics? Is there a model of excellence in a certain division you are trying to replicate and want to create more standardization across the province?

In collaborating with many of my colleagues many of us have other opinions as to improving outcomes for students. Here are a few:

Poverty: From my own perspective poverty and not culture, race or ethnicity has the most devastating effects on the outcomes for students and the research supports that. Children who live in poverty experience stress and trauma that can actually lead to physical changes in brain chemicals and functioning.

Readiness to Learn: Factors such as health, environment, experience, emotional regulation, sensory regulation, attention, distractibility and impulsivity preclude many children from successful social and educational achievement. A proven critical factor in working with students living in poverty is a link to hearing loss. We need comprehensive screening and healthcare to ensure our children are “ready to learn”

Frequency/Intensity of intervention – attendance – Learning is actually the making of neurological pathways in the brain. Neurons that “fire together – wire together”if children don’t have the experience, exposure, practice often enough.... Permanent learning just can’t occur. At risk Kindergarten students coming to school daily have greater outcomes than those who don’t...but not all have access in the system

Early Intervention: Learning can absolutely happen at any age with anyone but to have the most outcome and to have the most impact with the least amount of dollars....the earlier the better.... Research supports this.... Children with medically identified symptoms such as autism, Down’s syndrome, cerebral palsy have no access to specialized programs. ... They don’t qualify for the provincial Pre-K programs for “at risk” students

Loss of Leadership – School divisions across Saskatchewan chose (or we hope chose!) the best and brightest for leadership roles to do what you are tasked to do – to take all the information given to them and make the best decisions with the resources they have to benefit students in as many capacities as they can. Beyond that, earning and building trusting respectful relationships with each other and with each of the schools is developmental and requires a huge time commitment to come to the point efficient communication and effectiveness is achieved. How have you measured the cost of losing these individuals? If the larger communities are chosen to have the division offices what does that mean for smaller communities such as North Battleford? These leaders have personal relationships with nearly all of the staff they work with because the numbers allow it...We know which student we are talking aboutWe often know the family ...We know this can’t be true with larger divisions. Are you considering how this type of de-personalization will affect students and families....especially for rural areas? How far will someone like me drive? (I already visit 3 schools that are more than a 90 minute commute one way....) Will I have to move to a larger centre? If all of the Central Office personelle in the smaller centers either lose their jobs or have to move the new division centres what does that loss look like for those smaller communities. Have you factored in those social costs? The loss of our income taxes?

I also feel losing leadership through amalgamation loses diversity of thought and distribution of power...The larger you make the school divisions the fewer people have a voice and the less democratic it becomes. I’m not sure the diversity between our current school divisions is always capitalized on... Have you considered greater outcomes might be achieved through greater inter-communication between the school divisions versus going through the amalgamation effort? Who has the most

outcomes in reading? In attendance? In parent involvement? How are they achieving that? Which schools? Which programs? What outcomes are they achieving across the border with the same types of populations? What are they using? How are they measuring?

Loss of Community Input – Although we have diversified in recent years, our economy continues to have an agricultural basis. Farming and rural life, (many of us hope) will remain central to our lives. Living Sky is one of those divisions.... Increasing the school division sizes will reduce the number of elected board members and again shift the power structure. Rural students and their families will have less representation. This is one of the most impacting changes that will occur. We won't be able to call up our local board member but rather it will be someone who doesn't live in the community, know the school, or know the teachers. Democracy is only as good as the ability to have the collective voice heard. We all need to have a voice. The larger government systems become the greater the risk for authoritative control. "Head office says we do it this way" "we're using this model""We're using this assessment"We're hoping you will consider this in your debates....Does the ministry of education need more control? Why?

Appointed boards will only exaggerate this....Why do all the board members have to have the same political view....What is the benefit to students? Again....why can't the general public choose the person they want to represent them?

Government as a Representative- You are my representatives....and thus you speak for me too....and although many think these calls for public input are for naught, that you have an agenda already and likely made your decision long ago and the process is just an obligatory must....I am hoping not....I am still optimistic that you will read what I and others have to say and will weigh the information carefully. We don't all have to agree with the ideas that some from the government propose....The trouble is government becoming increasingly closed....everything happens behind closed doors....afraid of "leaks" ...Where's that great healthy public debate???.... You put your opinion out there and I'll put mine.....Let's bring our evidence.....Let's talk about it....You convince me!.....Or maybe I'll convince you!

Please consider my views when you are sitting at the debate table....We need you to stand up for democracy and take the time to hear us....

January 20, 2017

Mr. Fred Bradshaw
Carrot River Valley MLA
PO Box 969
Carrot River, SK
SOE OLO
fbradshaw.mla@sasktel.net

Dear MLA Fred Bradshaw:

We understand changes are being considered in our education system. As the MLA who represents our area, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community.

Education belongs to community and we want you to know that we support the *North East School Division* and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature:

1. We need to keep our school boards locally elected;
2. We need to keep decisions close to our communities.

Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

Sincerely,

January 23, 2017

To the Ministry of Education:

RE: Education Governance Review

The following is my expression of disappointment with the Saskatchewan Government and the Ministry of Education latest initiative: What system of governance and administration is needed in Saskatchewan's K-12 education sector to achieve the outcomes established by Saskatchewan's Plan for Growth and the Education Sector Strategic Plan?

At present, the process taken to arrive at this point are unacceptable:

Unacceptable for the following reasons:

- Report was compiled in less than a month
- Public consultation period less than 1 month and over a holiday season
- Very little information has been shared with the public by the Government or Ministry of Education
- Period of time between closing of public consultation and decision

This whole structure change requires due diligence to detail in many areas. The time above and a 33-page report does not represent that process.

Options for Model choices listed in the report are unacceptable for Lloydminster for the following reasons:

- Does not ensure that students receive equitable service regardless of which province they live in or which school they attend
- Effects the City of Lloydminster municipal levy which is imbedded in the Lloydminster Charter
- Due to the restrictions within the Charter, it would make it difficult to provide a seamless delivery of service across an expanded division.

Options of Elected Boards vs Appointed Boards are unacceptable:

- Takes away the representation of the knowledge and voice of our local individuals who live here, work here and know what is best for the students in our community
- Takes away the component of the community being able to keep their Board Members accountable and vested in the decisions they are making on behalf of our students

Did the Government and the Ministry of Education not learn anything about Lloydminster during the last amalgamation process in 2012? It appears not!

Is this really about efficient and effective governance? It leaves one to wonder.

If the Ministry of Education is really committed to the success and well-being of all Saskatchewan, learners and the enhancement of literacy for all Saskatchewan people they need to leave Lloydminster Public School Division as it is today.

Yours truly:

Cc: Saskatchewan MLA Colleen Young

Cc: Alberta MLA Richard Starke



Premier of Saskatchewan

Legislative Building
Regina Canada S4S 0B3

January 18, 2017

Dear _____ :

Thank you for your email. I appreciate receiving your input regarding changes to our education system.

As you may know, Dan Perrins was appointed to lead the work on a Kindergarten to Grade 12 educational governance review. Mr. Perrins has now submitted his report presenting three main education governance structure options for consideration.

On December 21, 2016, a six-person Advisory Panel was announced to lead consultations with the education sector and the public on the presented governance options and implementation implications. The panel will engage in face-to-face meetings with stakeholder organizations throughout January and will also be informed by an online engagement process.

Members of the public are invited to share their thoughts and comments on Dan Perrins' report by emailing K12govconsultations@gov.sk.ca or through the online submission form at: www.saskatchewan.ca/government/public-consultations/share-your-thoughts-on-the-k-12-education-governance-review.

This submission process will be open until January 23, 2017, and the panel will present their findings to the Minister of Education in February.

Again, thank you for taking the time to write.

Brad Wall
Premier

cc Honourable Don Morgan, Q.C.
Minister of Education

January 22, 2017

Dear Government of Saskatchewan and Government of Alberta

After attending the Lloydminster Public School Division, public consultation I feel confident in sharing my view of how all proposed options of amalgamation are not effective for the students of Lloydminster. Living in Lloydminster we are dealt with unique and diverse interprovincial issues. As a parent of 2 children in the Public Division, we as parents have the responsibility to advocate for the needs of our children. A division with an appointed board is not an ethical option.

My family and I live on the Alberta side of Lloydminster. With the responsibilities of being an adult and protecting our freedom of speech that we have been granted in this great country, I am a contributing member of society as we keep our taxes paid and vote in elections. As an Alberta resident I have absolutely NO say in the Saskatchewan government. If Saskatchewan goes to appointed school boards I have NO say in electing the governance that is making decisions on the most important thing in my life, MY KIDS and their education.

I feel as though my hands are tied and my freedom of speech as a Canadian has been removed. I now understand what a dictatorship feels like as I feel the Saskatchewan government is making the decision for what my kid's future will look like, and I had NO say in electing them.

Please choose to continue to keep elected governance local in the City of Lloydminster.

Yours Truly,

Dear MLA,

As someone who attended and completed my elementary and middle school education at Wymark School, I feel it is very important that I write to you today. This school and community are very dear to me, as I said I attended Wymark School as well as my sister and both of my parents. My one grandfather was the _____ for many years and my other grandfather was _____

I would hate to see anything happen to this school as now I am hopeful my children can attend as well, in the next years. The property that my husband and I own is just north of Wymark and the reason it was purchased - mainly - was so that our 2 children would be able to attend that school with only a very short bus ride.

I feel that having my young children spend up to 2 or more hours a day on a bus would not be conducive to good education. Going to Wymark School, my parents had a good and close relationship to my teachers, and I am very sure that this would not happen if my children were educated in a larger community away from our home community. Also, for myself, being able to participate in many school sports and drama

Within Wymark School gave me a large sense of pride. I was also able to join in noon hour intramural sports and activities. I do know that in a large school setting, only the best (or better) athletes get chosen for the team and only the more gifted students get chosen for Drama. There is no room for all students to participate. When our children decide to participate in such things, it would also be nice to be able to drive and pick them up afterwards within minutes rather than hours.

I believe that our locally elected School Board plays a vital role in our communities - our needs and concerns are able to be heard at a local level.

The board is also able show how they are part of the local community - they are a direct link between the wishes and desires of our villages, hamlets and RM's.

They also have a very large understanding of the needs and interests in the communities they are elected to represent.

There has yet to be a solid case put forth by your administration to prove that the removal of this local governance by a Transformational Change to centralized control will serve the greater need of the students and their families

of Southwest Saskatchewan.
I would like to leave off with a few very important notes and points:

- Smaller class sizes in smaller schools allows for a more personal relationship between the students, teachers and parents. Growing up in Wymark and Wymark school gave me a sense of belonging and my children need to feel that as well. The school was like it's own little family to me where everyone knew everyone and grew together.
- Because of my prior comment, there is more opportunity for one on one time with the students and teachers. With smaller class sizes, the teachers are able to help students more compared to larger centers & classrooms. This is proven that the smaller class sizes will promote more student success and they will feel confident in their class.
- Within the community, the majority of students have a short bus ride to school. It is not good for anyone - let alone young students with growing minds - to be stuck on a long commute.
- As I mentioned before, being in a small town school, students have the opportunity of playing on all sports teams (if they wish). In a

bigger city, this is far from true. Only the most athletic kids get chosen to play due to the high numbers. Many kids are missing out on so many opportunities.

My hope is that any decision made in regards to amalgamation ensures that our small rural school, even those close to larger centres, have a strong voice. I hope that the government of Saskatchewan respects our current school divisions in terms of borders, size and local governance structure to ensure that our current - and future - students are not harmed by ideological decisions.

Respectfully and Sincerely,
Local and Proud Resident in the R.M.:

January 18, 2017

Dear Governance Review Panel,

In response to the 'Educational Governance Review Report', our School Community Council met today to discuss their concerns regarding the report. We had the opportunity to pose questions and try to understand the possible changes that will be occurring. The following points were established concerns that we have:

- Strong concern for First Nations and Metis Education (maintaining the programs and supports in place)
- The importance that support staff bring to meeting student learning needs (Educational Assistants, Cultural Worker, School Counsellor, Community Liaisons, etc.)
- The current programming and support in provincial schools (we have families driving students in from reserves to receive the best for their children)
- We are worried about class sizes increasing to reduce the number of teachers on staff to save money on wages
- The Quality of Education could be affected (We know the needs of our students and all have an invested interest in meeting those needs)
- Teaching Individual Students (it is not as easy as teaching a class – we are teaching 24 individuals and meeting each child's need)
- Unique Demographics – (blanket decisions cannot be made, they need to take into account the specific needs of the school community)
- Children can learn with the proper programming (we have worked hard to find the right people that believe this and do what is necessary to ensure learning)
- Local representation from elected boards (they have invested interest in our community and the people that they serve)
- has developed a foundation that has created students that have an identity and believe in themselves to transition to high school (worried changes will affect this foundation and identity)
- Taking the 'love' away from the system (creating an institutionalized model rather than that deep caring model that connects with local concerns)
- This is starting to sound/look like the federal type system of the reserve education that appears to be failing students
- Trying to keep our students out of trouble (programming is in place to provide students with organized opportunities to give them positive options rather than on the streets or in trouble)
- Unaware of Changes, why they are needed and how it is being pushed through.
- Pride in our school and what we do (how will that be maintained and shared in a different system)

- Upset with the report and how it was presented (for some, today was the first time they were aware of the report, the deadline for submissions for public response is very quick)
- If a decision has already been made it needs to be shared (belief by some that everything has been decided and that all decisions have been calculated and planned with no concern of public opinion)
- Shaping our kids (are we meeting academic, social, and wellness needs to create the best people and leaders of tomorrow).

The stories shared at today's meeting of why our families choose and are proud of _____ school brought tears to our members. We believe in our students, our children, everyone wants to see each child flourish and be successful. The proposed changes to Educational Governance is creating anxiety amongst our school community council. It is our hope that any decisions made will protect and do what is best for students.

We are open to further discuss or answer any questions you may have regarding our concerns. Please feel free to contact us at any time.

Sincerely,

School Community Council

Submission to K-12 Education Governance Review Advisory Panel

Parents of students attending Saskatoon Public Schools

January 23, 2017

As parents of students who attend Saskatoon Public Schools schools and as City of Saskatoon taxpayers whose property tax bill funds education, we have a vested interest in the future of education sector governance and the role of local school boards in providing connected, responsible leadership, not only in our own school division but also those across the province.

Throughout Saskatchewan's history, education governance has been rightly considered to be a matter of local jurisdiction because of the importance that education plays in responding to and meeting the unique needs and challenges of individual communities. Elected boards are accountable to the communities they serve and not just at election time every four years. They are not distant entities; they are people who are accessible to parents and ratepayers at board meetings, through school community councils and by being directly connected to the individual schools they represent. The work of school board trustees work is done, at least by the best examples of them, without the filter of partisan politics.

Education is an investment that all of us as a society, not just parents, are making in children and youth and in the future of our community as a whole. With local taxpayers picking up 50 per cent or more of the bill for education they are the ones who must choose the trustees who will represent their investment in education and they must be able to hold those trustees directly accountable for addressing local needs in terms of facilities, programming, strategic direction and educational leadership. This is what our system of democracy demands.

The provincial government is not elected to be locally responsible for education. It is meant to be a guiding entity to provide direction, goals, and support so communities are able to create and build the education system that best responds to local needs. The government's removal of each school board's ability to set a mill rate that could be used to respond to local needs has already undermined board autonomy and direct responsibility to its electors. It has left boards subject to the fiscal and policy dictates of central government and has removed funding flexibility in recent years where boards and educators in many areas have worked mightily to address the challenges faced by an increasing school enrollment, both through population growth and immigration.

A further incursion into local jurisdiction by removing the elected boards themselves through either consolidation or the appointment of trustees would eliminate local voice and responsiveness to local needs. It would reduce the education of our children – arguably society's most significant responsibility – to little more than another removed outpost of government bureaucracy. Trustees appointed by the province would make boards of education less accessible and less accountable to the public and children they are supposed to serve, much in the same way that health region boards comprised of like-minded appointed individuals muted direct public voice and debate. Now those same health boards are being rolled up into an even more concentrated and opaque structure that further distances itself from public scrutiny and input. Our fear is that this same, ill-defined “transformational change” will have the same effect on public education in our province.

School boards and divisions have been responsible and responsive in the years since the last round of board amalgamations. With just 28 public boards across a broad range of communities there has emerged a reasonable balance between the local government and representation and the need for efficiency of operation. The current boards are representative of their communities, whether it is a large urban board such as Saskatoon Public or those that represent smaller urban and rural communities with shared interests. In terms of policy, the provincial government is already capable of directing boards and setting goals through the Education Strategic Sector Plan and the boards have been responsive to that direction. Amalgamation or concentration of governance into one entity will not provide greater momentum, it will only create disconnect and widen a chasm between the governance and administration level and the school-based educators and staff that are tasked with achieving these goals.

We would acknowledge, as individual school boards and the Saskatchewan School Boards Association have already done, that there are opportunities worth exploring to assist in greater co-ordination between boards in areas such as purchasing, transportation, etc. but those kind of efficiencies are things that can be accomplished without the loss of local representation.

The province does not have a mandate from taxpayers and school communities from these communities for further consolidation or the removal of duly elected boards and the replacement with appointed members. As a province, we do not consolidate neighbouring towns or cities simply to create efficiencies and then appoint city councillors as an expedient measure, nor is there any interest in finding governance savings by amalgamating the hundreds of rural municipalities. And, certainly, any notion that fewer legislative constituencies and appointed MLAs would be a great cost saving for taxpayers would be rejected as foolish.

So why, therefore, are school boards, a long-standing component of local democracy and public voice in Saskatchewan, somehow considered less valuable than municipal or provincial governance? If a local representation is required to run our towns, cities and province, then certainly that local voice must also be a part of fulfilling our responsibility as a society to educate our youth and communities. The lack of explanation for the reasons behind “transformational change” in education and the rushed process of the Educational Governance Review Report and short consultation period makes the whole process appear driven more by politics and a need for control than for what will benefit schools and students.

The report illustrates both potential benefits and challenges of change to the education sector in each of the three suggested models. In balance, while we can understand the reasoning behind many of the touted “benefit” outcomes, we feel the challenges that the report illustrates — alongside the absence of any notion just how many efficiencies could be found— outweigh potential benefits of radical change to education governance. Change as it is proposed in the report, and which appears to be supported by the provincial government, has the potential to create great upheaval in Saskatchewan education, to silence local voice and representation and, ultimately, to fail to provide direct benefits to the students to which the public education system must have as its first priority.

January 20, 2017

Honourable Don Morgan
Minister of Education
Room 361, Legislative Building, 2405 Legislative Drive
Regina, SK S4S 0B3
minister.edu@gov.sk.ca

Dear Minister,

I am writing in regards to the Education Governance Review and the proposed restructuring options for the Saskatchewan public school boards. After reading the lengthy Don Perrins' Report, concerns are raised.

My first concern is the loss of the local voice advocating for our children, their teachers, and the support staff for our rural schools. I fear that a smaller, appointed board cannot possibly understand the needs of our individual schools. I also fear an "out of sight, out of mind" approach by our appointed representatives.

Secondly, an appointed board that answers to the government will be encouraged to support capitalistic government interests above the needs of our children. This is distressing as a parent who can see that our education system is already grossly underfunded. With an amalgamation, not only will we be underfunded but we will lose the voice that only elected local representatives can give us.

Lastly, I am wondering what the cost savings of this amalgamation would be, and how those extra funds would be allocated? There is a lack of information in this regard. The data put out to demonstrate the positives of the changes is not sufficient, which leads me to believe that it is not to our benefit.

I implore you to listen to the parents, teachers and support staff that **do not** support the proposed public school board restructuring. Those of us on the front lines of public education know that the proposed changes are not in the best interest of our children. Unfortunately, our teachers and support staff have been muzzled when it comes to speaking out for our children's educational interests, but as a parent, I will always advocate for them.

Sincerely,

A concerned parent

Education Governance Review Panel Members & Minister Morgan,

The recently released Educational Governance Review Report by Dan Perrins (the Perrins Report) contains four different/alternate governance options for education in Saskatchewan and goes so far as to question whether school board trustees should be appointed or elected. To begin, I do not agree with any of the four governance options and I also believe that it would be a huge mistake to appoint trustees to school boards.

Nether the government, through the last six months of the transformational change rhetoric, nor Mr. Perrins, through his report, have been successful in providing a compelling “why” as to the need for any of the proposed changes. Through the ESSP, the current school boards in the province have made significant progress in achieving the goals identified and agreed upon, so why do we need such significant change in the system? Further structural changes, through the amalgamation of school boards, would create chaos in the system, chaos that will detrimentally affect our students and communities. Didn’t we learn any lessons from the last round of amalgamations in 2006?

Page 20 of the Perrins Report refers to the idea of “Strategic Direction and Accountability”, and provides some suggestions as to what he feels “must happen” in this area for the education sector to address the key challenges outlined in the report. If accountability is so important, what does not make sense to me is the fact that, earlier in the report, it is questioned whether or not school board trustees should be elected or appointed. Appointed trustees provide less accountability than elected trustees. Let me explain my point. Mr. Perrins, on page 20 of the report, writes the following, “The appointed board is accountable to government. Their direction can be set more readily to align with the interests and values of the appointer. They can be relieved of their role if they do not fulfil their mandate or do not achieve desired results.” This sounds more like control than accountability. Only elected trustees can hold both school division staff and government accountable. If school boards are appointed, who will hold government accountable for their decisions and actions? If elected trustees fail to meet desired results or mandate, they can still be removed. They can be voted out by the electorate. Be careful not mask government’s desire to have ultimate control with the tenets of accountability. They are two very different issues. This report, and the fact that the government has even started this type of process in the education sector, speaks only to the desire to take away the voice of the people of Saskatchewan regarding how our children are educated.

There are benefits to larger organizations, but only to a point. There is a point of optimization to achieve the most efficiency and effectiveness, but once an organization moves past this point of optimization, inefficiencies and ineffectiveness results. Larger school boards as organizations are no different; inefficiencies and ineffectiveness result will lead to loss of local voice. I believe we have the optimal size now, with the benefit of a wide range of programs and services while keeping Board members close enough to our communities and School Community Councils to keep the public voice in public education. In short, these proposed changes to education will not make education better, only worse.

Sincerely,

Local Democracy is True Democracy

I am greatly concerned that the amalgamation of school boards would present a serious erosion of local democracy and local representation, as well as being a serious erosion by decision makers of what should be their total commitment to accountability, transparency and most importantly, the learning requirements of our students and local communities.

At present, rate payers are represented by elected – not appointed – trustees, who are accountable to the students and citizens of their communities, and these local trustees are committed to working with their respective school divisions and the Ministry of Education to ensure that students, teachers, and classrooms have the resources required for educational success, as the critical stepping stone to our children’s overall success in life.

At times, this may mean that the resources required for success may put pressure on the models and funding available. Students and parents and committed rate payers are not going to be the first to lobby for decreased education taxes and for the de-funding of education, but they will be the first to ask for and expect an educational system that receives the support it needs to prepare our children for the future. Speaking up for the best interests of students should never be derided or labelled as anything but what it is – an enduring commitment to the children of this province being the future of this province; the best investment we can make to the future of this province is to make our students – and their quality education - a priority. Our elected trustees serve one master – the best interests of our children.

I do not believe that any fully-costed business case that shows what, if any, enduring and sustainable savings would result overall from merging or amalgamating school divisions has been shared with the citizens of Saskatchewan.

However, in the information that has been made available to the public, what I have not been able to find is financial information on the costs to taxpayers of the not wholly publically funded education system – the minimum 50% taxpayer funded private schools/independent schools.

How can we have an informed discussion on this topic without having full disclosure of the funding of **both public school divisions and private schools/independent schools** (by individual school and in total)?

Where is the Public Disclosure of Funding of Private Schools/Independent Schools?

(private or independent schools - albeit with at least 50% of their funding being taxpayer funding)

Government Fiscal Year (April 1 to March 31)
2015-16 vs 2016-17 Operating Funding & Preventative Maintenance and Renewal
<http://publications.gov.sk.ca/documents/11/90199-2015-16%20and%202016-17%20Govt%20Fiscal%20Funding%20Comparative.pdf>

While this chart is informative, it only lists the school divisions that are 100% publically funded, and provides no information on “schools that call themselves private or independent schools but in reality receive at least 50% of their funds from taxpayers.” **Why is equivalent financial information not available on private schools/independent schools – both operating funding and capital funding?**

Where is the public disclosure of what private schools/independent schools were allowed to retain in WCB rebates?

In the news article by CJME (<http://cjme.com/article/848362/sask-private-schools-get-keep-wcb-rebates>) it is stated that “the province says they’re only retaining the rebates from organizations which are completely funded by the government – private schools in Saskatchewan only get half of their operational funding from government.”

This poses a fundamental question:

Does this decision not amount to additional funding to private schools/independent schools?

In an earlier news report by CJME (<http://cjme.com/article/837896/millions-earmarked-saskatchewan-schools-going-back-provincial-coffers>) the Education Minister is reported as having made the following comments:

He said it (the WCB rebates) wasn’t anything the divisions did to earn the money, it’s simply a WCB surplus.

The WCB payments will be straight to the divisions, so the Ministry of Education will reduce its payments to the school divisions by corresponding amounts.

“They didn’t know the money was coming, it was not budgeted for in any of the budget submissions they did ... I don’t want to use the word windfall, but it was unexpected revenue for them,” said Morgan.

In addition, Morgan said it’s taxpayer money which is paying for the school divisions, so it’s taxpayer money coming back.

This poses several fundamental questions:

Why is the funding of private schools/independent schools stated as being “from government” and school division funding is stated as being “taxpayer money” – in reality, it is not taxpayer money that is going to private schools/independent schools?

If the WCB rebates were not anything the (public) school divisions did to earn the money, what did the private schools/independent schools do to earn the money?

If they (public schools) “didn’t know the money was coming, it was not budgeted for in any of the budget submissions they did ... I don’t want to use the word windfall, but it was unexpected revenue for them” then how was the situation any different for private schools/independent schools? **What were the regulations, principles and/or policies that allowed for the WCB rebates to not go to organizations that are completely funded by government (taxpayers), and allowed the rebates to go to private schools** (which receive a minimum of 50% of their funding from taxpayers, according to the 2016-17 Qualified Independent Schools Application (<http://publications.gov.sk.ca/documents/11/86193-2016-2017%20QIS%20Application.pdf>)).

Why is the public disclosure of the taxpayer funding of private schools/independent schools not occurring (i.e. as part of “2015-16 vs 2016-17 Operating Funding & Preventative Maintenance and Renewal” or as an appendix to that report)?

What is the total amount and by institution amount of taxpayer funding for private schools/independent schools?

Also, of note by its absence in the news report (<http://news.nationalpost.com/holy-post/regina-adds-funding-for-religious-schools>) is any statement as to whether or not private schools/independent schools must permit inspection by the Saskatchewan's Office of the Provincial Auditor.

Funding for Registered Independent Schools

The following web page - <http://publications.gov.sk.ca/documents/11/86158-2016-17%20Public%20List.pdf> – which states it was updated 10/11/2016 – lists fifty-nine (59) registered independent schools.

The following article (<http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/saskatchewan/cash-for-independent-schools-hurts-public-system-ndp-1.1257733>) provides several very important facts:

- That in early 2012 there were 33 independent schools with a total enrolment of about 820 students (four years later – 2016 – there were 59 independent schools, and an unknown enrolment).
- The government statement that any money going to qualified independent schools will be new and will not be taken from the publically funded system – which includes public and Catholic schools.
- Late last year (2011), the provincial government said starting in September, it will give about \$5,000 per student to independent schools if they qualify by following the Education Ministry curriculum and meeting other criteria.

With the increase in registered independent schools from 2012 to 2016 (from 33 to 59), and an unknown increase in enrolment (from about 820 students to an unknown number of students), the accurate statement is that for every student who moves from the 100% publically funded system to the (at minimum) 50% publically funded system (“independent schools”), the publically funded system will see a decrease in funding in the amount of \$11, 341.25 (from: <http://publications.gov.sk.ca/documents/11/86410-Funding%20Manual%202015-16.pdf>, 2015-16 Funding Distribution Model – Funding Manual, page 40, based on Provincial Average Per-Student Amount) and the registered independent school will see a funding increase of \$5,671 (taxpayer funds, plus whatever tuition they charge)?

Why is the amount of taxpayer (government) funding that each of the registered independent schools receives not listed?

It is curious that the list is noted as the ‘public list’ – is there a ‘private list’ or an ‘list of applications waiting in hopes of the 2 years in operation requirement before receiving public/taxpayer funding will be dropped’ that are not being made available to the public?

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts recently voted down a proposal to allow the expansion of charter schools (very similar to our independent schools). Part of their dialogue and debate (<https://www.bostonglobe.com/metro/2016/10/12/should-mass-lift-charter-school-cap/z4ER9dwXlvObiYDyKpTjjP/story.html>) was on the financial impact of charter schools on public schools. From the referenced article:

Charters are public schools that have a freer hand with curriculum, budget, and personnel decisions than traditional public schools.

Supporters say Massachusetts charters are making impressive strides in poor, racially segregated urban areas and should be expanded to offer parents more choices. Critics say they drain too much money from traditional public schools that serve the bulk of students.

The Brookings paper shows that Massachusetts charters have not had a positive effect in suburban and rural areas.

What is the financial impact of charters on traditional public schools? *State law requires the money to follow the child. So a student who leaves a traditional public school for a charter takes thousands of dollars in education aid with him.*

In the current fiscal year, charter schools are expected to drain \$451 million from traditional public schools in all — a figure that has become a rallying cry for the opposition to Question 2.

Transparency & Disclosure

In the Regina Public Schools Annual Report 2015-2016

(http://www.rbe.sk.ca/sites/default/files/boarddocs/2015-16_annual_report.pdf) the following statement is made (page 38 of that report):

As part of government's commitment to accountability and transparency, the Ministry of Education and Saskatchewan school divisions disclose payments that total \$50,000 or greater made to individuals, businesses and other organizations during the fiscal year. These payments include salaries, contracts, transfers, purchases of goods and services, and other expenditures.

Following the above statement in that report is the payee list for that division.

Similar disclosure information is also readily – and publically – available for the Regina Roman Catholic School Division ([http://www.rcsd.ca/uploads/RCSD%20Annual%20Report%202014-2015%20-%20Final%20\(2\).pdf](http://www.rcsd.ca/uploads/RCSD%20Annual%20Report%202014-2015%20-%20Final%20(2).pdf)).

Using just these two school divisions as examples, the public disclosure that is available for school divisions via their annual reports is commendable, reasonable, and not onerous.

What are the public reporting requirements for taxpayer funded private schools/independent schools? According to according to the 2016-17 Qualified Independent Schools Application (<http://publications.gov.sk.ca/documents/11/86193-2016-2017%20QIS%20Application.pdf>),

Financial Statements: The Education Act, 1995 holds the K-12 education sector accountable for effective and efficient delivery of educational services. The Ministry of Education requires approved annual financial statements and management information as part of its accountability framework.

Please provide a copy of the most recent audited/reviewed financial statements for the school.

Wholly publically funded school boards' financial statements are publically available (via their respective web sites) – **how are the financial statements and management information that are required by the Ministry of Education for the remainder of the K-12 education sector made available to the public?**

The criteria of the 2016-17 Qualified Independent Schools Application

(<http://publications.gov.sk.ca/documents/11/86193-2016-2017%20QIS%20Application.pdf>) includes the following requirements:

(f) agree to participate fully in the ministry's provincial student assessment program;

(g) agree to participate fully in the ministry's accountability framework;

(h) agree to submit financial statements to the ministry, as directed by the minister;

How is this information disclosed and made available to the public?

The following article on British Columbia (<http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/education-minister-on-vs-school-closures-and-funding-private-schools-1.3649251>) identifies questions that were asked of B.C.'s Education Minister Mike Bernier, and his responses.

This year the provincial government is providing \$358 million in funding to private schools. In a recent CUPE poll, 77 per cent of British Columbians say they oppose the government subsidy to private schools. Should taxpayer dollars be subsidizing families who send their kids to elite private schools?

When we look at education in British Columbia, I would say we don't fund private schools. We fund students. We fund opportunities for students and those opportunities are chosen by parents.

But you fund students whose parents who can afford tens of thousands of dollars in tuition to send their children to private schools. Why is public money being put towards that?

We have legislative formula that has been put in place for several decades. We have to remember that families have a choice.

We want to ensure that every child has the best education possible, which is why the majority of the funding goes to public education.

If people choose to send their child to an independent school, they have already paid taxes towards public school even though their child has not gone there. That's a choice parents make.

(Note: the above statement seems to imply that only the parents of children in the K-12 education system pay education taxes)

Our Saskatchewan review should be asking the same questions of our Minister of Education. Has the Saskatchewan public ever been asked if they support taxpayer funding of private/independent schools, and if so, what were the results of that polling, and were those poll results ever made public?

To close:

Questions have been noted in the proceeding text, but the following questions are worth repeating and are respectfully asked as this information, if it is publically available, is not readily publically available in a manner that is any way equivalent to the transparency and availability of equivalent information on the wholly publically funded education system (school divisions):

What is the amount of taxpayer funding (government funding) for education outside of our public school systems?

Where is the public transparency and disclosure for this taxpayer funding of private schools/independent schools? (Is not the revenue per student at a private school/independent school the per-student taxpayer funding of approximately \$5,671 *plus* the tuition that institution charges?)

Where can the public access material that is provided to Ministry of Education by private schools/independent schools? This information - which is critical to transparency and accountability - is readily and publically available and published in the annual reports of school divisions.

Is there a commitment to **not** removing or shortening the 2 year requirement outlined in subsection 38.2 (1) of *The Independent Schools Regulations*, and noted on the “2016-17 Qualified Independent Schools Application” that states:

Independent schools eligible to apply to be designated as Qualified Independent Schools include schools which:

(a) have lawfully operated as a registered independent school for at least two consecutive school years immediately prior to applying for a Certificate of Qualification.

Where is (is there?) a (fully-costed) business case that shows what, if any, enduring and sustainable savings would result overall from merging or amalgamating school divisions?

Where is (is there?) a (fully-costed) business case that shows what, if any, enduring and sustainable savings would result from removing or shortening the 2 year requirement outlined in subsection 38.2 (1) of *The Independent Schools Regulations* - possibly thereby allowing ‘everyone’ to say ‘we did not close any schools’ but instead ‘they/we’ creating the conditions for schools to ‘choose’ to move from being part of a school division to being an independent school (rather than facing closure)?

If there is a removing or shortening the 2 year requirement outlined in subsection 38.2 (1) of *The Independent Schools Regulations*, it does raise the concern that that specific outcome was pre-determined.

Thank you.

January 21, 2017

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the governance of school divisions in Saskatchewan. As the School Community Council for _____, we care about the well-being of our students and staff. Given this, we have five main concerns about the options outlined in Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report.

- 1) Our primary focus is, and must continue to be, student achievement. If school division boundaries are significantly changed, or amalgamated into one provincial division, there must be a solid plan to mitigate negative effects on students. The focus of teachers, administrators and other staff needs to be on students. Significant restructuring of school divisions has the potential to create stress, uncertainty, and instability for everyone in the education system. Ultimately it is our children who may be adversely affected by this stress, uncertainty and instability.
- 2) We are also concerned about potential negative outcomes for teachers and staff. For example, if school divisions become much larger, we need to ensure that teachers and other staff are not transferred to schools outside their home communities. Current practice is to transfer teachers and administrators to different schools at regular intervals.
- 3) We are also concerned about the lack of evidence from other jurisdictions that restructuring governance improves student achievement outcomes. We are not convinced that restructuring will actually result in better outcomes for students. Given Saskatchewan's poor student achievement compared to other provinces, perhaps the government's attention should be placed directly on student achievement rather than on governance.
- 4) We have some misgivings about how quickly the Educational Governance Review Report was prepared and the short timeline for consultation. We have the same misgivings about the sincerity of the public consultation – there have been no town hall meetings, or other opportunities for the public to discuss in-person, only a comment form on Saskatchewan.ca that has not been particularly well-publicized.
- 5) Finally, we believe it is essential that the board or boards remain elected instead of being appointed. This will ensure they remain accountable to the Saskatchewan public, and is a safeguard against too much political influence on the governance of our province's education system.

Again, we appreciate the opportunity to provide our feedback on this very important issue.

Sincerely,

Sent on behalf of the

School Community Council,

Village of Vibank

January 23, 2017

SENT VIA E-MAIL AND REGULAR MAIL

I understand changes are being considered in our education system. As the mayor of Vibank, I understand the importance of a local voice and listening to the community. Representing our community I feel very strongly forced amalgamation would have a negative effect on the students in our local school division. I am **opposed** to amalgamation, appointed boards and strongly feel we currently have the right number of trustees in the Prairie Valley School Division. We simply cannot do with any less. None of the options in Dan Perrins report are favorable for our students.

Our school division is an optimal size now, with the benefit of wide programs and services. Our elected Board members are still close enough to our community and our School Community Council to make decisions in the best interest of our rural students.

Prairie Valley School Division underwent major restructuring just ten years ago. As a result of that major change we have less elected local voice for our communities. Any further change in local voice or our school division boundaries would not be in the best interests of our children and our community. Education belongs to the community and I want you to know that I support Prairie Valley School Division and Saskatchewan's school boards and ask you to share this important message with your colleagues in the provincial legislature.

We need to keep our school boards locally elected.
We need to keep decisions closer to our communities.
We do not support further amalgamations.
We do not support changes to our subdivision boundaries.

Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community. Thank you in advance for being our voice with your government as any potential changes for our community are being considered.

Sincerely,



Ryan Reiss
Mayor, Village of Vibank

Over the last 120 years changes in transportation and communication/technology have allowed the size of school districts/divisions in Saskatchewan to grow and the number of school districts/divisions to decrease significantly. In general, as we have moved to larger school divisions our schools have become better equipped to serve the diverse learning needs of our students and communities, with the main casualty being loss of local voice. Based on the trends both in Saskatchewan and other provinces (as presented on page 6 to 11 of the report), it seems pretty clear that there is pressure to move to yet larger school divisions until we arrive at Option 1, a province wide school division. I hope that this transition is driven more by what will be best for our students than by the desire to save a dollar, but I realize the two are really very closely linked as what we are really trying to do is use our limited resources more effectively.

Based on my personal experience working in education I feel this pressure to move toward a province wide school division MUST BE RESISTED. As I reflect on my many years working for Saskatoon Public schools I think there are two main reasons I gave 100%. First, I wanted to make a difference for my students and in turn for my community. Second, I was inspired by the leadership provided in the school division by many of my fellow colleagues, school division leaders and in a few cases even by individuals I knew who were serving on the school board. Together they created a climate where students and staff felt supported and valued. **Looking back probably the key to feeling inspired by these leaders was I knew them personally.** I got to know them by working with them closely as friends, colleagues and even former students. I knew that in general they were caring, compassionate, knowledgeable, insightful, visionary, hardworking people who also wanted the best for the students and community. This is also likely the reason that promoting senior leadership from within the division was generally more effective than selecting equally qualified individuals from outside the school division. During the second part of my career I ended up working a little more with the Ministry of Education, but I never felt the same inspiration when working with leaders there. I often found myself questioning their knowledge, understanding, decisions and motives. At the time I thought these leaders down in Regina must all be people who had never worked in schools, were a little slow and didn't really care about students, so I did not trust their leadership and decisions the same way I trusted and respected the leadership within my own school division. In fact, probably most of leaders with the Ministry were the same type of exceptional people that were providing leadership in our school division, **but the key was I didn't have a chance to get to know the kind of people they were.** If we move to a much more centralized form of leadership I am concerned that our staff and in turn our students will become less inspired and motivated.

If we have to choose from the four options presented I would select option 3B **with an emphasis on the shifts in governance described on page 20.** I wonder if the first step should

be these shifts in governance without forcing any further consolidation of school divisions. I think implementing the shifts in governance could improve efficiency a little, but at least fairly quickly, while further consolidation of school divisions is likely to be difficult to implement without short to medium term adverse effects on learning.

As I think about inefficiency in our educational system the first thing that comes to mind is public and separate school divisions. We have two large school divisions serving Saskatoon. Each has their own, school board, central administration, specialized central office staff, maintenance and transportation services etc. I am surprised and disappointed that the report just accepts separate school divisions the way they are and mainly makes recommendations for public school divisions. I realize that The Constitution protects the rights of people of minority faith, but I wonder if we could find a different way to protect the rights of people of minority faith without separate school divisions. Many years ago, we had Protestant and Roman Catholic schools and school divisions in Saskatchewan. **If we ignore First Nations religions and lump all Protestants together, at that time it seemed fair to provide Roman Catholics the right to have their own schools like the majority Protestants did.**

Society and schools have evolved in Saskatchewan and now, in general, we no longer have Protestant schools and Roman Catholic schools, but public/secular schools and Roman Catholic schools. How would we define and identify people of minority faith if The Constitution was being written today? If we recognize that the Constitution is not now treating people of all religions fairly and justly shouldn't the Constitution be changed? There are now people of many different faiths in Saskatchewan. It might appear to some that people of the Roman Catholic faith have been singled out to receive special treatment. It seems strange that new Roman Catholic schools are built with tax dollars, but when a Christian school or Muslim school is built they are built without tax dollars. Things have changed so much over the years that now instead of sending their children to the originally protestant public schools many protestant families that I know feel their children may be more comfortable in Roman Catholic schools while others are sending their children to private or associate Christian Schools. I know there are also students from Roman Catholic families attending public schools. It is almost like we have two competing public school divisions, one that is basically secular and another that is operated by and basically for Roman Catholics. I worked in public school divisions for 35 years and have a preference for inclusive schools that serve a diverse student body, as I think in today's society we all need practice living and working with people who are different than ourselves. **However I do want to maintain the option for various religious minorities to have their own schools and do understand why many Protestant parents choose not to send their children to public schools.** I am not interested in taking rights away from Roman Catholic families, but want to see people of all faiths treated fairly and equally.

As our education governance model evolves I wonder if we can find a way to protect the rights of people of a minority faith without the redundancy of two full school divisions serving the same geographic area and the need for some parents to pay significant tuition fees. One approach that may point to a solution is associate schools. The Saskatoon Public School Division has two associate schools that are serving the needs of religious minorities. Each associate school and their students are able to benefit from the extensive infrastructure, specialized supports and resources available in the large school division while maintaining the desired degree of autonomy. Unfortunately due to lack of funding from property taxes families who choose this faith based education for their children must pay a significant tuition fee which makes this option less attractive. (In 2016-17 tuition at the Saskatoon Christian School was around \$4,500 for the first student in the family. I believe that fees at the Saskatoon Misbah School are lower, but still significant.)

Recently Saskatchewan has been building joint-use schools. A government web site describes the benefits of these joint use schools as: “provides extra benefits to the students in schools where specific programming may not have otherwise been offered” and “strengthens partnerships between school divisions.” At first I didn’t think joint-use schools were that great an idea, but these benefits are appealing. Perhaps this is just the start of bringing the two divisions closer together. My experience has been that senior school division administrators rather than school boards are the ones that actually have the largest impact on student learning. Collectively central office staffs have a great deal of knowledge, experience and skill related to the teaching and learning process along with many specialized administrative functions. I notice from the table on page 28 that on average school division administrative costs are about seven times as large as the governance costs. Due to constitutional restrictions perhaps we will have to maintain public and separate school boards, but if public and separate school divisions can share buildings and associate schools can function in cooperation with a larger public school division, I wonder if a public school board and separate school board could share central office administrations. Both the public and separate school boards could maintain a few administrative staff of their own to provide leadership and to promote their own identities, but the specialized administrative and maintenance staff could be shared or operated out of the public school system, as is the case with some associate schools. For reasons explained in the second paragraph I think it would be essential that professionals from both school divisions have equal opportunity to be included in the shared central office team. Perhaps some of the funds saved by combining the central office administrations could be used to lower or eliminate the tuition fees required at the faith based associate schools.

Retired teacher

January 19, 2017

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing in regards to the Saskatchewan Ministry of Education's recent announcement of future governance options for public education in the province. I teach in the public school division in Lloydminster and have young children in the elementary system here in town.

I am seriously concerned that the government's plan to pursue the amalgamation of numerous school divisions in the province will lessen the education that I can offer to my students and the education my children will receive. The bi-provincial nature of our city is unique and creates unique concerns. As you are aware, our student funding comes from both Alberta and Saskatchewan and Lloydminster Directors are constantly working with **both** provinces in regards to all decisions that affect the division. This is not a relationship that any other school division in the province currently deals with or is prepared to take on.

I recently learned about the significant change to the Lloydminster Charter that previously prevented amalgamation of Lloydminster Public School Divisions with other communities. It was shocking to hear that this change occurred with no apparent knowledge from anyone involved with Lloydminster Public or with any public consultation. The secretive nature of this change makes me question the motive by which the change was made. Lloydminsterites have a right to know who is responsible for this change because it affects us directly.

I currently sit on the _____ committee in our division. This is a committee that is made up of teachers from each school in the division, our superintendent Todd Robinson, and our Board Chair David Thompson. This committee was created to open the lines of communication between administrators and teachers in the division. I value this relationship immensely and the intent of our director to forge a strong relationship between LPSD leadership and the teachers they support. This relationship would be ultimately lost with the loss of the Lloydminster Public School Division.

Alberta residents should be seriously concerned about Lloydminster Public School Division moving to a location where they will have no political representation. Here in Lloyd I have an Albertan MLA that I can address educational concerns to. If the school board office was to

move to another Saskatchewan location Alberta residents, with their children in the public system, would have **no** political representative that they could contact with educational concerns. This is discriminatory to Alberta residents with children enrolled in LPSD.

Lastly, I have a real concern with the idea of appointed school board members. Currently board members are elected locally and are accountable to the community they represent. They therefore hold the concerns of their community at the forefront of all decisions they make. If board members become appointed by the Minister of Education they will now become accountable to the provincial government and not the community they are appointed to represent. The optics of this option are terrible. It looks like the Minister of Education is more concerned about controlling the educational system than serving the people the system was created to educate.

Change is inevitable and I am under no false pretense that this letter will do much to alter the decision of the Minister of Education. In fact, this is the first time I have sent a letter like this to any political representative. However, I feel like the complacency that Canadians show to the major changes that get pushed upon them needs to end. The short period of public consultation that the government has presented in regards to this issue will no doubt impede the number of responses that will be received. My hope is that the Minister will sincerely listen to the concerns of the people of this province that do make the effort to respond and reevaluate accordingly.

Sincerely,



Saskatchewan Home Based Educators represents the approximately 2250 children in Saskatchewan registered as home educating students. We also have members with children who are registered in distance learning programs, and members with children who are not registered because they are outside the ages of compulsory attendance (younger than 7 or older than 16).

The purpose of SHBE is to assist in creating a positive social network and a positive political environment for all those who choose home-based education. We also provide supportive, social and instructional resources for our members.

The Home School Legal Defence Association (HSLDA) is a national not-for-profit organization that empowers, protects, and encourages homeschooling families across Canada. HSLDA has extensive legal experience with education law as it pertains to homeschooling, and with facilitating good relationships between government and homeschoolers.

The right to home educate in Saskatchewan is protected by the *Education Act, 1995*, S.S. 1995, c. E-0.2 and has been affirmed by the Supreme Court of Canada (see *R. v. Jones*, [1986] S.C.J. No. 56).

Any change in governance in Saskatchewan should take into consideration:

Home educating parents should have a voice when decisions are made about home education policy in Saskatchewan.

Home educating students in Saskatchewan have been largely ignored by the government and the ministry of education. It is noteworthy that home educators were not mentioned in the Educational Governance Review Report. We see some similarities between the 1600 Francophone students in Saskatchewan who have a constitutional right to French education and the 2250 home educated students in Saskatchewan who also have a right to home educate based on constitutional rights and freedoms.

We request that home educating parents be part of any stakeholder groups such as the proposed provincial advisory board to the Minister of Education. We feel there is a great benefit in hearing our voices along with public, Catholic, First Nations and Metis, and Francophone students.

We request that SHBE and HSLDA represent home educating parents as part of any stakeholder groups such as the proposed provincial advisory board to the Minister of Education.

The registering authority of home education programs must respect the provincial regulations.

In Saskatchewan, home educators send a notice of intent to home educate to a registering authority, currently determined by the province to be the school division in which they live. Parents are also required to provide an educational plan and a yearly report for their students. “The registration of a home-based program represents a determination by the registering authority that the parents have complied with the registration criteria for a home-based education program. *It does not represent approval* by the registering authority of the home-based education program.” *Saskatchewan Home-based Education: Policy and Procedures Manual* (emphasis added)

Every year, registering authorities from school divisions request more information or attempt more supervision than is required by the regulations. It would be very helpful if the registering authority was someone who had home education experience, or who had a good understanding of home education.

We request that home educators register with one province-wide registering authority, and that SHBE have input into the selection of that registering authority.

Additionally, SHBE suggests the province allow SHBE to approve the ministry’s choice, or to have the ministry choose from a list of nominees provided by SHBE.

Any funding provided for home educated students should be spent on those students in a transparent and accountable manner.

Each school division determines their own policy with regard to funding and other supports they might provide to home educators. Each school division receive half of the provincial per-student grant for each home educated student. While this number varies by school division, \$3,000 per student would be a minimum estimate of what the school divisions receive per student. This means the provincial government is transferring at least \$6.7 million to school division for home educated students.

Some school divisions provide funding to home educating students within the range of \$200 to \$1000 per year. Many school divisions provide no funding. Some school divisions also supply supports such as access to curriculums, classes and libraries.

We note that the OECD defines the key elements of good governance to be accountability, transparency and participation.

- School divisions have been unaccountable for where they spend the funding that they receive from the province for home educated students.
- There is no transparency in where the money is spent.
- There is very little participation or consultation with home educators at any level of the educational system.

We request that there be a re-evaluation of home education funding in Saskatchewan with the purpose of ensuring that funding be directed toward home educating families.

We request that SHBE and HSLDA be involved in the re-evaluation.

For further information, please contact:

Anne Bennett
President
Saskatchewan Home Based Educators
www.shbe.info
abennett@shbe.info

Lisa McManus
Legal Counsel
HSLDA Canada
www.hsllda.ca
info@hsllda.ca

I am a Structured Learning Assistant with the School Division, an employee for sixteen years, President of CUPE local Chairperson of the Education Workers Steering Committee (EWSC), Vice President of and everyday I'm thankful for my union and our collective agreement.

The government gave Dan Perrins three weeks to study and write his review on Educational Governance. Any of the three options Mr. Perrins is offering as options will cause a huge change to our education system and the rushed process totaling six weeks from study, to report, to consultation with stakeholder, has the potential for many mistakes. I don't see how any of the options Mr. Perrins review and the hasty process the government imposed "will focus on student success while ensuring accountability and efficient operational structures within the education system." What's the urgency?

There's no evidence in Mr. Perrins review that proves restructuring school divisions and government appointed trustees will save money. It will only guarantee that the parents, workers and communities have no voice. Communication and feedback to and from parents, workers and the community will be negatively impacted. The last time I checked, I had a democratic right, as a tax paying citizen, to elect a school board trustee. Elected school board trustees have a vested interest in my community and workplace, they are accountable to my community and workplace; and they represent my community and workplace and my voice.

Elected school board trustees are directed by their communities to represent their voices, and not the government's mandate. Shame on this government for disrespecting the democratic process....the very process that elected them!

Public feedback supports our existing school division boundaries and keeping our democratic process of elected school boards. I love my job working with students and they are my priority every day I go to work. I have to wonder why this report does not consider how this change will impact our children and their learning. In this report, our children's education is not a priority, as this is a business model and the priority is to find efficiencies. Our children are not car parts on a Toyota assembly line, and to be treated as such is disgraceful.

School division boundaries are large enough, and local democratically elected school board trustees are the best choice for my family, my community and my workplace.

January 22, 2017

Honourable Premier Brad Wall
Room 226 - 2405 Legislative Drive
Regina, SK
S4S 0B3
email: premier@gov.sk.ca

Dear Honourable Brad Wall, elected officials and the Education Consultative Committee,

I am writing with concerns over the proposed changes suggested by Mr. Dan Perrins in his Educational Governance Review Report. While I appreciate that our government and the residents of Saskatchewan are facing challenging financial times and there are difficult decisions to be made, I urge you all to consider the long term consequences to not only our children, but all rural communities should broad spectrum amalgamation take place. I do not believe that any of the options put forward by Mr. Perrins are in the best interests of my grandchildren or my community of Indian Head.

As stated on Page 22 of Mr. Perrins' report the role of the board of education is to “determine program and service levels to respond to community needs and interests.” With further amalgamations of our school divisions, the board of education will be further out of touch and in fact work against community needs and interests. I am concerned that with further amalgamations, many rural schools will close. The legislated rural closure threshold of 51 students needs to be maintained. Further school closures would result in more children being transported on Saskatchewan highways and grid road systems.

Interestingly, in Mr. Perrins report on page 22, he states that “during the transition period, a focus on restructuring may compromise the focus on student outcomes in the Plan for Growth and ESSP”. This is not acceptable, failing our children to save money is unacceptable, these are our future lawmakers, healthcare providers, etc. I do not want my grandchildren to fall through the cracks during this “transition period”. As noted in Mr. Perrins report the transition in 2006 took approximately 5 years.

Mr. Perrins reported that with one provincial school division, there would be “greater opportunity for sharing and implementing effective practices and results from one regional service area to another”. There is absolutely no reason this cannot be done now, even with the current 28 school divisions. In 2017, electronic means of communication enhance the efficiency of sharing information. His opinion on this is wrong. What Mr. Perrins fails to consider is the fact that different geographic areas of our province are dealing with a variety of different situations, there are pockets of different cultures, different socio-economic status and different family circumstances that require customized approaches. Amalgamating 28 school divisions into larger school divisions will impede educators and school

boards abilities to customize their approach to education. Amalgamation will not raise the performance of the students that are struggling, it will detrimentally impact the students that are meeting learning objectives.

On page 23, Mr. Perrins reports that one large school division will allow for continued accountability to the community through school community councils. In many rural communities, the rural closure threshold must be maintained in order for those schools and their community councils to exist. I believe that if rural schools close, those communities will disappear. I find it interesting that Mr. Perrins reports that there would be more transparency with larger school divisions, in spite of him also stating that one large school division would result in “reduced communication between the board and community” and “the public's access to the decision makers would be reduced.” Larger school divisions would be less transparent and less accountable to communities than our current 28 school division system.

In summary, I want what is best for my grandchildren, my community of Indian Head and the people of our province. I believe that having a school in the community in which we live with locally elected school board members is of the utmost importance to children's success and community growth. Many small businesses exist in communities and their existence is threatened should the population of a community decrease with school closures, assuming large amalgamations would lead to school closures. Locally elected school boards would be much more accountable and more informed on factors impacting our community and students than appointed board members from outside our community. I do not support further amalgamations or further changes to our subdivision boundaries.

Regardless of what decision you make, whether you choose option 1, 2, 3a or 3b from the Educational Governance Review Report, or if it is something else entirely, I respectfully request that you present your decision to the stakeholders and communities for public review and input prior to implementation or legislative changes. This would allow stakeholders the opportunity to point out any unintended consequences that may arise as a result of your decision.

Respectfully submitted,

c.c Honorable Minister of Education Don Morgan, Q.C.

c.ci Educational consultative committee (email: K12govconsultations@gov.sk.ca)

c.cii Honorable Don McMorris, MLA Indian Head - Milestone (email: mcmorris.mla@sasktel.net)

January 22, 2017

To Whom It May Concern

I am writing in response to the *Educational Governance Review Report*. As a highly educated employer in the community of Lloydminster with 3 children in the public school division these proposed changes deeply concern me as a parent. I do not believe that these changes are being made to better the education that my children are receiving. As a business owner I understand the needs to balance budgets and develop efficiencies, however, these changes do not appear to be well grounded in real facts or science. These changes may save administrative costs in the short-term, but long-term they will not. These changes will have a larger social and educational cost which will be directly related to the regional nature of the province of Saskatchewan. I believe that these changes will be detrimental to the students in Saskatchewan and increase regional variation and disparity among the educated.

Our student's and children's best interest's must be at the forefront of all decisions that are made in the education system. The restructuring of school boards/divisions to make school divisions larger will have a negative effect in schools and communities. A super board, no matter how diverse will not have the ability to properly evaluate or determine the regional needs of the individual students within their schools. Local administrators and educators understand the day to day struggles and the ever changing dynamics in their communities and regions and the different effects these changes have on students, children and families. Every community has specific educational needs, resources and services to ensure all students' needs are managed and taken care of. Not understanding or being able to properly evaluate these needs will have an immense financial and social cost that will creep to astronomical levels over the next decade.

Also, as you should be aware, Lloydminster education is funded bi-provincially. This is a significant challenge if Lloydminster were to be combined with other communities in Saskatchewan. Funding structure, rural and urban education differences, regional economic and family support differences will occur in trying to provide equitable education to all students in communities surrounding Lloydminster. I realize as an Alberta resident I have limited input into the Saskatchewan education system, however, portions of my taxes are collected and split in a cost sharing agreement between the two provinces to provide medical and educational services in Lloydminster, as such, I should have input and my input needs to be considered. This current initiative is prejudice and is discriminatory against me as an Alberta resident relying on a service being provided by another province's ministry.

Upon reviewing the educational governance review and the restructuring options put forth by Dan Perrins and the Saskatchewan government I see no reasonable options and as such the Ministry of Education should go back to the drawing board to rethink this plan and these options. I feel this report is extremely short sighted and is not based on real facts or science.

I fully support a public based school system and the values and education they have historically provided for me, my children and my family however, as stated earlier as a an Alberta resident, I

acknowledge the limited input I have in this process. Unfortunately if the options put forth by the Saskatchewan Ministry of Education were to come to fruition, my only other option as a parent would be to remove my three children from the Lloydminster public school system, change my tax allocation and move my children into the Lloydminster Catholic school system.

I encourage the leaders within the government of Saskatchewan to revisit this initiative and develop a better, more sustainable system and ensure they are keeping the students' best interest as the focus of their decisions, and ensure they have access to high caliber of education and support. Local education boards are knowledgeable in their communities needs and are paramount in maintaining a safe, highly valuable and equitable education system functioning in their communities for the young people they are servicing.

Thank you for your time thinking deeply about our children's future in education.

Best Regards,

January 22, 2017

To Whom It May Concern

I am writing in response to the *Educational Governance Review Report*. As a highly educated employer in the community of Lloydminster with 3 children in the public school division these proposed changes deeply concern me as a parent. I do not believe that these changes are being made to better the education that my children are receiving. As a business owner I understand the needs to balance budgets and develop efficiencies, however, these changes do not appear to be well grounded in real facts or science. These changes may save administrative costs in the short-term, but long-term they will not. These changes will have a larger social and educational cost which will be directly related to the regional nature of the province of Saskatchewan. I believe that these changes will be detrimental to the students in Saskatchewan and increase regional variation and disparity among the educated.

Our student's and children's best interest's must be at the forefront of all decisions that are made in the education system. The restructuring of school boards/divisions to make school divisions larger will have a negative effect in schools and communities. A super board, no matter how diverse will not have the ability to properly evaluate or determine the regional needs of the individual students within their schools. Local administrators and educators understand the day to day struggles and the ever changing dynamics in their communities and regions and the different effects these changes have on students, children and families. Every community has specific educational needs, resources and services to ensure all students' needs are managed and taken care of. Not understanding or being able to properly evaluate these needs will have an immense financial and social cost that will creep to astronomical levels over the next decade.

Also, as you should be aware, Lloydminster education is funded bi-provincially. This is a significant challenge if Lloydminster were to be combined with other communities in Saskatchewan. Funding structure, rural and urban education differences, regional economic and family support differences will occur in trying to provide equitable education to all students in communities surrounding Lloydminster. I realize as an Alberta resident I have limited input into the Saskatchewan education system, however, portions of my taxes are collected and split in a cost sharing agreement between the two provinces to provide medical and educational services in Lloydminster, as such, I should have input and my input needs to be considered. This current initiative is prejudice and is discriminatory against me as an Alberta resident relying on a service being provided by another province's ministry.

Upon reviewing the educational governance review and the restructuring options put forth by Dan Perrins and the Saskatchewan government I see no reasonable options and as such the Ministry of Education should go back to the drawing board to rethink this plan and these options. I feel this report is extremely short sighted and is not based on real facts or science.

I fully support a public based school system and the values and education they have historically provided for me, my children and my family however, as stated earlier as a an Alberta resident, I

acknowledge the limited input I have in this process. Unfortunately if the options put forth by the Saskatchewan Ministry of Education were to come to fruition, my only other option as a parent would be to remove my three children from the Lloydminster public school system, change my tax allocation and move my children into the Lloydminster Catholic school system.

I encourage the leaders within the government of Saskatchewan to revisit this initiative and develop a better, more sustainable system and ensure they are keeping the students' best interest as the focus of their decisions, and ensure they have access to high caliber of education and support. Local education boards are knowledgeable in their communities needs and are paramount in maintaining a safe, highly valuable and equitable education system functioning in their communities for the young people they are servicing.

Thank you for your time thinking deeply about our children's future in education.

Best Regards,

January 22, 2017

To Whom it May Concern

I am writing in response to the *Educational Governance Review Report*. As a Lloydminster resident with children in the public school division here these proposed changes worry me as a parent. I do not believe that these changes are being made to better the education that my children are receiving. I believe that these changes will actually be detrimental in to the students in Saskatchewan. I realize that funding is a huge decision maker in all government funded program but it is also extremely important to seriously consider the impact these huge changes can/will have in our student's education. **Our student's best interest have to be at the forefront of all decisions that are made in the education system.** The restructuring of school boards/divisions to make school divisions larger will have a negative effect in schools and communities. Every community and school have very individual needs and who better to make decisions regarding their schools than the people who deeply understand these needs in the community than people that reside there.

Living in Lloydminster, and the options laid out by the government cause further concern for me as Lloydminster resident. Lloydminster education is funded bi-provincially and this raises a huge challenge if Lloydminster were to be combined with other communities in Saskatchewan. Challenges would occur in trying to provide equitable education to all students in communities surrounding Lloydminster.

Another concern I have with the proposed changes is that I live on the Alberta side and have no legal voting rights in Saskatchewan. If Saskatchewan were to move to a provincial model or regional boards with appointed board members I would have no legal say in my children's education, as I would be unable to vote during provincial elections for the party I believe is most suitable to run the province.

I hope that the government can resolve issues that they are dealing with by keeping students' best interest as the focus of their decisions, and ensuring they have access to high caliber of education. Keeping communities in charge of important decisions and having quality, equitable education is extremely important to our young people.

Thank you for your time thinking deeply about our children's future in education.

Regards

To Whom it May Concern,

I am a teacher employed by the Lloydminster Public School Division and a parent with children attending the North West School Division.

I am very concerned with the proposed amalgamation, but especially alarmed by the timeline and lack of consideration on the government of Saskatchewan.

Any of the proposed options are going to directly affect my own children as well as the children I am blessed to teach. Local boards provide accountability, direct and effective communication and a proactive approach to local issues. They are in touch with the needs of our students. A representative in Regina or Saskatoon is not going to know or appreciate our local community concerns.

You cannot compare education to health. And leading the public to this notion is ignorant. Property taxes are paid to our local communities. Our local boards need to represent our local communities.

If the Saskatchewan Government cares about the future of education and the future citizens of our province, they will put more time and effort into a viable solution.

Thank you for considering my voice.

A concerned tax payer, educator and parent,



TOWN OF LEADER

Saskatchewan
Incorporated 1917

OFFICE OF THE THE ADMINISTRATOR

Telephone: 306 628-3868
Fax: 306 628-4337

January 19, 2017

P.O. Box 39
S0N 1H0

Premier Brad Wall
premier@gov.sk.ca

Dear Premier Wall:

The Council of the Town of Leader feels strongly that all of the proposed options presented in the Educational Governance Review Report (Perrin's Report) fail to keep the most important stakeholder's interests first – OUR PROVINCE'S STUDENTS.

We feel this process is being fast tracked. We certainly feel proper consultation has not been done. There has been talk about the potential for transformational change or making substantive changes. PLEASE rethink your approach. Time needs to be taken to ensure you get it right. Giving the people of our province a month to consider what could create huge changes to our education system seems very unfair.

Prior school amalgamations in this province have failed to save money. Our community has been through the amalgamation of school divisions before. It is messy and takes its toll on all involved; most importantly, our students and our educators.

As the people who fund the system, we feel it is our RIGHT to have input from a local level regarding education. Please remember that the decisions you are considering making to our education system are affecting the future of our great province. The education system you are making changes to is largely funded by local property taxes. The province sets the rate and our Saskatchewan citizens pay. Removing elected trustees from the equation should not be an option!

Our youth are our future. Decisions that constitute larger classes, fewer teachers, less educational support, more geographical limitations to receive support, longer bus transports and less local input are not in the best interest of our students.

You are our elected voice; please consider our concerns.

Sincerely,

Craig Tondevold
Mayor

/RCF

January 19, 2017

Sir/ Madam:

I voted for the Saskatchewan party, because I have watched my neighbors to the west suffer under a leader who puts ideological notions ahead of common sense. I voted for my MLA, Colleen Young, because of her local presence and my belief that she would always act for what is right for Lloydminster. Yet I find myself now facing an ideological, poorly considered decision by the very government I believed in that flies in the face of everything that I voted for.

Here's the thing. I disagree with the proposed changes to the Saskatchewan school boards, but I disagree further with how it's being forced on us. A report released three days before Christmas and given a one month consultation period that includes two holidays, but impacts an entire province, is a farce. It was meant to slide under the radar, and this consultation period was merely a formality because you didn't really want our feedback. I suspect you already knew how we'd feel about it, and you know you haven't done enough leg work to be able to answer the difficult questions that we'd ask.

So, with five days until your deadline, and only one week after learning about this, I'm asking them.

Have you considered how this will affect the 20,000 residents of Lloydminster who live in Alberta, but are subject to the whims of Saskatchewan education? Who will be their voice in these changes? The majority of our residents and students will have no ability to make their voices heard through official channels on an issue that affects every one of them, and all of our futures.

Have you thought about how this will affect our separate school division? LCSD accepts children regardless of religious background so, in effect, Lloydminster has two parallel public school divisions, only one of which is subject to these forced amalgamations. The separate schools will be overwhelmed with children whose parents see the importance of both local representation and the ability to live anywhere in the city while receiving a seamless education. Why is the education of a separately-schooled child legally protected while my publicly-schooled child's is not?

Has it crossed anyone's mind that these forced amalgamations will cause a tiered education system that flies in the face of the equality we have fought for and

accomplished in our border city? The education funding that Lloydminster receives from Alberta for those residents I mentioned previously is required to stay in Lloydminster. Therefore any other school divisions merged in to ours will not have access to those funds, while some or all of our children will. How can a school board justify that to parents or children who are as much a part of the division as anyone else, but have a different postal code?

What are you really trying to accomplish? Why are you pushing these changes through so hard and fast that many won't even know it's happening? What is the next thing that will be coming at us, that you're paving the way for? Forced amalgamations of school boards aren't new, but they've never saved anyone any money. The last time that Saskatchewan amalgamated school divisions, Lloydminster was exempt because it would be too complicated. Let me tell you, it hasn't gotten simpler since then.

I want to be clear. I am not against regional representation and I certainly support the need for finding efficiencies. No one can argue about the economic space we are currently in, and honestly, my taxes are high enough. However, I don't think adequate – or any - consideration has been given to the special circumstances that Lloydminster is in, or to the consequences that these changes will have on the delivery of education to children in our city.

My child both lives and attends school in Saskatchewan, so I can't even say I'm writing this letter because I'm concerned about the impact on his education directly. I don't even know what that will be yet, because you haven't bothered to lay out specifics before you force these amalgamations through. He may come out as one of the 'haves' while his friends who live a few blocks over and across the border may become 'have nots'. I am much more concerned for the inequalities this will result in within our city and potential conflicts with current municipal and education partners.

Lloydminster faces unique challenges by being a border city, and we always have. No one likes working with one provincial government - who would work with two by choice, right? But, until now, we have always been able to work together to better our community as a whole. We are different, but being like everyone else is boring, anyway.

Respectfully asking you to consider the best interests of my community,

Dear Mr. Morgan,

I have **attached a letter** opposing the current Restructuring of School Divisions and the appointment of school board members. I trust that you will give due consideration to the contents of my letter.

The government does not have the support of the public or the Local School Boards for these initiatives. There are better ways to achieve the goals of Education set out for 2020. I encourage the government to work with the local elected school boards and the public over time to collectively develop and carry out a progressive, detailed plan of action.

As the Minister of Education, I strongly urge you to oppose the amalgamation of our school divisions and oppose government appointed school boards.

Retired Educator and Administrator

Dear Mr. Morgan

I have been watching the news regarding the proposed changes to the School Boards and want to express my concerns and state my position that I **do not support** the amalgamation of school divisions or the appointment of school board members. I will address my concerns in the following areas:

As a retired educator, I have seen the effects of the move to larger school divisions. Having worked in both the smaller and larger divisions I can honestly say that in the larger division:

1. there was a lack of appreciation for the differences between schools and their individual needs as well as the staff and students
2. management was removed further from the individual schools, resulting in less time being able to be spent in each school and with individual staffs, and teachers, this meant a lack of understanding of challenges, successes, needs and support for individual schools.
3. Central administration spend more time driving between schools than they do in schools assessing needs and providing support and resources for the staff. There is no longer time for the individual discussions that resulted in a true understanding of the challenges of each community, school or staff member. This results in a lack of investment from central administration right down to the school's support staff as they do not feel that they are being heard or understood.
4. Spring Planning Programs were reviewed by Board Members, Directors and other administrators. In some cases there was surprise and shock by what some schools were dealing with or what they had achieved. In some situations school staff was judged negatively when there seemed to be more issues to deal with or less progress at one school than another. Despite the efforts of individual presenters, the variety of stresses, needs, contributing factors etc. were difficult for local individuals to appreciate, this could only be compounded by a board even further removed from the school and community.

Question: How can someone from even further away accurately assess the needs of our local schools when they come from a totally different social, economical, and cultural situation? They won't be traveling to the various schools and spending sufficient time in regular visits to develop a true appreciation of each situation. Bigger is not always better.

As an educator and administrator that was part of the last amalgamation process I would like to know the benefits of that process?

1. Was there improved graduation rates?
2. Was there improved reading, or PISA scores?
3. Was there improved participation in education by all parties?
4. What was the cost?
5. What were the savings?

As none of this has been researched or reported, it would beg the question as to why further amalgamation is even being considered.

Saskatchewan currently has the lowest number of school divisions in Canada by half or more than half of the other provinces. Efficiency seems to be a major point repeatedly emphasized by the government. From past to present the main reason for change has been money.

1. Perrins' Report indicated that as of November 9, 2016 the "\$5 million target has been surpassed with school divisions noting that \$8 million in efficiencies were achieved by August 31, 2016. On November 22, 2016 the Saskatchewan School Boards Association (SSBA) reported that school divisions have identified approximately \$9 million in accumulated savings for the 2015-2016 school year as well \$6.4 million in planned reductions in FTE/positions and vacancy management during the school year."
2. This should indicate that current school divisions and elected school boards can assist the government in achieving efficiency when given the opportunity and time.
3. Where is the efficiency in spending significant funds on restructuring that could be better spent on education our children and building a strong future for Saskatchewan?

If research has been completed in regards to other models of governance being suggested, it has not been made available to the public or current boards. Yet, in Perrins' report, he noted that Newfoundland had tried appointed boards which were reversed after a public referendum.

1. Our current school boards provide local voice and representation.
2. Current School Boards are elected, meaning that if we as parents or community members can approach them regarding concerns and questions having an integral part in education.
3. If we find an issue, we can meet **locally** with the current board in a convenient manner.
4. Local board members understand the needs of our communities, the cultural backgrounds, and the strengths.
5. Local board members volunteer a huge amount of time outside of the meetings to support and grow education in our communities. They are invested in our students' education and success.
6. Local boards are more aware of the needs of each community in terms of building, transportation, staffing etc. than someone from an appointed board far removed from our rural area.
7. The SSBA's guiding principle is that public education is best governed by locally elected accountable boards of education. The government expounds on Saskatchewan Strong, well, what could be better than public involvement in student success and growing education?

One reason given for considering further amalgamation of school divisions and appointed boards is that of a lack of student achievement. Perrin stated that "School Boards form only one element of the context in which learning occurs and thus it is challenging to isolate the impact of school board governance on student achievement."

1. Provincial goals for graduation and reading were set for 2020, yet the statistics used in the report were from 2013 and 2015.

2. Graduation rates stated could be attributed to the restructuring that took place 10 years ago as they were the first group to be impacted by this.
3. The Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP) has only been in operation for two school years, but Perrin points out the good results. "All 28 school divisions are participating in Saskatchewan Reads and the percentage of students reading at grade level in Grade 3 has increased from 65 percent in 2013 to 74 percent in June 2016. " Imagine what could be the result in another 4 years?

There seems to be reference to what set of skills individual board members bring to their jobs, suggesting that they are not competent, so board members should be appointed based on skill sets.

1. Numerous Ministers within our past and current government have not had any background in their job assignments, maybe we should appoint more people with a background in the respective area being governed.
2. Elected board members are only re-elected if they are representing the wishes of the electorate and getting the job done. This may be worth considering in the political arena as well.
3. Local elected board members provide the public with a direct voice and leads to heightened civic engagement. They are accountable to the local community and independent from the administration, giving them a degree of freedom for their actions.

In conclusion, I am frustrated and angry. There has been little time to respond to this government edict given at the opportune time of Christmas holidays when Saskatchewan citizens might not be as cognizant of the news. There appears to be little planning as there are no details of how each of the 3 options for restructuring would take place or their ripple effect. I am not against change or I would not have been an educator or administrator.

I would encourage the government to suspend their actions in regards to restructuring and work with the current SSBA and local School Boards to move closer to their goals.

I oppose the idea of restructuring at this time and oppose appointed school boards.

I thank you in advance for taking the time to consider points I have raised and listening to the voices of your electorate.

Yours in Education,

ph: 306 367 4934

Hon Don Morgan
Minister of Education
Legislative Building
Regina SK, S4S 0B3.

Dear Sir,

Having read the report produced by Dan Perrins and its suggestions for changes to the governance of education in the province I would like to respond with my input.

First of all I would like to acknowledge the financial pressures the government is facing and the need to find efficiencies in the public sector. As I learned from the report, the changes in funding in the education sector have placed the government in a position where, while providing direct funding to school boards, they do not have control as to how those dollars are spent. The report also demonstrated the significant cost of reimbursing school trustees for their service. It is apparent that those concerns are the motivators for the government to gain more control over how money is spent in our schools and to reduce the number of elected officials in the school system.

As an elected government I believe there are other factors that the government needs to consider in these decisions, some which have been raised by the Saskatchewan School Boards Association, others which may not have.

The goal of reducing governance costs seems prudent, however at best, it seems inconsistent with the governments own move in your previous portfolio as Justice Minister to increase the number of MLA's from 58 to 61 in the previous election. It also seems at odds with goal of increasing First Nations engagement in the education system. Currently four of the trustees in the division are granted to members of four respective First Nations in our division, in addition to the regular trustees serving a geographic region. This point aside, I believe that local

elected school officials that are accessible to parents and community members provide an essential link that ensures our schools are responsive to local needs and conditions. As an SCC chair I can cite numerous examples of how our community has been better served because of these relationships, relationships that would not exist, if we were administered by a provincial board. Improvements in the education system need to account for the incredible diversity in the schools and communities of this province that resist one size fits all solutions. Policies, procedures, staffing formulas, etc, that may work well in Saskatoon, will be at best irrelevant, at worst damaging to the education in our small rural school. The only way to ensure that education remains suited to, and effective in diverse communities is to have strong local voices, as currently exists in our local school boards.

Secondly, the goal to gain efficiencies in the education sector needs to account more fully for the vast geographic areas that many school divisions serve. My five year involvement as an SCC member has provided some insight into the administration of our school division, and how much of a challenge distance poses. Whether it is maintenance staff, speech pathologists, or superintendents, all must spend significant portions of their time traveling to the schools they serve. (One school is over two hour's drive from head office.) Attempts to further centralize these services would likely have a negative impact on cost effectiveness as travel costs would eliminate any other efficiencies gained. A move to a provincially administered system will likely increase the levels of bureaucracy, not reduce them. In my opinion efficiencies would be best gained by divisions collaborating on services such as web services and payroll that are duplicated between divisions.

Thirdly, the government needs to account more fully for the cost involved in their proposed changes. Any radical changes to the system will cause significant interruption to the education of our children as the support systems for local schools are changed. Frequent shifts in curriculum delivery, educational ideology, and administration pose significant challenges to front line staff as they have to shift their focus from classroom instruction to learning new administrative protocols. This is a price that I will not appreciate my children paying. Related to this are the significant financial costs of renegeing on contracts made in good faith by local school boards. Whether these contracts be employment, bussing, maintenance, or otherwise, early cancelation or buyouts will have taxpayers paying large sums of money for services that are

never delivered with the vague promise that these losses will be recovered through future efficiencies.

Finally, the government needs to acknowledge that of all the public sectors, education is one of the largest benefactors of local volunteer hours, community fundraising, and other goodwill that serves to directly lower the cost and improve the quality of education in classrooms across the province. In the past five years our local school has benefited from new lockers, a new gym floor, a new backstop, thousands of dollars in sports equipment, reduced rates for landscaping services, and countless volunteer hours spent in classrooms enriching the lives of students. Unpopular shifts in public policy can be very damaging to the goodwill of communities and what they are willing to invest in public education in their community. I believe the government would be well advised to listen closely to the response from the public in these matters, reconsider the length of their consultation process, and ensure that the critical relationships with local communities remain healthy as we move forward with education in this province.

I trust that the issues of the need for a local voice, the differing needs of diverse communities, the large geographic areas that need to be served, and the cost of restructuring will be fully understood and accounted for before the government proceeds with recommendations of Mr. Perrin's report.

Sincerely,



Agriculture is Everyone's Business

January 23, 2017

Honourable Don Morgan, Q.C.
Deputy Premier and Minister of Education

Dear Minister Morgan:

I am writing on behalf of the Agricultural Producers Association of Saskatchewan to inform you of a resolution that was recently passed at our 2016 Annual Meeting (November 29-December 1, 2016).

The resolution reads:

BE IT RESOLVED that APAS support a delivery model for health and education services for rural Saskatchewan that is cost-effective and efficient, but does not include the forced amalgamation of health regions and school divisions.

Local voice in decision-making is essential to ensuring accountable and transparent education outcomes. As part of your Ministry's ongoing review of educational governance, APAS wishes to express our support for the present number of elected school boards and divisions that serve rural Saskatchewan.

Maintaining equitable education standards across the province is an additional concern that we'd like to see addressed as part of this review process. In 2014, APAS passed a resolution requesting the Ministry introduce provincial standards specifying the maximum amount of time students can spend on the bus each day. We recommended no longer than two hours per day of bus travel for elementary students. Our expectation was that school divisions should be provided the requisite resources to meet or exceed the basic minimum standard. APAS requests that the Advisory Panel consider the use of these types of base-line standards as a means of maintaining a consistent quality of education services across the province.



Schools are an integral part of the economic and service infrastructure that serves agricultural communities. While we understand the need to strive for continuous improvement of government service delivery, it is essential that educational opportunities be readily available to serve the present and future needs of rural Saskatchewan. We hope that the Ministry will adopt our recommendations to preserve rural Saskatchewan's existing governance structure, while establishing minimum standards to ensure the quality of education remains consistent across the province.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input.

Yours Sincerely,

Sincerely,

Todd Lewis
President



January 23, 2017

Big River, SK.

Saskatchewan Rivers Public School Division

Dear Minister Morgan,

I am writing as a concerned parent and teacher. Though my son is not yet in school, I feel the need to express my concern on his behalf as I want him to receive the best education possible in the public school system in Saskatchewan.

One of my main concerns is the idea of government appointed trustees. Our locally elected school board members provide a local voice and representation of our tax dollars. I believe that appointed trustees would not be in the best interest of our children or our schools. Locally elected members are able to immerse themselves in the communities in which they represent. They develop personal relationships with the schools that they serve. Knowing the communities they represent is invaluable in understanding the unique strengths and needs of individual schools within the larger divisions. Neighbouring schools can be extremely different and I fear that an appointed trustee who is unaware of the uniqueness and needs of our communities will be unable to advocate effectively for our schools which in turn may adversely affect our children's education. I strongly believe in exercising my right to vote and that our school board trustees be voted in by the public they serve.

I am also concerned about the options provided for restructuring governance of our public schools. It concerns me that the options are so far ranging. This leads me to believe that there is not a clear understanding of what exactly these recommendations are supposed to address. After reading the Perrins Report I feel that the four options provided are ONLY about money and not about the quality of education that we are providing our students. Our children should be viewed as an investment into the future of Saskatchewan, not a way to save money. The Perrins Report fails to demonstrate how each (or any) of the proposed options will save money and/or how they will benefit our students. Shouldn't that be our priority? Our children. Our future.

As the Minister responsible for Education in Saskatchewan, I would like to strongly urge you to oppose government appointed school boards and prioritize our children's education over budget concerns. I believe that our school divisions can find efficiencies that will not detract from the quality of education that our children receive in our public schools.

Sincerely,

January 20, 2017

To The Minister of Education of the Province of Saskatchewan:

As both a teacher and a parent, citizen of Lloydminster, and a resident of the Province of Alberta, I have some concerns with the proposed school district changes within your province.

In the city of Lloydminster, we have a long-standing charter that clearly states that within the city, there will be a seamless delivery of education, no matter what part of the city you live, what religion you are, and that the opportunities for our children will be equal. The funding that is received from both provinces is shared within the city. If amalgamated, The Lloydminster Public School Division, would have difficulties in being able to equally share that funding with any schools outside of the city limits, as well as making sure education delivery is equal to that of its sister school division, the Lloydminster Catholic Division. This would cause many families to reconsider their educational options, and potentially affect school populations, as well as the jobs of those employed by the school division. This would go against the Lloydminster Charter which has stood in place for the past 84 years.

After reviewing the recommendations and the report, there is little detail on how the province intends to save money by combining school divisions. The process appears rushed, and more about the province making powerful decisions, rather than taking the needs of our students into the forefront. As a teacher, I am concerned as to how the delivery of programs will change, and whether or not my student's needs will be able to be met with the proposed changes to leadership, governance and possibly funding allocations. As a parent, I am concerned that my child's educational opportunities in our home city of Lloydminster would possibly be less than others within our community.

Our Lloydminster Public School Division currently has forward thinking on learning, assessment, funding and the most important, future planning for our students. My family is in full support of the Lloydminster Public School Division being excluded from the amalgamations within the Province of Saskatchewan, based on the current Lloydminster Charter that promises seamless delivery of education across the city, funding and programming opportunities for our students and children, as well as a locally elected school board, that the community can speak to and where they can share their concerns. It would be considerably less disruptive to the educational system, currently and historically in place in Lloydminster, to be excluded from the amalgamations to avoid working under new boards, leadership, mandates and regulations.

Sincerely,

To: The Honorable Don Morgan; Minister of Education,

Jan. 20, 2017

I am writing to express my concern regarding the recent recommendations from Mr. Perrin's report regarding proposed changes to the governance of education in Saskatchewan. I live in Lloydminster and am both an educator and a parent in the system. Lloydminster is a unique area of the province because it sits on the AB/SK border. Over the last 84 years, Lloydminster has worked with both governments to create a model of seamless delivery of educational services to the children of Lloydminster. It has been a complex process with many intricacies involved.

I do not wish to see any change to the Lloydminster Public School Division's (LPSD) system of governance. Children in our division are served well. Our results speak for themselves. We have among the highest graduation rates and the highest literacy rates in the province of Saskatchewan. There are many contributing factors among them being that we are a relatively small division that has worked collaboratively with the government, school board, division office, parent council, administrators, teachers, and families to ensure personal excellence for students. We are able to provide the types of programming and differentiation needed because we are able to collaboratively assess the needs of students and teachers and provide what is needed. I believe any changes to this system would harm our ability to continue to provide quality, seamless, equitable service to the students in our division.

It is my belief that the concerns identified in the Educational Governance Review Report can be addressed through less disruptive means such as changes to legislations, regulations, and policies. Mr. Perrins identified in his report that school divisions were asked to reduce costs in the last year and cost savings yielded better results than were expected or asked for. He also identified that the optional collaborative work done by school divisions were producing positive results. Those examples prove that we can make progress by working together rather than upsetting the entire system. The focus would not be on the quality of education that students were receiving but rather figuring out how to navigate new systems, relationships, regulations, and expectations. That would be costly financially and damaging to students in the learning process.

I implore you to look for less disruptive ways to ensure students receive quality education. At the very least, please understand the complexities of Lloydminster and let us continue to do the good work we do without changing our system. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

CC: Colleen Young
Richard Starke

January 18, 2017

To Whom It May Concern:

At our most recent School Community Council meeting held on January 17, 2017, we had an in-depth discussion regarding the proposed changes suggested by Mr. Dan Perrins in his Educational Governance Review Report. We discussed the various options outlined in the report and as a whole do not believe that any of the options presented are in the best interest of our local, rural community. As you know, ten years ago, we weathered the storm through a previous amalgamation. That was an incredibly difficult and disruptive time in our division for the teachers and students alike. However, we worked diligently to overcome these difficulties and as a result have shown progress in the following areas:

We currently have a great working relationship with all of Prairie Valley School Division and most notably with our **elected** trustee, Janet Kotylak. Janet is able to attend most of our SCC meetings and represents our school and students very well at the Board level. We as a council believe that she is the voice for our small regional school. We are concerned that with larger divisions, a regional division or a provincial board of **appointed** officials, we will lose that representation. Students do not benefit from moving the decisions further away from their community. We feel that the size of our division as it currently stands allows the voice of our relatively small rural community to be heard throughout the division and the province as a whole.

Since the previous amalgamation, our enrollment has continued to grow each year. We feel as though we are doing our best to meet student's complex needs with the resources we have and as a result, our students continue to exceed the academic levels of the provincial average. We believe that any changes to the status quo at this time is a threat to this success and our students are at risk of suffering through this change.

As a community council, we firmly support the views of Prairie Valley School Division and the Saskatchewan School Boards Association. First and foremost, we want what is best for our students.

- We need to keep our school boards locally elected.
- We need to keep decisions closer to our rural communities.
- We do not support further amalgamations.
- We do not support changes to our subdivision boundaries.

Thank you in advance for your consideration on this very important matter.

Sincerely,

January 19, 2017

Premier Brad Wall
Minister Don Morgan
2405 Legislative Drive,
Regina, SK,
S4S 0B3



Attention: Premier Wall and Minister Morgan
Re: Recommendations in Educational Governance Review (D Perrins)

Dear Premier Wall and Minister Morgan

Please accept this letter on behalf the White Butte Regional Planning Committee with regard to recent recommendations from the *Educational Governance Review Report*. We share the concerns of many in our communities about the proposed changes to the governance structure of our school boards. While we respect that the Provincial Government, Ministry of Education, along with the boards and trustees have some difficult decisions ahead we believe the proposed changes will create a great risk to the students of Saskatchewan and our future.

Evidence suggests that the strong relationships we have created between elected officials, local school boards and our communities has been beneficial to the delivery of education to students in our communities. For example, elected officials in the division that is served by Prairie Valley have established excellent working relationships with the school board and have made a number of changes to meet the needs of students while managing scarce resources. Student population has risen by 40% in ten years, while the delivery of services has become more balanced. We are very proud that this has resulted in student achievement far beyond provincial averages as measured by standardized testing. We strongly believe this is a result of our local school boards having a better understanding of their communities and unique student needs. We are certain that the changes proposed will sever the ties between the education system and decision makers from the local communities they serve and will increase the risk that education is delivered in a cookie cutter, one-size meets all fashion that will not serve students or enable us to continue to build a strong future for our young people.

We respectfully request that you reconsider the recommendations put forward in this report and understand that the communities in our region:

- Wish to keep school boards locally elected,
- Wish to keep decisions closer to the communities they serve,
- Do not support further amalgamations and,
- Do not support the changes to subdivision boundaries.



- 2 -

Thank you for acknowledging our concerns and helping to bring our perspective to the legislature in the upcoming discussion regarding these recommendations.

Sincerely

White Butte Regional Planning Committee

Representing the member communities of: Balgonie, Regina, White City, RM of Sherwood, RM of Edenwold, Pilot Butte and Village of Edenwold.

January 19, 2017

Dear Minister Morgan,

Having read the entirety of Mr. Perrins Educational Governance Review Report, it is our desire to add our voice to that of many in the province. To be clear, we are not entirely opposed to the concept of restructuring the current education system because, as Mr. Perrins points out, there are inefficiencies and inequalities that need to be addressed. We are however opposed to what we feel is the motivation behind these proposed changes.

Educational reform should be focused on empowering students, and on creating teachers and teacher leaders who are knowledgeable and secure in the value of their roles. Given the history of the Saskatchewan Party, when it comes to the education sector, we feel it is fair to state that this is NOT what is driving this change. The future of the province lies in our children. If decisions around reform are not centered on creating a positive difference to teaching and learning relationships, then the reform should not proceed.

It is our belief that the challenges found on pages 20 and 21 of the Educational Governance Review Report can be met with amendments to policy and regulation, without changing division boundaries. We further believe that any cost savings recovered through policy changes should be placed directly back into the education of our children.

Further amalgamation of school divisions, regardless of the model chosen will not, in our opinion, lead to an improved teaching and learning relationship and will therefore not have a positive impact on education in our province. It is our hope that you are able to receive this feedback with an open mind and a willingness to explore options beyond those included in this report. The guiding question for all changes should be "Will this change be positive for teaching and learning in our province?" If the answer is no, then further consideration is warranted.

Dear Minister Morgan;

We understand that there are changes being considered in our education system. You understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community.

Education belongs to the community and we want you know that we support Saskatchewan School Boards and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature.

- ✓ We need to keep our school boards locally elected; and
- ✓ We need to keep decisions closer to our communities
- ✓ We DO NOT wish to see the boundaries of Northern Lights School Division #113 changed in any way
- ✓ We do not support any of the recommendations in the Perrins' Educational Governance Report. We believe that any of the proposed changes will seriously harm our children's education in the north.

Our students would not benefit in moving decisions further away from our communities. Those who live further away from our communities don't necessarily understand the dynamics of the north.

Sincerely,



OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

City of North Battleford
1291 101st Street
P.O. Box 460

North Battleford
Saskatchewan
Canada S9A 2Y6

PH: (306) 445-1728
FAX: (306) 446-3288

January 31, 2017

Mr. Ray Morrison, Chair
Saskatoon Public Schools Board Chair
310 21 St E
Saskatoon SK S7K 1M7

Via email

Dear Mr. Morrison,

Re: K12 School Division Support Letter

City Council is concerned with the recent discussions regarding potential forced amalgamations of School Divisions and Boards. Our Council firmly believes that local education issues should be governed and managed locally.

Local issues are also best understood locally and there is more of a vested interest from locally elected representatives to resolve and create school systems that recognizes the very special needs and demographics of our community.

Local School Boards take action when they see an issue that needs to be addressed. The most recent example is when the three local school boards partnered with the City of North Battleford to provide:

1. *RCMP High School Liaison Officer*
This Officer provides services to the three local school divisions and it recognizes the somewhat unique nature for a city of our size
2. *Emergency Responder High School Credit Program*
This is an excellent opportunity for hands-on learning for students who have an interest in emergency services as a possible career. We expect that these students will form a special bond that will carry forward into their personal lives, and encourage them to support each other to stay in school and pursue their dreams.

This also has potential to assist in recruitment of emergency services workers either through the pursuit of a career, or in developing the knowledge necessary to become involved in volunteer activities as adults (i.e. volunteer firefighters).

Finally, this provides a valuable team setting and common goals that some youths may not have an opportunity to participate in.

Please take our comments into account as Council strongly believes that education for our children should be at the grass roots level with local elected school Boards.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. Bater". The signature is stylized with a large, looped initial "R" and a cursive "Bater".

Ryan Bater
Mayor

cc Glen Gantfoer, Light of Christ Catholic Schools, Board of Education Chair
Ronna Pethick, Chair, Living Sky School Division
Merle Osecap, Chair, Battlefords First Nations Joint Board of Education
Herb Cox, MLA
Deputy Premier and Education Minister Hon. Don Morgan

To the Saskatchewan Ministry of Education in Saskatchewan,

I am sure I am one of many voices regarding the proposed changes to governance in Saskatchewan, and I hope you are listening to all of them.

I deserve to be heard. I am a life-long resident of Lloydminster as well as a health and education professional. I am the one service provider within Lloydminster Public School Division (LPSD) that works directly with children of all ages and abilities and the staff at all 10 schools at LPSD and I deal with the complexities of being under the umbrella of two provinces every day.

I was born, raised, and educated in Lloydminster before choosing to establish my career at LPSD. Lloydminster and LPSD are my home and I am very committed to them.

I am required to be licensed in both provinces to practice in Lloydminster, doubling the cost to our school division and the knowledge and skills required by colleagues and me. We are all required to effectively navigate two provincial systems seamlessly to offer the best services to LPSD students, and this is a unique challenge that we embrace. After being in Lloydminster long enough you become an expert at understanding how everything works and it takes a lot of time, patience, and flexibility as things change often.

Everyone employed at LPSD has the extra responsibility of understanding and working with the complexities that come with working and living in a border city. For example, I see the superintendent of student services at LPSD do double the work that superintendents at other school divisions in Saskatchewan do, as he has to work with two budgets, apply for two different kinds of funding, write two different types of reports for funding, and know and understand the services, agencies, and resources available to students in each province. In some instances the services offered in Alberta are superior to those offered in Saskatchewan, and we at LPSD know how and when to best access those for our students. Are you trying to make them even less available? Does the Ministry of

Education in Saskatchewan really want to take on the full responsibility of taking on these tasks?

The residents of the community of Lloydminster are experts at understanding how our city operates seamlessly and we do an excellent job. So please listen to the people of Lloydminster and understand our unique position. Please really listen to our director and chair of our board of education, as they are the experts in helping you understand our unique situation. We are different than any other community in Saskatchewan. I feel if you listen closely, they may save you from taking on a daunting task that you may not realize you are taking on.

I am a Lloydminster, Alberta resident and when I travel both in and out of Canada, I am proud to explain that I am from a border city, and enjoy the opportunity to explain how smoothly we make it all work for our community.

As an Albertan, it also concerns me if I have children who attend LPSD that my tax dollars for their education could be potentially invested in another community and I have no say in how their education is delivered. That is not fair. If I was a parent in this position I would be extremely upset.

As a Canadian, I am concerned about how these changes are transpiring so quickly. It appears are not being heard or considered because this process is happening so quickly. Several people feel that the government has already made a decision about our future, without our input or knowledge, and is giving us a little opportunity to provide our feedback because our feedback really has no value.

I also have to mention that appointed boards of education are simply a terrible idea. Appointed boards are never true representation of a community's needs. Boards of education need to be local residents that understand the needs of the community they are representing.

I feel any changes to LPSD will cause both the Saskatchewan government and the residents of Lloydminster more problems than we currently have. The current threat of changes in governance is already negatively impacting our community; it has been hard to focus on supporting the needs of children these past weeks due to the stress this is causing my colleagues. This proposal of change to

our governance in Saskatchewan education has actually already taken away our ability to provide the best educational services to our children and decisions have not even been made yet.

Although not clearly defined, my understanding is that these changes are to cut costs, although doing so will also cut services. Have you looked at alternative cost cutting measures that would not impact service delivery? I know I would be open to a salary roll back in the interest of keeping LPSD autonomous. The children I am helping now will be helping me someday when I am a senior, so I will benefit in the long run. I would rather pay a little more in taxes to see money go towards education. Maybe one of our students has the potential to invent vehicles that run on water, who knows? We may never know if we continue to take away from our education system.

Please do not repeat the mistakes of Saskatchewan's health care system. I collaborate with both health and education professionals all the time and we will all tell you the education system is a better organization to work for because there are fewer barriers and more support. It is a domino effect. We invest more in education and you get more return in the quality of people operating within a community.

Student needs, and consequently, the demand on teachers, support staff (including myself) and administration are always increasing. LPSD is very fortunate to get the services they do, but yet students always require more. Amalgamation will lead to a decrease in student services. As a _____ I see so many at risk children. I feel every year more and more children are coming to school underdeveloped and our future generations are at risk. The last thing our province needs right now is to potentially decrease support for our teachers and students.

Sincerely,

Métis Nation Education Plan

Draft

March 21, 2014

Métis Nation Education Plan

1.0 Introduction

The MN-S and the Métis people of Saskatchewan are anxious to be part of the implementation process of the recommendations of Voice, Vision and Leadership: A Place for All and in the actualization of the Education Sector Strategic Plan. We have visited our communities and spoken to educators, students, parents, and grandparents. We heard the views of our community and we heard that our children want to succeed

The Metis community is ready and willing to work with the province of Saskatchewan to collaboratively develop education goals for métis children in education. We know how to successfully graduate Metis students. Since 1980, Dumont Technical Institute has successfully graduated many students who left the school system. The Saskatchewan Urban Native Teacher Education Program has graduated over 1000 fully qualified teachers. We know what our students need to succeed.

We have the skills knowledge and community assets to develop shared goals in partnership with the ministry of education. It is imperative that mn-s be engaged in all facets of education.

Currently, our strengths and community resources are not an integral part of the Saskatchewan education system. Our resources need to be identified, recognized and brought into a comprehensive plan to support our children to fulfil their dreams and become part of evolving Saskatchewan economy.

2.0 Our Mission:

Our Mission is to celebrate and enhance the Metis languages, culture and identity to promote Metis students' academic success in our Saskatchewan schools, to ensure that Metis students graduate from Saskatchewan schools as strong individuals who are proud of their Metis heritage and have the knowledge, skills and opportunities to be an important part of Saskatchewan's economy.

3.0 Our Vision:

It is the vision of the Métis community that:

∞Our students shall be educated in schools that nurture their cultural traditions, history, and identity as Métis people. Nurturing a positive Métis identity for our children is essential to their success in school.

∞Our students will emerge from Saskatchewan schools believing that they are winners, that they will be successful in whatever field they choose, and that they can look forward to living their dreams;

∞Accurate records of the success of our students will be kept by the provincial government, school boards and school administrators. They will provide us with Métis-specific statistics and demonstrate how they are ensuring that our students receive an education that not only makes them successful Saskatchewan citizens but also successful Métis citizens.

∞The provincial government will do what is necessary to ensure that our children not only graduate from high school and receive post-secondary education appropriate to their dreams but ensures that Métis individuals are given the opportunity to direct their knowledge, skills and abilities to the future of the province as their ancestors did.

∞Our students will have the opportunity to learn Michif and the essence of Michif culture.

∞Métis Studies will be mandatory so that all students take at least one class in secondary and post-secondary education. We believe that the study of our history and culture are necessary for Saskatchewan students to develop dignified mutual relationships.

∞Funding for Métis-specific initiatives will be provided as an integral part of the provincial education budget.

∞Options such as a Métis-controlled Métis education system, a Métis School of Excellence, or a Métis Science and Math Academy will be examined to determine whether they might provide Métis students with the security, confidence, knowledge and skills necessary to contribute to and benefit from Saskatchewan's booming economy. Metis-specific schools and education institutions may be needed because we cannot Metis-ize existing educational institutions.

∞Our children will not have to fight racism and discrimination to get an education and job.

∞ Métis cultural and historical symbols will be displayed in all schools in the province to remind all students that we have been and continue to be an integral part of Saskatchewan's story.

∞ All Metis children will be able to fulfill their dreams.

4.0 OUR GUIDING PRINCIPLES

We believe that we must be guided by the ways of knowing and ways of being which come from our Metis heritage. The following principles will guide our actions:

∞**Generosity:** We believe in helping one another and that means sharing in planning, development, and implementation of initiatives aimed at our children;

∞**Reciprocity:** We value the concept of reciprocity.

∞**Holistic Practice:** We understand the interconnectedness of the body, mind spirit and emotion in a way that shines a light on our interconnectedness to each other and all of creation. Holistic practice is the celebration of educating the whole child and helping to support our children to become strong, resilient and positive contributors to our communities. We need a holistic approach to creating change and in supporting those who are trying to make a difference in our children's lives.

∞**Spirit of Collaboration:** From our shared history as Metis people we know that our survival was due greatly to our willingness to work together for the common good: we learn from and with each other.

∞ **Cooperation:** Cooperation is similar to collaboration but is applied more broadly to recognize the need to work cooperatively with all the individuals, agencies, government departments and others to meet the complex needs of students in our contemporary society.

∞**Consensus Building:** Consensus building is foundational to our work for Metis children. We need to ensure that all community members understand and are committed to the educational responsibilities we share. At the same time, we must acknowledge and celebrate the diversity within Metis perspectives and understandings.

∞**Honouring our Diversity:** The essence and strength of our Metis heritage is our complex multicultural, multilingual identity. We have resisted attempts to define us and strip us of the uniqueness as a people who embrace our differences.

∞**Advocacy:** Our children need us to advocate for them. We will use our voices to speak for Metis children and elevate the status of Metis education in our communities, within the education system, and the Ministry of Education. We will advocate through school divisions, through teacher organizations and community organizations in regards to governance, curricula and instruction.

5.0 A Letter of Agreement

6.0 Priorities

In going forward with implementing the Joint Task Force recommendations and in having the Métis voice in the development of the Education Sector Strategic Plan 2014-2020, it is essential that the Métis community have a coordinated educational response. At the present time, there is no single agency which represents the Métis community in the planning, design, development and implementation of educational programming in Saskatchewan. Although the community is rich in resources, these are not reaching the schools because when decisions are made about resources, the Métis are not there.

6.1 Developing MN-S Education Capacity

To offer the expertise and advice of the Metis community, MNS needs to be at the decision-making tables. Currently, MNS does not have the capacity necessary to communicate the needs of Métis students or community members to educational decision-makers. Nor is there coordination of the resources of the Metis people with regard to promoting Métis student success. The Metis teachers in individual schools have been acting as unpaid consultants to other teachers and school divisions but their impact is limited because there are not enough Metis individuals in management and supervisory positions to translate the teachers' advice into policy that will impact the way all Metis students are treated.

6.1.1 Education Director

The most immediate requirement is for MN-S to acquire a Director of Education. This individual would be the point person for the MN-S on all issues related to education. This person will be the contact and liaison between the Ministry of Education and MN-S. He/she will be accountable for ensuring that the terms of the Letter of Agreement are met. The Director of Education shall be an active participant in the evolution of the Education Sector Strategic Plan and the implementation of the Joint Task Force Report recommendations.

He/she will be responsible to the Minister of Education for the MN-S and ultimately to the Métis people. Of utmost importance will be the role of the Director as the voice of the Métis people in decisions about the education of Métis children. To successfully represent the Métis community, the Director will be tasked with finding ways to connect with Métis students, parents, Elders, and educators. In addition to these responsibilities, the Director will negotiate strategic partnerships with the MN-S affiliates, schools, school divisions and corporations to facilitate community development and Métis community education. The Director of Education for MN-S must be able to synthesize all the disparate elements into a coherent, effective plan for increasing Métis students' academic success. He/she must develop relationships with education officials advocating for Métis content and resources in the schools, ensure that teachers receive Métis cultural awareness so that they can teach all Saskatchewan students about Métis people and become culturally competent so that they can teach Métis students what they need to know to be strong, confident Métis learners.

The Education Director will work with the network of inter-related affiliates of MN-S to define and identify the role each affiliate plays in the education and employment of Métis people. Through this internal co-ordination, the Education Director MN-S will develop a comprehensive overview of the strengths and capacity of the organization and determine how these strengths

when brought together will contribute to the overall strategy of improving the outcomes of Métis education and employment.

6.1.2 Métis Nation Education Authority

MN-S needs a Métis Nation Education Authority. This Authority will work with other affiliates in supporting PreK-12 education and will be comprised of an Administrative Assistant for the Director of Education to provide administrative support to the Director of Education as well as the Education Advisory Committee and the Minister of Education for MN-S.; a Researcher/Analyst; and IT Support and Researcher.

The role of the Métis Nation Education Authority will include:

- Data collection and analysis of data related to Métis school success;
- Policy analysis;
- Research and development on issues related to improving Métis school success;
- Researching and writing position papers on Métis school success;
- Proposal writing for funding for innovative projects;
- Funding submissions;
- Coordinating Métis education conferences, workshops, think tanks, student education forums and community education forums;
- Developing A Communication Plan;
- Developing Métis-specific positions on educational matters as they arise;
- Meeting with provincial education officials as required;
- Communicating research findings to all MN-S departments and affiliates to ensure that the pertinent Métis-specific data are used by all who require them;
- Responding to requests from the Métis community for Métis-specific data;
- Advocating for and advancing Métis education in the Pre-K to Grade 12 system;
- Collaborating with GDI Publishing Department to ensure that materials necessary for teaching Métis history and contemporary life, cultures and languages are produced for schools;
- Researching Métis school success and highlighting the distinctions between First Nations and Métis students;
- Studying and addressing Métis student achievement;
- Assessing funding inequities for Métis institutions;
- Undertaking research to define and describe culturally responsive learning environments for Métis learners;
- Developing the Red River Cart Wheel Education Model with appropriate and responsive curriculum;
- Preparing background research on various educational options for improving Métis education and employment;
- Developing Métis –specific responses to the Joint Task Force recommendations and the Education Sector Strategic Plan
- Establishing databases to support Métis education, including but not limited to: Cultural resource people; craftspeople; Elders; musicians; story tellers; Michif speakers; writers; dancers; and visual artists.

- Collecting Métis-specific student data from schools and school divisions around the province;
- Developing in collaboration with GDI, a Métis Memory Cache – a Virtual cache of teachings, stories and images

6.1.3 Existing Capacity For Incorporation into the Plan

- A cadre of experienced Métis teachers who have expressed enthusiasm for the idea of working with other Métis educators and the Métis community towards a better future for Métis students;
- Proof that we know how to educate Métis students, including the more than 1,000 SUNTEP graduates with four-year Bachelor of Education degrees and hundreds of DTI program graduates;
- Métis teachers who understand the elements which create a positive learning environment for Métis student success;
- Teacher trainees learning the latest in educational approaches;
- An educational publishing unit which has been developing curriculum materials that are not being used to their potential;
- Young parents who want their children to learn their Métis ancestry;
- Ile à la Crosse with forty years of experience being an independent Métis school division;
- Current and past Métis educators – superintendents, principals, educational consultants, curriculum developers and administrators who can provide guidance and support;
- Michif speakers;
- Gabriel Dumont College at the University of Saskatchewan which is designed for the development and delivery of Métis-specific courses;
- Métis faculty members in SUNTEP and Native Studies who can teach Métis courses;

7.0 Implementing the Community Priorities

The Community Consultations provided the following workplan.

Metis Community Recommendations	Recommended Actions
1. One Metis Voice /Shared Metis Vision:	Education Gatherings with Metis Educators; community members; students to receive direction

2. Formalized process for MN-S to work with the Ministry of Education;	development of LOA; data sharing protocols; regular dialogue and communication; shared accountability;
3. An Education Department within MN-S to advocate for and advance Métis education	Director of Education position filled; support services identified and put in place; IT support; researcher; administrative support put in place
4. MN-S will continue to engage Métis educators through its Education Advisory Committee to provide direction and guidance to the work of MN-S and provide representation on behalf of MN-S at various educational tables;	Establishment of Education Advisory Committee as a permanent body with terms of reference; specific mandate within MN-S; selection criteria for members; action plan for the immediate, medium and future term;
5. We must engage in and support Métis culturally responsive educational research;	Undertake research that will clearly make distinction between First Nations and Metis students, address Metis student achievement and funding inequities for Metis institutions;
6. Define and examine Métis culturally responsive learning environments for Metis;	Report and promote learning environments which would enhance the learning and increase Métis academic success
7. Initiate the development of Métis appropriate and responsive curriculum.	Work with GDI to create and develop curriculum which will support Métis student success; work with teachers and the provincial department of Education to ensure the inclusion of these curricular materials in the curriculum for Métis students.
8. Ensure that all students of Saskatchewan learn the Métis experience in Saskatchewan as part of their education.	Create strategic partnerships with educators, school divisions, employers and stakeholders to educate the Saskatchewan policy makers about the need to learn about the Métis culture, history and reality of racism in the province.
9. MN-S to support locals and regions with schools, school divisions, employers and Stakeholders in their own communities.	Establish consultation processes to ensure that schools, school divisions, employers and stakeholders know what MN-s can offer to support Métis students ' success
10. MN-S must keep momentum from consultation process.	The consultative data gathered will be developed into proposals for appropriate capacity and implementation
11. Look at options such as Charter Schools; a Métis School of Excellence; Language and Culture Program for Métis students; Science and Technology School	Research and examine the possibilities for developing a range of Métis controlled institutions which have the potential to increase Métis student success.

8.0 Implementing Joint Task Force Report Recommendations

8.1 Overarching Foundational Understandings

MN-S are exceedingly pleased with the overarching foundational understandings of the Task Force Report.

7.1.1 Dignified Mutual Relationships

The history of our people has been one of building relationships.

- The Old Ones tell us that the Creator put us on this land to be the bridge between the North American people and the European newcomers.
- This role that the Creator gave us necessitated that we learn the languages of other nations and Michif was our language incorporated other languages to facilitate communication across languages.
- We learned the different ways of behaving when in the presence of each nation and practiced the protocols that were appropriate in various interactions.
- We were taught to show respect for the knowledge and wisdom of others.
- Our families are multilingual and multicultural. We are in a unique position to address contemporary issues of multicultural, multilingual existence.

7.1.2 Poverty Reduction and the Prevalence of Racism

Our community is painfully aware of the impact of poverty on our parents, grandparents and children. Métis teachers encounter and work with families who struggle to survive in the midst of plenty. Our teachers have developed ways of working with children who come to school hungry. They have sensitive approaches to addressing a child's needs without making them feel singled out for their poverty. Our households are often working class households where employment earnings do not stretch far enough. Often our families are supporting the "hidden homeless" who come to the city for schooling or work but cannot find affordable, safe housing. Our stable families fall into poverty as they look after nieces and nephews who come from Métis communities where they can't get work. Our Elders are often Grandmothers in full time care of grandchildren and struggle to make ends meet while taking care of the needs of the child. These are the realities that we know exist in our communities and classrooms.

- Racism is not new to our people. As one researcher said in the 1950's, these are people who are looked down on by both the non-Aboriginal and First Nations peoples. Our story in Saskatchewan can be an eye-opener for those who came here to make a new life.

- A core of Metis teachers have worked in Saskatchewan’s schools and knows what works and what doesn’t who can infuse the Metis Education Plan with their passion for educating children with their knowledge and expertise;
- We have the capacity through DTI to offer courses to train Metis Educational Assistants to support the teachers in our schools;
- Our Elders have lived in poverty during different periods in their lives. They can help children feel that they are not alone because they do not have the same opportunities as others and show them how to use their resources to prepare for a better future.
- We have the knowledge and expertise to teach teachers about the Métis experience. Our teachers do it now in the schools where they teach.

7.1.3 Recognizing First Nations and Métis Cultures and Languages

Saskatchewan is the home of many Métis cultures, languages and stories. As Father Guy Lavallee has stated, “...*this multicultural nature of our identity is what makes us unique, is what makes us Métis.*”

The idea of a people being a composite of many nations is a difficult concept to grasp. All we have to do is look around the world to see the conflict arising from one nationality confronting another. We represent a different model. Father Lavallee goes on in his prayer, “*In many ways, God, I think we represent what Canada should be as a unified country.*”

Academic success requires that students have a strong identity—cultural identity is a critical component. Recognizing our cultures and languages are keys to our Métis students’ success and in important ways would prepare all Saskatchewan students with knowledge which will make them better citizens of the world.

- Metis people are recognized as a separate distinct people of Saskatchewan by the Metis Act. It therefore follows that Metis institutions are an acknowledged part of Saskatchewan history and conceivably, future.
- The Metis Act is the only legislation of its kind in Canada;
- However, the people of Saskatchewan have never been taught who we are, or what makes us separate and distinct.
- The Education Forums in the MN-S Community Consultations provided a model, the Red River Cart Model to show how Métis education flows from a Métis cultural foundation.

Present Priorities

Recommendation #1 Recognition of First Nations and Métis Languages

We are in full support of this recommendation and are prepared to enter into discussions with the government to determine the most effective manner of implementing this recognition and support.

- Michif is the language which our ancestors created in Saskatchewan to reflect our complex and integrated reality. Saskatchewan people do not get a chance to study this language which in many ways is essential to understanding our cultures. We still have Michif speakers who are willing to support Michif teaching in the schools. However, there is an urgency to preserve the Michif language as there are very few speakers left. We will proceed with preserving, retaining and revitalizing as much of the Michif language is possible as quickly as possible.
- We are prepared to support the work in First Nation languages because our people speak and spoke many languages.

Recommendation #7 “Métis in the Classroom”

We believe that MN-S should work with the province to advance “Métis in the Classroom.” We are prepared to bring our knowledge, skills and ways of being forward in developing this very important resource. We will develop it in collaboration with our communities and young people. We will develop a Concept Plan to be approved by the Métis community at an Education and Culture Conference in November 2014. The content and materials will be developed over the next year working with our educators and Elders to ensure authenticity and community approval. We will be asking the province for support in the resources needed but also in ensuring that the “Métis in the Classroom” materials are mandated for all students and teachers are involved in appropriate inservice activities prior to using the materials.

Recommendation #8 On-Going Professional Learning

The Métis community and MN-S are committed to educating the Saskatchewan public about our history, culture and contemporary issues. We foresee the need for one or more Métis Education Specialists to expand the scope of the Métis Nation Education Plan in the next couple of years to meet the needs of teachers and communities in implementing the “Métis in the Classroom” curriculum and with Métis resources and resource people in provincial schools.

Recommendation #19 First Nations and Métis Institutions of Higher Learning

- Since 1980, we have been successfully graduating Metis individuals who the school systems failed to graduate through Metis-controlled programs and

institutions. We know what works. We have a model for success which we know works. We are willing to share our model.

- In 1980, our people decided that our children needed Metis teachers. The Saskatchewan Urban Native /Teacher Education Program (SUNTEP) has graduated over 1000 teachers. As well, we have teacher trainees who can do work experience semesters in Saskatchewan schools while learning to be teachers in our schools. We need to expand this program to high school teachers preparation and the preparation of Métis personal and career counsellors for high schools;
- We have an educational publishing unit which has been developing curriculum resources in support of Métis perspectives. We can design and develop the resources necessary to support Métis Essential Learnings;
- We have Gabriel Dumont College through which we can deliver Métis-specific courses designed as a result of the research and development done to support teachers in classrooms;
- Dumont Technical Institute is able to deliver courses to transition students from the school to the work world.
- Gabriel Dumont Institute has established over the years networks within the Saskatchewan government and corporate Saskatchewan which will be instrumental in implementing the recommendations of the JTF.
- We have staff in SUNTEP and in the Native Studies Department who can teach Metis-specific courses at the university;
- We have the capacity to offer short courses to Metis parents and community people to be Literacy and Math Coaches to work with students one-on-one in specific areas of Literacy and Math;

9.0 Work Plan

9.1 Time Frame

The Work Plan will be a 3 year plan. Attached as Appendix 2 please find a Preliminary Work Plan based on the tasks identified in the various reports. It is not complete. Some items

will be ongoing. However, it is felt that the Education Director needs to have the flexibility to determine the priorities which will come in the final year of the plan.

10.0 Budget

Education Director	\$88,000.
Administrative Assistant	40,000.
Researcher/Analyst	50,000.
IT Support and Researcher	50,000.
Education Advisory Council.	72,000.00
<hr/>	
TOTAL	300,000.

APPENDIX 1
Education Director MN-S
Job Description

Métis Nation-Saskatchewan Education Department

Director of Education

Key Responsibilities:

- ∞ to oversee the implementation of the Joint Task Force Recommendations;
- ∞ to implement the Métis Education Plan;
- ∞ to work under the direction of the MN-S Minister of Education and the MN-S Education Advisory Committee;
- ∞ to provide strategic direction and planning for the MN-S Education Department;
- ∞ to support the MN-S Minister of Education through research, policy development, reports outlining the results of communication, collaboration and joint efforts with Métis communities, school divisions, individual schools, teachers, Elders, students, employers and others who are eager to support Métis students' school success;
- ∞ to oversee the develop of a database of Métis students in the province including who they are; where they are going to school [school and school division], grade level and strengths and needs for support. The database will generate aggregate data on the success of schools and school divisions in successfully graduating Métis students;
- ∞ to lead creative collaboration with other departments of MN-S and the MN-S affiliates;

Qualifications

The Director of Education for the Métis Nation will be an experienced teacher with knowledge of the Ministry of Education, how school divisions work and possess a background of successful teaching of Métis children. The candidate will be familiar with the Métis community, its history and culture.

APPENDIX 2
PRELIMINARY WORKPLAN

Task	Dates	Activities	Deliverables	Responsibility
Building	May 1-June 30,	Letter of	Letter of	President of MN-S

Relationships	2014	Agreement signed with the province	Agreement	
		Meetings with Ministry of Education officials	Work Plan mutually agreed upon	President of MN-S and Education Director
		Education Sector Strategic Planning Meetings	Report on Meetings to MN-S President	Education Director
	Summer 2014	Meetings with MN-S affiliates and MN-S departments to analyze the ESSP	MN-S analysis of areas where Métis input is required	Education Advisory Committee, MN-S Directors, Affiliate Directors and Education Director
	September 2014 to March 2015	Meetings with Education Directors of School Divisions	Power Point Presentation of Final Report: Improving Métis Education and Employment Outcomes	Education Director
	November 2014 Around Louis Riel Day	Métis Youth Symposium "Looking to the Future"	Report of Youth Solutions to Problems They face	Education Director Education Advisory Committee Education Authority Youth Delegates Community Support
	November 2014 Overlapping with dates of Youth Symposium Around Louis Riel Day	Métis Education and Culture Conference	Report on Community Expectations and responses to Task Force Recommendations and ESSP	Education Director Education Advisory Committee Cultural Teachers Jiggers Fiddlers Writers Elders Researchers
	Ongoing	Partnership Agreements with corporate partners	Analysis of specific jobs over the next 20 years; description of skills and knowledge required for each	Human Resource officers of corporations; Education Director of MN-S Education Authority IT Unit

			anticipated job vacancy including professional and supervisory positions	
	November 2014-March 2015	Métis Community Educational Development	Report on Follow-up Community meetings attended for community education, teacher support, parental support, trouble shooting, etc,	President- MN-S Education Director and staff
	Ongoing	Community Education Communication	Workplan on hosting workshops; working with Community Elders and families; Identifying community capacity needs; Discussion of community history of racism, institutional structuralism, colonization, and decolonization; Finding Community solutions	Education Advisory Committee Education Director President and Secretary MN-S
Data Collection and Analysis	May 1, 2014	Data Sharing Agreements with Government of Saskatchewan Vital Statistics, Ministry of Education; MN-S Registry; GDI including DTI; others to be determined	Metis-Specific Data	President of MN-S; Director of Education
Data Collection and analysis	May 1, 2014-March, 2015	Collection of Baseline Data on Métis in Saskatchewan	Report on “How many Métis there are in Saskatchewan?” “Where are they	Education Director IT Unit of Education Authority President MN-S

			<p>located?"</p> <p>"How many school-aged children are there?"</p> <p>"How many will there be in 5 years?" "10 years?"</p> <p>"What school divisions have the most Métis children?"</p> <p>What do the School Divisions know about the number of Métis students in their schools?</p> <p>"What percentage of Métis students graduate from high school per division?"</p> <p>What is the educational level of Métis people in each Census District?</p>	
	Ongoing	Statistical Analyses of Métis Education in Saskatchewan	Reports on participation and success at all levels, in each region	Education Director IT Unit Education Advisory Committee
	Ongoing	Statistical Analysis of Métis education levels and employment	Reports on the impact of Métis education on labour force participation and employability by region	Education Director IT Unit GDI and DTI staffs
	March 2015	Accountability Report	Report on the cumulative statistics for Métis education and employment in Saskatchewan	Education Director GDI Director President MN-S

Research and Development	May 1, 2014 – September 2015	Métis in the Classroom Curriculum	Concept Plan Desired Outcomes Scope and Sequence Challenges	President-MN-S Education Director Director of Research and Development Coordinator GDI/DTI SUNTEP
	October 2014- March 2015	Métis in the Classroom	Design and Development	President of MN-S Education Director; Research and Development Coordinator; GDI Publishing SUNTEP
	March 2015	Métis in the Classroom	Pilot Teacher Inservice	School Division Education Director MN-S Education Director Métis Elders Story tellers Jiggers Musicians Craftspeople Writers
	April 2015- June 2015	Métis in the Classroom	Pilot in selected schools and classrooms	School Divisions Classroom Teachers; SUNTEP
	July- September 2015	Métis in the Classroom	Redesign of project taking into account Pilot results	GDI SUNTEP students MN-S President
	September 2015- June 2016	Métis in the Classrooms	Implementation and Evaluation	Classroom Teachers Education Director School Division personnel SUNTEP GDI Métis community people Métis students; Other students Research and Development Coordinator MN-S

	May 2014 – November 2014	Michif Language	Concept Plan Scope and Sequence Identification of Resource People	SUNTEP Elders Education Director MN-S President
	November 2014 Education and Culture Conference	Michif Language	Community Involvement in the design and development of program	Youth Community Members Teachers Michif speakers
	November 2014 – January 2015	Michif Language	Design and Development	Michif speakers Research and Development Personnel Practicing Teachers GDI Publishing
	February 2015	Michif Language	Pilot Teacher Inservice	Michif Speakers Teachers SUNTEP
	February 2015- June 2015	Michif Language	Pilot(s)	Pilot Teachers Michif Speakers SUNTEP
	July-August 2015	Michif Language	Pilot Evaluation	Michif Speakers Pilot Teachers President MN-S SUNTEP
	September 2015- December 2015	Michif Language	Redesign and Implementation in selected classes	SUNTEP Prospective Teachers
	Ongoing	Metis in the Community	Research and public education documents to inform and educate the Saskatchewan public on the findings and research	President MN-S Communication Officer MN-S The media-Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal across Canada
	September 2015- March 2016	Evaluation of the Success of MN-S initiatives	Comparison of Métis student success in selected grades and schools; Interviews with Métis youth and	President MN-S MN-S Education Director Research and Development Co-ordinator

			compare the attitudes from the Community Consultations in 2012 to 2016	
--	--	--	--	--

As the School Community Council representing

, Saskatchewan, the council strongly believes the four options that have been made available in the Perrins report which will create changes within our school division are not appropriate in meeting the needs of our community. Our student population of 400 students is currently comprised of approximately 98% percent of Aboriginal students and parents. Some of the reasons we oppose the four options include:

1. We strongly believe that there was a lack of consultation with all stakeholders prior to the report and options being created. We believe that the timing allowed to engage with all stakeholders and parents is extremely brief and does not allow our council to reflect, respond and do proper consultation with the parents.
2. As was cited in the Perrins report Northern Lights School Division #113 is already serving the largest geographical area (322,000 sq km), covering half of Saskatchewan. Amalgamating our school division and creating a larger school division would be detrimental to the Northern Aboriginal communities. We currently have difficulty with accessibility to services for our students due to the location and distance. We are concerned that our service providers will be diminished under amalgamation.
3. Currently the parents, community leaders and all organizations of take great pride and value in retaining and learning about our Aboriginal culture and language. Our culture and language is fully integrated and implemented into our day to day routines at school. We believe that it is our role to protect our cultural values. The changes being proposed to our education system will threaten the loss of our languages along with our cultural skills, knowledge and values as Aboriginal people.

In closing this School Community Council strongly feels that it is the Ministry's duty to consult with Aboriginal communities before creating options which do not take the Aboriginal people into account.

Dear Ministry of Education,

As a parent or guardian of a student in the Prince Albert Catholic School division, I would like the Ministry of Education to consider the following as feedback to the Dan Perrins report:

1. **Catholic education is important.** The Minister has made a commitment to continued Catholic education in the province. We are pleased with this response and we would like to affirm this with the Minister and Ministry of Education. I applaud the Minister of Education on valuing the Constitutional Right to have publically funded Catholic Education in this province.
2. **Student achievement is a priority.** Our school division is in the midst of completing the next three-year strategic plan and has had statistically meaningful academic improvement for our students in the last three-year plan 2014-2017. I encourage our Ministry to support our next three-year plan (2017-2020) that staff, parents, community stakeholders, School Community Councils, Catholic constituents, trustees and children are developing that will help our children meet the 2020 provincial growth plan.
3. **Relationships are important.** As parents and guardians of children participating in Catholic education, I would like to have the Minister of Education consider local relationships and partnerships in administering and managing the educational affairs of the school division. These are important as our school division operates efficiently and has one of the highest graduation rates of success in the province for all students especially First Nation, Metis graduation rates. I believe in developing long term, positive relationships with staff, parents, community stakeholders, School Community Councils, Catholic constituents, trustees and children to respond locally to our children in Prince Albert with the goal of supporting students to be engaged citizens who have a strong sense of self and community.

In conclusion, I thank the Ministry of Education for the opportunity to provide feedback at this critical time.

Yours in Catholic education,

January 17, 2017

Dear Minister Morgan,

I am writing as a member of _____ School Community Council. As a parent of a public school student, I support our elected boards and believe they are the best way to represent our students. Our school board provides local voice and representation for our local taxes. I do not believe that having government appointed trustees would be in the best interests of our children or our school. Forced amalgamation will disrupt our students and their learning. Our school divisions are large enough to run efficiently and I believe that additional amalgamation will not create cost savings. I am concerned about the impact of amalgamation on (rural schools, vulnerable students, quality education, etc.). I trust that our school division will continue to find efficiencies that will not detract from the quality of education our children receive. _____, and that they will have our children's interests as a priority. Our children should be viewed as an investment in the future of Saskatchewan, not a way to save money. Amalgamating school divisions does not benefit them or their educational needs. As the Minister responsible for education, I strongly urge you to oppose the amalgamation of our school divisions and oppose government appointed school boards.

Sincerely,

January 22, 2017

Honourable Don Morgan, Q.C.
Minister of Education
Room 361
Legislative Building
2405 Legislative Drive
Regina, SK, S4S 0B3

Dear Sir:

I am very concerned about some of the recommendations made in the Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report. I have been a supporter of your government in the past, but many of the recommended changes would cause me to question continued support. I understand the need for board accountability to provincially mandated educational objectives, and I do agree with the need for minimum qualifications for board members, but I strongly believe that locally elected representation is essential – particularly in the North. School councils cannot replace elected school boards.

As a Northerner, as a parent, and as one intimately familiar with every school in the Northern Lights School Division, I believe that the communities and schools of the North are culturally distinct from those in the Parklands and the South. Delivering educational services – or any kind of service, for that matter – is very different than delivery in the South. I would strongly urge you to consider the following points before turning delivery of education in the North over to rural or city divisions in the South:

- The North is culturally and linguistically very different than the South
- The geography, climate, and demographics of the North present challenges unknown in the South, and even the Parklands.
- Schools in the North have a much closer connection to their communities and provide programs, services, and community involvement to a degree not found in the South
- Delivery of education and support services in the North is dramatically more difficult
- Staffing remote locations is extremely challenging
- Staff housing is not optional in the North – no staff housing, no teachers
- The challenges of the North cannot be made smaller – or cheaper – by adding it piecemeal to divisions in the South

I strongly urge you to maintain the integrity of public education in the North. NLSD employs northerners who care deeply about education in the North. There are efficiencies in delivery of administration that can be obtained through centralization of some services in all divisions, but none should require dissolution and loss of representation.

Respectfully,

.....

Northern Lights School Division

January 15, 2017

Dear Premier Wall,

I am a teacher in _____ and my family ranches north of _____. Our children graduated from _____ and I continue to teach in the school. My husband and I are both members of the Saskatchewan Party. I am very concerned about the changes being considered in our education system.

Education belongs to community. We need to keep our school boards locally elected and we need to keep decisions closer to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community. It is said that "one size does not fit all." I think that the quote fits this situation in that I do not think that people far removed from our community can make decisions that meet our student needs in the small rural schools that are geographically too far apart to be integrated into one school.

The NDP promoted amalgamation held back education for at least 5 years. As a teacher, I feel like we just completed the process of amalgamation. We had several years of upheaval throughout the transition process which impacted student learning. Significant improving in student learning is just beginning to be achieved in the last few years. It seems impetuous to go through this massive process again, throwing our schools, students and staff into transition state. The main concern is student learning and such massive transition and change is negative to the learning. The economic cost to this transition is always greater than anyone anticipates.

I am also concerned about the cost of transition and operation of the newly formed division to local taxpayers through their property taxes. Property taxes are already very high and with the uncertainty of cattle prices and all other factors that affect agriculture such as the weather, further increases to property taxes is very concerning.

I look forward to your response to my letter.

January 18, 2017

Dear Governance Review Panel,

In response to the 'Educational Governance Review Report', our School Community Council met today to discuss their concerns regarding the report. We had the opportunity to pose questions and try to understand the possible changes that will be occurring. The following points were established concerns that we have:

- Strong concern for First Nations and Metis Education (maintaining the programs and supports in place)
- The importance that support staff bring to meeting student learning needs (Educational Assistants, Cultural Worker, School Counsellor, Community Liaisons, etc.)
- The current programming and support in provincial schools (we have families driving students in from reserves to receive the best for their children)
- We are worried about class sizes increasing to reduce the number of teachers on staff to save money on wages
- The Quality of Education could be affected (We know the needs of our students and all have an invested interest in meeting those needs)
- Teaching Individual Students (it is not as easy as teaching a class – we are teaching 24 individuals and meeting each child's need)
- Unique Demographics – (blanket decisions cannot be made, they need to take into account the specific needs of the school community)
- Children can learn with the proper programming (we have worked hard to find the right people that believe this and do what is necessary to ensure learning)
- Local representation from elected boards (they have invested interest in our community and the people that they serve)
- has developed a foundation that has created students that have an identity and believe in themselves to transition to high school (worried changes will affect this foundation and identity)
- Taking the 'love' away from the system (creating an institutionalized model rather than that deep caring model that connects with local concerns)
- This is starting to sound/look like the federal type system of the reserve education that appears to be failing students
- Trying to keep our students out of trouble (programming is in place to provide students with organized opportunities to give them positive options rather than on the streets or in trouble)
- Unaware of Changes, why they are needed and how it is being pushed through.
- Pride in our school and what we do (how will that be maintained and shared in a different system)

- Upset with the report and how it was presented (for some, today was the first time they were aware of the report, the deadline for submissions for public response is very quick)
- If a decision has already been made it needs to be shared (belief by some that everything has been decided and that all decisions have been calculated and planned with no concern of public opinion)
- Shaping our kids (are we meeting academic, social, and wellness needs to create the best people and leaders of tomorrow).

The stories shared at today's meeting of why our families choose and are proud of _____ school brought tears to our members. We believe in our students, our children, everyone wants to see each child flourish and be successful. The proposed changes to Educational Governance is creating anxiety amongst our school community council. It is our hope that any decisions made will protect and do what is best for students.

We are open to further discuss or answer any questions you may have regarding our concerns. Please feel free to contact us at any time.

Sincerely,

Community Council

Dear Ministry of Education,

As a Parishioner in the Prince Albert Catholic School division, I would like the Ministry of Education to consider the following as feedback to the Dan Perrins report:

- 1. Catholic education is important.** The Minister has made a commitment to continued Catholic education in the province. We are pleased with this response and we would like to affirm this with the Minister and Ministry of Education. I applaud the Minister of Education on valuing the Constitutional Right to have publically funded Catholic Education in this province.
- 2. Student achievement is a priority.** Our school division is in the midst of completing the next three-year strategic plan and has had statistically meaningful academic improvement for our students in the last three-year plan 2014-2017. I encourage our Ministry to support our next three-year plan (2017-2020) that staff, parents, community stakeholders, School Community Councils, Catholic constituents, trustees and children are developing that will help our children meet the 2020 provincial growth plan.
- 3. Relationships are important.** As parents and guardians of children participating in Catholic education, I would like to have the Minister of Education consider local relationships and partnerships in administering and managing the educational affairs of the school division. These are important as our school division operates efficiently and has one of the highest graduation rates of success in the province for all students especially First Nation, Metis graduation rates. I believe in developing long term, positive relationships with staff, parents, community stakeholders, School Community Councils, Catholic constituents, trustees and children to respond locally to our children in Prince Albert with the goal of supporting students to be engaged citizens who have a strong sense of self and community.

In conclusion, I thank the Ministry of Education for the opportunity to provide feedback at this critical time.

Yours in Catholic education,

Jan. 22/2017
Date

Dear Ministry of Education,

As a Parishioner in the Prince Albert Catholic School division, I would like the Ministry of Education to consider the following as feedback to the Dan Perrins report:

1. **Catholic education is important.** The Minister has made a commitment to continued Catholic education in the province. We are pleased with this response and we would like to affirm this with the Minister and Ministry of Education. I applaud the Minister of Education on valuing the Constitutional Right to have publically funded Catholic Education in this province.
2. **Student achievement is a priority.** Our school division is in the midst of completing the next three-year strategic plan and has had statistically meaningful academic improvement for our students in the last three-year plan 2014-2017. I encourage our Ministry to support our next three-year plan (2017-2020) that staff, parents, community stakeholders, School Community Councils, Catholic constituents, trustees and children are developing that will help our children meet the 2020 provincial growth plan.
3. **Relationships are important.** As parents and guardians of children participating in Catholic education, I would like to have the Minister of Education consider local relationships and partnerships in administering and managing the educational affairs of the school division. These are important as our school division operates efficiently and has one of the highest graduation rates of success in the province for all students especially First Nation, Metis graduation rates. I believe in developing long term, positive relationships with staff, parents, community stakeholders, School Community Councils, Catholic constituents, trustees and children to respond locally to our children in Prince Albert with the goal of supporting students to be engaged citizens who have a strong sense of self and community.

In conclusion, I thank the Ministry of Education for the opportunity to provide feedback at this critical time.

Yours in Catholic education,

01/23/2017

01/23/2017

Date

Dear Ministry of Education,

As a parent or guardian of a student in the Prince Albert Catholic School division, I would like the Ministry of Education to consider the following as feedback to the Dan Perrins report:

1. **Catholic education is important.** The Minister has made a commitment to continued Catholic education in the province. We are pleased with this response and we would like to affirm this with the Minister and Ministry of Education. I applaud the Minister of Education on valuing the Constitutional Right to have publically funded Catholic Education In this province.
2. **Student achievement is a priority.** Our school division is in the midst of completing the next three-year strategic plan and has had statistically meaningful academic improvement for our students in the last three-year plan 2014-2017. I encourage our Ministry to support our next three-year plan (2017-2020) that staff, parents, community stakeholders, School Community Councils, Catholic constituents, trustees and children are developing that will help our children meet the 2020 provincial growth plan.
3. **Relationships are important.** As parents and guardians of children participating in Catholic education, I would like to have the Minister of Education consider local relationships and partnerships in administering and managing the educational affairs of the school division. These are important as our school division operates efficiently and has one of the highest graduation rates of success in the province for all students especially First Nation, Metis graduation rates. I believe in developing long term, positive relationships with staff, parents, community stakeholders, School Community Councils, Catholic constituents, trustees and children to respond locally to our children in Prince Albert with the goal of supporting students to be engaged citizens who have a strong sense of self and community.

In conclusion, I thank the Ministry of Education for the opportunity to provide feedback at this critical time.

Yours in Catholic education,

Jan 22 2017
Date

Dear Ministry of Education,

As a parent or guardian of a student in the Prince Albert Catholic School division, I would like the Ministry of Education to consider the following as feedback to the Dan Perrins report:

1. **Catholic education is important.** The Minister has made a commitment to continued Catholic education in the province. We are pleased with this response and we would like to affirm this with the Minister and Ministry of Education. I applaud the Minister of Education on valuing the Constitutional Right to have publically funded Catholic Education in this province.
2. **Student achievement is a priority.** Our school division is in the midst of completing the next three-year strategic plan and has had statistically meaningful academic improvement for our students in the last three-year plan 2014-2017. I encourage our Ministry to support our next three-year plan (2017-2020) that staff, parents, community stakeholders, School Community Councils, Catholic constituents, trustees and children are developing that will help our children meet the 2020 provincial growth plan.
3. **Relationships are important.** As parents and guardians of children participating in Catholic education, I would like to have the Minister of Education consider local relationships and partnerships in administering and managing the educational affairs of the school division. These are important as our school division operates efficiently and has one of the highest graduation rates of success in the province for all students especially First Nation, Metis-graduation rates. I believe in developing long term, positive relationships with staff, parents, community stakeholders, School Community Councils, Catholic constituents, trustees and children to respond locally to our children in Prince Albert with the goal of supporting students to be engaged citizens who have a strong sense of self and community.

In conclusion, I thank the Ministry of Education for the opportunity to provide feedback at this critical time.

Yours in Catholic education,

Jan 3, 2017
Date

Dear Ministry of Education,

As a parent or guardian of a student in the Prince Albert Catholic School division, I would like the Ministry of Education to consider the following as feedback to the Dan Perrins report:

1. **Catholic education is important.** The Minister has made a commitment to continued Catholic education in the province. We are pleased with this response and we would like to affirm this with the Minister and Ministry of Education. I applaud the Minister of Education on valuing the Constitutional Right to have publically funded Catholic Education in this province.
2. **Student achievement is a priority.** Our school division is in the midst of completing the next three-year strategic plan and has had statistically meaningful academic improvement for our students in the last three-year plan 2014-2017. I encourage our Ministry to support our next three-year plan (2017-2020) that staff, parents, community stakeholders, School Community Councils, Catholic constituents, trustees and children are developing that will help our children meet the 2020 provincial growth plan.
3. **Relationships are important.** As parents and guardians of children participating in Catholic education, I would like to have the Minister of Education consider local relationships and partnerships in administering and managing the educational affairs of the school division. These are important as our school division operates efficiently and has one of the highest graduation rates of success in the province for all students especially First Nation, Metis-graduation rates. I believe in developing long term, positive relationships with staff, parents, community stakeholders, School Community Councils, Catholic constituents, trustees and children to respond locally to our children in Prince Albert with the goal of supporting students to be engaged citizens who have a strong sense of self and community.

In conclusion, I thank the Ministry of Education for the opportunity to provide feedback at this critical time.

Yours in Catholic education,

Jan. 10th 2017
Date

Dear Consultation Panel Members,

After consulting with other SCC members, SCC Chairs and Community Members in School Division, we would like to put forward a collective disagreement in regards to the proposed amalgamation options outlined by Mr Dan Perrins in the Educational Governance Review Report. In particular, we do not support option **3b**, which would directly affect our own school division.

Among the following documents, you will find a compilation of many comments, questions and concerns regarding these issues. SCC Chairs, SCC members and community members within the School Division wish to have their opinions heard, and appreciate the time allotted to do so.

I sincerely hope that you will actually take the time to read and consider all of the following messages sent to you by your rural constituents, as we took the time to read and consider your own messages to us during elections. We strongly believe that any plan for further amalgamation would be detrimental not only to our children's future, but also to the future of our communities. Our concern is that our voice in education will become less significant and our resources will be stretched even thinner than they already are.

Further to the subject of appointed board members, we believe that it is our right to elect our own representatives, or even choose to run for a position as a local representative ourselves. Our own representative has been so much more than just a go-between for us. attends almost every meeting we hold, even on short notice, and from her we receive advice regarding practice and policy on running our School Community Council meetings, information on government policies and suggestions on how to make our volunteer hours count. She attends many school functions at our school, and within . Although she does not live in our town, is part of our community. These men and women that we elect, we do so for a reason, these are the people that we want representing us, and we strongly believe that we reserve the right to continue to choose who speaks on our behalf.

Lastly, I would like to acknowledge the letter sent out on January 5th by Don Morgan, with assurances that school closures were not imminent. His words did nothing to quell any of our concerns. Such a statement only brought on more concerns that a decision had already been made by our government, and our public voice, which is said to be welcomed and heard will be disregarded.

Received from SCC

After reviewing the report prepared by Dan Perrin's, there are a few issued we, the members of the School Community Council, feel should be discussed.

We meet regularly with our Prairie Valley Board member and are confident that she represents our community's and school's individual needs. Our elected board members have worked with the Prairie Valley School Division to implement a new Pre-K program, as well as a major school renovation that was very much needed to serve our thriving community in rural Sask. With the current size of our school division, which has a wide variety of programs and services, our Board members work closely with our communities and School Community Councils to make decisions in the best interests of our rural students. Having appointed boards, our voices will not be heard and our needs will not be met.

We need to focus on reading, writing, math, graduating and attendance. These are all important issues that matter to our students, families and the future of Saskatchewan. By amalgamating with other school divisions, it will become time-consuming and disruptive to staff and students, and not cost-efficient.

In our opinion, PVSD currently have the appropriate number of Board members to represent the communities in our school division. We believe the present system can work if all the school divisions are mandated to follow a best practice approach (ie. if one division is utilizing a successful system regarding student service support, then all divisions should be expected to use that same system, instead of 20 different models). That would create consistency, but at the same time, still leave us with board members that are local enough to know the needs of the community.

We are in support of elected boards to represent our local voice and opposed to the idea of further amalgamating with larger school divisions.

Our main concern is for our students to receive the best education possible, with equality, effectiveness, efficiency, and without disruption from the report's proposals.

Sincerely,

SCC

Received from

SCC

The SCC from [redacted] School fully supports the Prairie Valley School Board's stance against proposed changes to the education system. We believe that Board members must be elected to properly represent the voice of parents. If our voices aren't heard over the next few years, then they will be heard during the next provincial election. As the PVSD already complies with provincial initiatives on education and has successfully striven to save the province money, our SCC does not see how a school board realignment would be beneficial to our students; in fact, it would likely be detrimental during a transition period as focus would be drawn away from the students. We feel that the PVSD provides an excellent educational experience to our students and that the government has not satisfactorily demonstrated that proposed changes would be beneficial to our students.

SCC

Received from**SCC**

January 17, 2017 K-12 Education Governance Review Advisory Panel, After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report, we offer the following feedback: - We do support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). - It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! We do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. - We do not support any of the three models presented in the report. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support that change to governance or further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. - We have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold we are legislated by. - We need a permanent high school plan, including transportation, to accommodate the best interests of our students, their families, and our community. - Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in.

Regards,

School Community Council

Received from **SCC**

Dear Government of Saskatchewan,

In response to the “Educational Governance Review Report” the School Community Council (PBSCC) supports the view of the submission being made the Board of Education from Prairie Valley School Division.

The does not agree with the thought of having appointed Board members as we currently live in a democracy and feel the our will be lost. The government members are elected not appointed as the voice of the people from their constituencies. Appointed members may not be acting in the best interest of families. May be more pro to government thoughts.

Rather than proceeding with any of the options listed in the report feels most of the school divisions are large enough to provide support to the children already. There are some further amalgamations the province should consider.

Existing School Division should look for efficiencies y in ways to save money province wide. This would involve sharing of best practices, province wide buying power for school supplies, technology, etc.

Changing governance or major amalgamations as outlined in the report are disruptive to staff/students, very time consuming and come at a cost. Prairie Valley could be consulted to see how they have a significant amount of money for the efficiencies they used.

Prairie Valley School Division is at an optimal size already and is already seeing high outcomes for graduation rates, reading levels, math levels, etc.

Thanks for your time.

Sincerely,

School Community Council Members

Received from

SCC

January 20, 2017

Dear Minister Morgan,

Re: K-12 Education Governance Review Advisory Panel

We have examined the Educational Governance Review Report as a School Community Council with both the PVSD Board and members of our community. We understand the importance of achieving the targets in the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP) as efficiently and effectively as possible, especially given the financial challenges the government is currently facing. However, we do not feel that the options presented in this report will result in significant cost savings without negatively impacting the quality of education for our students, eroding community voice, and affecting the sustainability of our community.

- * We support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for students and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP).
- * We do not support the concept of an appointed Board of Education. We believe local voice is an essential part of a successful school-community relationship.
- * We do not support any of the 3 models presented in the report. We feel forced amalgamation puts our school, and many like it, at risk of closure.
- * We want to know what potential changes there will be to the rural school closure thresholds that are currently legislated. We feel this is a critical consideration in evaluating the options.
- * We would like to see a permanent solution for high school transportation and are concerned what impact forced amalgamation will have on bus ride times for our students.
- * We believe that further progress can be made in existing school divisions to find sector-wide efficiencies and cost-savings and recognize that the government may need to be more directive in requiring these sector-wide efficiencies to be realized.

We urge you to do further research, most notably on the points raised above, before making a decision that will ultimately affect the quality of education of our children.

Sincerely,

School Community Council

cc: Lyle Stewart, MLA

Warren Steinley, MLA

R.M. of Sherwood

Town of Grand Coulee

Received from **SCC**

January 19, 2017

To whom it may concern:

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to comment on the Educational Governance Review Report that the Government of Saskatchewan made public in December of 2016. While change is never easy to accept and may come with bumps in the road and "hiccups" along the way, our school community council believes that past amalgamations have held the students and communities best interests in mind and have benefitted all parties involved.

Upon reviewing the options set forth in the Educational Governance Review Report by Dan Perrins, many concerns came forward to our school community council. Our utmost concern is that the options laid out do not appear to bear in mind the best interests of students and their individual needs. The options presented are aimed at financials and the "bottom line" with no regard for students and the communities in which they reside. Student achievement and well-being must be at the forefront on any decisions made by government in regard to education. In the options paper presented, consideration for putting the student first is glaringly absent.

Our school community council believes in the need for a locally elected voice to advocate for the best interests of our students. We do not support appointed officials, further amalgamations or changes to our subdivision boundaries.

Thank you in advance for being our voice with the government as potential changes are being considered.

Regards,

School Community Council members

Received from SCC

Change is inevitable, but change should not just happen for the sake of change. Our children's future and the rate payer's tax dollars are too valuable for activities that do not focus primarily on a positive impact on the front line education in addition to ensuring fiscal responsibility. A local voice is of utmost importance to our rural area. We believe that the elected board is a superior option to an appointed board to ensure that our local voice is heard. The School Community Council fully support PVSD opinion that the current PVSD size is large enough to achieve an efficient school division.

Sincerely,

School Council Chair

Received from **SCC**

We support elected governance and are happy with the current direction of the school division and having a voice at the local level. We believe forced amalgamation and decrease in the number of school divisions will have detrimental impact to our schools and children's education.

Rural schools have very unique needs and challenges and we do not feel they would be well served by the proposed changes. As a small school with a high First Nations population and some special needs children in our school, we are concerned about having access to the resources we need to support these children. Being that we are geographically a great distance from any major center also puts us at a disadvantage. We believe it will be difficult for there to be equal services in urban and rural schools. The concern is that the focus will be on what makes sense in terms of travel time for the resource provider and not on need by the individual child.

SCC

Received from SCC

From: School Community Council

This is regarding the provincial governments proposed amalgamations of school divisions. Our school council has unanimously agreed that we are opposed to any changes in the size of our school division. We believe that an appointed school board would not be accountable to the local school communities. It would simply be a government job that reports back to government. We believe the local feel of our existing school division will be lost if it is expanded. It is an appropriate size.

Although we think changes to the school divisions size are not acceptable, there are certainly ways to make the divisions more efficient. The money spent on this education review could have been better spent on reviewing where the existing divisions could save money.

Received from

SCC

The following letter was written by _____, Principal of _____. She has given permission for me to share it with the _____ SCC and then to send it on to you with our endorsement. We are in complete agreement with the thought she has expressed and would like to add our “endorsement” to it, rather than reinventing the wheel and writing our own letter that would say essentially the same thing. One addition we would like to make is that we want to emphasize our belief in the importance of community representation by locally elected board members, rather than an appointed board. It is our belief that this is the only way for local concerns or issues to truly have a voice.

Received from

Principal

We have some concerns regarding amalgamation and how it will affect the colony schools. We are very proud of the relationships the community, school, PVSD board and Director have developed. The Board, Director, and Superintendents of Education have taken the time to get to know the Hutterite culture and specifically our communities, our leaders, our needs and our strengths. We feel that this relationship has allowed us to move forward in offering quality educational programming, grade 12 attainment within the three year graduation rate, and higher academic achievements for our students. We feel like valued partners in our school division and our students/community are welcomed into all PVSD opportunities and treated fairly and equitably. If we amalgamate we are concerned that we could easily lose that support as many Hutterite schools across the province may not be as fully integrated and supported in their respective divisions. We would lose the understanding of the Hutterite culture and the unique needs of each Colony within PVSD. PVSD has supported us through a variety of ways including supplying quality and quantity of resources, staffing, technology, training, and opportunities for our students. We do not want to slide backwards in our development as the government tries to “fix” their issues with the educational system. We would prefer to remain a solid part of the PVSD and continue to develop as a high performing school in a high performing school division.

Thank You.

Principal/Teacher

School, PVSD

Received from SCC

Upon reading Mr. Perrins *Educational Governance Review Report* it is very difficult to understand how changing governance or amalgamating school divisions is the answer to the financial challenges that we face, to ensuring our children's quality education, or to ensuring our local voices will matter.

- Locally elected boards matter in the education of our children. Local voices matter!!!!
- Our province went through a forced amalgamation in 2006. Most of the school divisions that were created are large enough to achieve all significant economies of scale. How will additional, large scale amalgamation further improve student outcomes and benefit our children?
- School division amalgamations are highly disruptive, time consuming and represent a significant financial cost, plus a very large cost to our students.
- With respect to our particular school division, Prairie Valley: we feel it has an optimal number of Board Members to adequately serve the needs and best interests of our rural communities. It is also an optimal size, offering a wide range of programs and services with excellent results. In reviewing Mr. Perrin's report, we are happy to note that our Board does an excellent job of adhering to the Principals of Good Governance as outlined on Pages 18/19. It also does an excellent job of meeting the unique challenges that are involved in providing education in rural areas.

Rather than 'transformational' change in the direction suggested by the 3 options in the report, please consider an Option 4 - **maintain the status quo with implementation of system of (a) sharing best practices among school divisions and (b) look for sector-wide efficiencies to be gained by the school divisions in working together.**

Respectfully,

School Community Council

Received from

I am appalled, disgusted and afraid of what our provincial government, people we have elected to take care of our province, our families and our well-being, is doing to our education system. I have been a supporter of our conservative government for a long time, but I am starting to question whether I have made the right choice. When the government I helped elect into office begins to threaten both my children's education and my family's livelihood, I can't help but feel angry and betrayed. I am honestly questioning whether my words will have any impact with a government that clearly has no real interest in listening to the overwhelming cries of its provinces' citizens to not do this to our children, or if my words will even be read. But I would be remiss if I didn't add my voice to the outcry.

As someone who was educated in Saskatchewan, who has worked in the education system for almost 30 years, who has many friends and colleagues in education, and whose children have spent several years in the education system, I can tell you that bigger is NOT always better. Class sizes are already ridiculously high, and with the focus of special education moving from academics to behaviour concerns, many students who have minimal behaviour issues but who struggle to learn are falling through the cracks. This hurried report that was done in order to facilitate this move to bigger divisions shows that Saskatchewan is falling behind in many areas of academics; larger class sizes are not a way to remedy this. The trend we are seeing in our lower class/middle class culture now is that education is frequently not a priority for many families anymore. As such, the support from home is often minimal, and it falls on teachers and support staff to ensure these students are not left behind. How are they to do that when they are dealing with sometimes 30 students in one classroom, many of whom struggle with their learning, and many of whom live with various mental health issues and other cognitive impairments? In addition to this, the students who do not suffer from any of these set-backs to their education, the "normal" achieving students, also end up being denied their full potential as teachers are forced to spend more and more time trying to accommodate the weaker learners, leaving the stronger ones to learn on their own. This is something I have seen regularly in various classrooms in various schools.

I find it almost humorous that a government of elected officials is proposing that moving to appointed school boards, rather than elected ones, is a better option. Many of you only have your jobs because the citizens of this province put you there. Now you want to take away our collective voice by appointing someone chosen by the government, instead of the people of this province, in a place to help oversee the education of our children.

I hold a very personal stake in the proposed changes, as well. My family lives in the community of _____ My youngest son attends grade 8 in our community, while my oldest son is in grade 10 in Indian _____ School. My husband has been an Educational Assistant in our school system for over 16 years and currently works in our school in _____. I have been the Administrative Assistant in _____ School in _____ or four years, and was an Educational Assistant for 13 years prior to that. The changes that are proposed are going to be detrimental to my family in a very personal way, across the board. My oldest son, who is trying to find his footing in his first year in a new high school, will end up just another number in a sea of faces if schools are closed and more and more students pushed together. He is already having trouble keeping his head above water, and I know for a fact he is not the only one. If the province is so concerned with graduation rates, I can assure you that if he, along with many of his peers, loses the benefits of a smaller class size, the odds of him graduating on time will plummet. My younger son, who is academically inclined, will be one of those students left to his own devices because his teachers will have even more on their plates when more students with academic and behavior needs are put in their classrooms. The likelihood of him reaching his potential will certainly decrease. These children, and many others, are going to be the ones inheriting this province from us. Do we not want them to reach their fullest potential?

The biggest impact, however, will be on our family as a whole. We are fully aware, having been through it multiple times now, that amalgamation means school closures. The school my husband and I work in is one of those small rural schools that will likely be targeted. Closing our school will most certainly affect our job situation. And we are not alone. When teachers and support staff start losing their jobs because our government decides that these small schools are “too costly” to keep open, how much money will truly be saved as we fight for what few jobs remain and the rest of us need government assistance to feed our families?

This whole plan is extremely rushed, which leads me to believe that the government is not truly interested in what its people have to say. We know this province is up to its neck in debt, but money is not the only thing at stake here. How many other plans were looked at? How much

time was spent trying to find the least invasive solution? And why does it always seem to be the health and education sectors that take the fall for our provincial financial woes? I do understand not wanting to pay multiple school boards, truly I do. And I can see how cutting teachers' salaries seems like an easy and effective solution in the eyes of our elected officials who are trying to save the province money. However, our teachers have a ridiculous amount of work on their plates, from assessing, to planning for a variety of student needs, to grading their students, to the actual teaching of our children, and expecting them to do this for lower wages is unfair. I would suggest that before our elected officials consider something like that, they take a long look at their own salaries and question whether they deserve them for the work they do. If the answer is yes for you, it is yes for our teachers.

I would like to say I am confident that our government will take care of us, but given the recent proposals, I can't. I really do hope that our voices will be heard and listened to. Education has changed greatly since I was a student, and in my opinion not for the better based on what I've seen over the past years, and I feel very strongly that a huge part of that is because of the increase in class sizes which is related to school and school division sizes. I truly hope that our government will do the right thing for our province, our families, and our children. Every person I know who is aware of what is going on believes that we will be let down in this situation, myself included. Every person I have talked to about this believes this government initiative will leave Saskatchewan with lost jobs, suffering families, and children who will fall through the cracks. I hope and pray that we will be proven wrong; that our government officials, who are supposed to look out for the best interests of everyone, especially our most vulnerable citizens, will listen to the people who elected them. I WANT to be proven wrong in this instance.

Thank you for your time.

Received from SCC

To Whom It May Concern:

At our most recent School Community Council meeting held on we had an in-depth discussion regarding the proposed changes suggested by Mr. Dan Perrins in his Educational Governance Review Report. We discussed the various options outlined in the report and as a whole do not believe that any of the options presented are in the best interest of our local, rural community. As you know, ten years ago, we weathered the storm through a previous amalgamation. That was an incredibly difficult and disruptive time in our division for the teachers and students alike. However, we worked diligently to overcome these difficulties and as a result have shown progress in the following areas:

We currently have a great working relationship with all of Prairie Valley School Division and most notably with our elected trustee, . is able to attend most of our SCC meetings and represents our school and students very well at the Board level. We as a council believe that she is the voice for our small regional school. We are concerned that with larger divisions, a regional division or a provincial board of appointed officials, we will lose that representation. Students do not benefit from moving the decisions further away from their community. We feel that the size of our division as it currently stands allows the voice of our relatively small rural community to be heard throughout the division and the province as a whole.

Since the previous amalgamation, our enrollment has continued to grow each year. We feel as though we are doing our best to meet student's complex needs with the resources we have and as a result, our students continue to exceed the academic levels of the provincial average. We believe that any changes to the status quo at this time is a threat to this success and our students are at risk of suffering through this change.

As a community council, we firmly support the views of Prairie Valley School Division and the Saskatchewan School Boards Association. First and foremost, we want what is best for our students.

- * We need to keep our school boards locally elected.
- * We need to keep decisions closer to our rural communities.
- * We do not support further amalgamations.
- * We do not support changes to our subdivision boundaries.

Thank you in advance for your consideration on this very important matter.

Sincerely,

Vice-Chair School Community Council Chair School Community Council

Received from

SCC

I would like to voice my concern for the future of rural education in Saskatchewan. Perrins was obviously hired, for good money I'm sure, to do this report for a reason. In asking boards and businesses to be accountable and transparent, I sure hope that our elected government in Saskatchewan feels obliged to do the same. What is the purpose for this review/ investigation? And the intended or potential changes are to be made in the name of what? Is this about saving money? Is this about power and not answering to anyone? Is this about bettering the education and wellbeing of our students? Is this about Saskatchewan conforming to the standards being set out elsewhere in the world – to turn everything into big business? Because I challenge you to ask yourself – what makes Saskatchewan so special? And yes, it is. We live in one of the best countries in the world, and in that country I would argue that Saskatchewan is one of the greatest places to live. Why? Because of the people. And what is it that makes people here different? Special? I think it is our rural roots. There is a reason that the first kids to be hired on the pipelines in Alberta are Saskatchewan farm boys. Because in Saskatchewan we grow good, hard working, family-oriented, honest, kind, grounded, and respectful kids. And although comparing to many places in the world, all of Saskatchewan and it's people could be seen as generally conservative and rural people (even in the cities, so small in scale...), we ARE different in the country. And I don't want that to change. Yes, our large geography and our relatively small population pose challenges, but I think we need to find solutions to those challenges that do not unravel the fabric that makes Saskatchewan unique.

We do NOT want to be a number.

We do NOT want to be governed by city-folk who have no clue about the unique needs of rural Saskatchewan. I apologize if that offends you.

I know you say there will not be school closures, but you can say anything you want and then do something quite opposite. Even if school closures is not on your agenda, you are setting it up for that to happen. I don't doubt there are some places that needs to happen, BUT, with all of the options laid out by Mr. Perrins, our very strong and healthy school division (PVSD) would be torn apart. We have been through amalgamations before. And we are finally in a place of growth.

The city school divisions have not had to experience this. Nor will this change much for them, once again. Needless to mention, the separate schools (which are already given much freedom) are not being required to bend or 'give' in the face of these changes.

Please, DO NOT create one school division for the province.

Please, do NOT create 4 regions in the province.

Please, do NOT destroy the existing divisions and make entirely new ones. Do not reconfigure the current divisions and create 8-14 bigger divisions. The larger the school divisions get, the less voice students have and the less voice the people of Saskatchewan have. We are big enough already – at least our school division is. We DO NOT want to be torn apart!

Please, DO NOT take the 'donut' schools surrounding the two major cities and join them to the city school divisions. We need a few of these bigger schools – they help us keep the bar high, and give people options. If people want their kids in the city schools, they should live in the city.

We do NOT want to see the future of Saskatchewan schools look like this – city schools with a few large country schools sparsely dotting the landscape, with kids riding on buses for unacceptable amounts of time.

We do not want to see a bunch of big city schools with rural kids being shipped off to private schools, far from home. Do not tell me this will not happen. It's the direction we are headed!! In

New Zealand, many of the farm kids go to private schools in the city... I don't want to see this happen. I want to raise my own kids, thank you very much. Remember, 'we are who we are' in Saskatchewan BECAUSE of our rural routes. We genuinely care for our neighbours. We help each other out. Our kids can ride their bikes around town without fear because we generally trust people. And we'd like to keep it that way. We VALUE this way of life, we VALUE where we come from, and can attribute our success and happiness in life to this rural foundation!

Please, do NOT tell me our current school division is not seeing enough success for its students! We are steadily making great strides.

Do NOT tell me that they are not showing accountability – they cannot be any more transparent.

Do NOT tell me that our school division is not operating efficiently. They have SAVED money in the face of MASSIVE cuts to rural school divisions, among other efficiencies.

It costs more to provide a good education in the country (due to distance alone), but that does not mean our kids are any less deserving of that quality education. If you want to make cuts somewhere, take from the affluent city school divisions and provide more funding to the rural divisions where it is needed.

Our division is willing to work with you to grow and improve – please do NOT insult them by destroying their very existence as we know it. They will share best practices with other school divisions who are not as strong.

If our school division gets any bigger, the work load for our trustees just gets bigger. And we lose that personal connection with them. Our trustee makes it to virtually every one of her 5 SCC's meetings. We are heard. We are valued. Dumping more on trustees not allow them to do such a good a job. And if they are able to spread themselves thin and do it all, money will not be saved. A bigger job and responsibility warrants better pay! This will NOT save money. Who will want these jobs if they get bigger? Who will be able to take on a job like this? Retired folk? Lawyers? Politicians? The wealthy? Will the everyday folk have a voice anymore? NO! No longer will our trustees include stay at home moms, and farmers, and small rural business owners, etc. (And this will NOT improve the educational experience of our kids.)

For reasons stated above, we do NOT want to see appointed boards – to put more power in the hands of fewer. We know these kinds of moves are NOT making the world a better place.

And SCC's are already doing enough – we are the connection between community and school, and we help support our school's Learning Improvement Plans. It is a good sized volunteer job already.

If changes need to be made to education, and of course there can ALWAYS be improvements, you are looking in the wrong place! You will need to other ways to improve education in Saskatchewan.

These kinds of changes affect students AND teachers, families and communities.

Please handle the people who are entrusted in your care, and who are trusting you, with genuinely caring hands. The almighty dollar is not everything. Please show us that rural people still matter to you...

Sincerely,

SCC Chairperson,

Mom of Farm Wife, and Teacher

Received from

SCC

- I strongly believe that the vast majority of our rural public School Divisions are large enough. I do understand that there are a couple of very small Divisions that could be amalgamated with their neighbouring Division and there are always areas where efficiencies can be improved upon. To look at changes to the larger Divisions however, such as PVSD, that currently covers 27,000 square kms, would not result in positive changes.
- Disruptive and time consuming amalgamations take away from a focus on student learning. They waste valuable resources on the administrative side that is required to carry out these amalgamations and will shatter the cultures that have taken the past 10 years to build!
- A move to an appointed board undermines our democratic process that I believe makes our Province and our Country so strong! An appointed Board Member will have no accountability to the public that it represents and will not understand the communities it represents. You will strip away our public voice in Education!
- I believe the Government and current Ministry needs to look at areas over all where efficiencies can be gained across the Province without redrawing borders in a drastic way! These areas may be such things as payroll and benefits administration, IT, or even Transportation, to name a few.
- As a parent of children, a rural community member, and the Chair of our local SCC, I STRONGLY urge you to please leave School Boards elected and not drastically change borders of our public school divisions.

Chair of

School Community Council

Prairie Valley School Division

Received from

School SCC

To the Advisory Panel regarding governance changes to the Education System in Saskatchewan

The _____ School's School Community Council _____ is writing to you to express our concern over the proposed changes to the governance of the provincial education system. The members of the _____ are in favour of elected school board representatives and of maintaining school division boundaries at their current size.

Locally elected boards matter. Local board representatives work and live in the communities they serve and have strong ties to the school and the community. These elected representatives are in the best position to make decisions in the best interest of students in their area. They are also in the best position to connect with parents and local community members.

Our school division, Prairie Valley School Division (PVSD), has made tremendous strides in the last 10 years since its creation in the areas of programming options, facility improvements, technology upgrades, leveled literacy intervention and student achievement results. We feel our school division is at an optimal size to provide a wide range of programs and services and still have board representatives who are close enough to our school community councils to make decisions in the best interests of our rural students and communities.

We do not want to see school division amalgamations which are disruptive, costly and time consuming for staff and administrators. We want focus to be maintained on students and the issues that matter to our students such as reading, writing, math, and strong student outcomes. We want the highest amount of school division resources as possible to be directed at student learning.

There are unique challenges in rural areas and we fear that large scale school board amalgamations would not be in the best interest of our students. PVSD has developed creative ways to deploy services across our 27,000 square kilometer area. Amalgamation with urban centers that do not face the same challenges as rural centers is not in the best interest of students.

As parents and community members we do not want to see centralized decision making. Our priority is the learning achievements and student outcomes of our children and we fail to see how larger school divisions or appointed board representatives will meet our students' needs in a better way than they are currently being met. Without further information on the reason for proposing governance changes or the intended outcomes that are expected to be achieved from governance changes we can not support any change at this time.

- School Community Council

19 January 2017.

Hon. Don Morgan,
Saskatchewan Minister of Education,
(via e-mail, minister.edu@gov.sk.ca).

Dear Minister:

I write to express my deep concern about the educational effects of the proposed options for school division reorganisation contained in the recent report prepared by Dan Perrins. "Education Governance Review Report".

As a resident of Lloydminster, Alberta, I note that our unique bi-provincial situation will require exemption from any boundary change beyond the City of Lloydminster. The potential inclusion of the Lloydminster Public School Division in a regional or Province-wide Division would jeopardize the benefits that our schools enjoy as a result of the funding we receive from the Province of Alberta. As well, inclusion in a broader region would likely result in the loss of the supplementary education funding that has been approved by our City Council. (These funds, approximately \$1.6 million to LPSD in 2016, are used to equalize educational services for all of our students, irrespective of their province of residence.) I understand that our Board of Education has made representation to your Department and so I will not add further details on the particular needs of our Lloydminster setting.

More generally, though, I am compelled to observe that the options presented in the Report are potentially damaging to education outcomes in the Province as a whole. I have read Mr. Perrin's report carefully. It identifies the need (p. 20) for the modernisation of legislation and regulations so that your office can exercise the level of oversight and accountability demanded by the Provincial Auditor. I understand and fully endorse this concept and am confident that your office has the where-with-all to draft and get Legislature approval of such changes. Such action, though, can be taken totally independently of the revision of Public School Division boundaries.

Mr. Perrin also notes correctly that Saskatchewan students under-perform their Canadian and international peers on standardized achievement tests. This situation is not acceptable and measures most certainly need to be taken to improve learning outcomes. The report explains how the Education Sector Strategic Plan and the establishment of collaborative Provincial Leadership Teams are apparently making good progress in addressing instructional improvement and student achievement. There is an educational need and educational solutions have been implemented. I fail to see how a focus on the overhaul of school division boundaries has any bearing on this situation. On the contrary, the distractions associated with forming new

administrative units will drain the leadership capacity of school and division administrators and bring the much needed instructional reforms to a halt.

In summary, the legislative problem should be addressed by a re-drafted Act and attendant regulations. The learning outcomes problem should be addressed by instructional reforms. The wholesale re-framing of school divisions is not called for or potentially beneficial.

Since the last restructuring of school division boundaries, experience may suggest the desirability of minor adjustment in a few communities. Such adjustments should be made in consultation with the respective communities (as noted above, Lloydminster is not among that number). Again, wholesale changes will be counterproductive.

A theme in Mr. Perrins' report is that it is important for School Divisions to be structured for efficiency. The report, however, goes on to identify the efficiency measures that existing school divisions have committed to address. I urge you to allow these initiatives to be implemented. There is no evidence in the report to support the notion that larger administrative units would provide any significant cost savings. Indeed the disruptive nature of Mr. Perrins' four options would likely result in a loss of efficiency.

Last, I want to comment on the possible replacement of elected Boards of Education with those appointed by the Minister.

In that time, I came to appreciate and value the local insights provided by the elected Board members. They were accessible to the community and the staff and, consistently, they held me accountable for optimizing the performance of our Division.

In that context, my experience was that the appointed Board was an effective buffer between residents of the region and the Ministry of Health but it did not have licence to make meaningful local decisions to enhance health services. Clearly, elected boards are more efficacious than appointed boards. **Please do not make the mistake of imposing appointed boards on the education community.**

Thank you for considering my opinions. I respectfully trust that the decisions you make will enhance the learning outcomes of our students.

Yours truly,

cc. Colleen Young, Saskatchewan MLA

Dr. Richard Starke, Alberta MLA

K12govconsultations@gov.sk.ca

Mr. David Thompson, Lloydminster Board
of Education

Who Do Public School Trustees Represent?

1. Local ratepayers through property taxes

The Saskatchewan education system, while a provincial responsibility, is funded in large part by local ratepayers whose property taxes include a large portion to be allocated to elementary and secondary education in either the public or the Catholic system. Who is the voice for these municipal ratepayers? **Not the provincial government** no matter how financially strapped the provincial government may be. If the Saskatchewan Government wishes to govern the education system like it does the health system then it must fully fund the education system through provincial taxation and not property taxation. **Do not make the mistake of drawing a parallel between the funding systems for health and education in Saskatchewan. Neither should the Saskatchewan Government draw a parallel in governance. Health services in Saskatchewan are funded by the Province since health reform in the 1990's; the public education system is funded by Provincial educational grants combined with funds derived through local municipal property taxation.**

If local municipal taxation is used to partially fund the Saskatchewan public elementary and secondary education systems, then there needs to be local accountability to local ratepayers. There should be no [local] taxation without [locally accountable] representation! If the Government wishes to fully assume this level of local governance accountability, then it clearly follows that the Province must fully fund the education system from provincial resources and remove the local property taxation from the education funding system. I very much doubt that the Saskatchewan Government would want to sponsor such a massive change in taxation policy throughout our province. Furthermore, I cannot conceive how the taxation for public education system could change while leaving the governance and funding systems for Catholic education in Saskatchewan unchanged.

2. Parents and Students

Publicly elected school board members also serve the interests (and are accountable) to parents and students for a quality education in all respects. Public school board members are not, at least overtly, elected on the basis of any partisan political party or ideology. Provincial governments are elected on the basis of partisan politics, and their appointees to an education board would be viewed as partisan as their most pressing accountability would be to the provincial government. The public education system should not, in my view, be

or appear to be, susceptible to unbalanced partisan political direction and manipulation. I believe that our health system has been severely weakened and discredited when the provincial government assumed the role of funder and service provider rather than insurer of health services as the publicly funded health system was originally intended. As insurer of health services, the Saskatchewan Government alleviated the financial burden of insured health services for individuals and families but did not direct the provision of health services. The accountability for these services was vested in the service provider and the agency that organized the services. Accountability for the quality and the outcome of the services existed largely between the service provider and the individual patient. Saskatchewan health reform of the 1990's and since has resulted in a direct accountability shift; for the quality and outcome of health service must now be viewed as a matter controlled by the Province of Saskatchewan, whose Government is elected on the basis of partisan politics. Inevitably it has become a political football game without end and the consequence, in my view, has been a loss in public confidence in our health system.

In the case of the provincial health system however, it must be acknowledged that the provincial government funds almost all of the system. Therefore a point can be made that the Saskatchewan Government should direct the health system. I understand that the Provincial Auditor will advocate this position, a position that might be defensible. However the provincial public education system is partially funded through local taxation so that the Province is not, and should not totally direct the education system. Locally elected and accountable community leaders are responsible for the provision of public education services and the differences between health and education should not be ignored. Do not make the same mistake in the education system as Government has already made in the health system. A partisan provincial government of any political stripe should do no more than subsidize public education; it should not become the sole funder, provider and direction setter in terms of education values and beliefs for to do so will ultimately result in a loss of public confidence in the system.

How Would Separate and Private Education Systems Compare with A Provincial Public Board of Education?

I am concerned how the governance structure for the Catholic school system, the private schools and First Nations school systems would be compared to a centrally governed public school system. I fear that the step to centralize governance of public education would ultimately serve to weaken the public perception of quality in a public education and thereby encourage responsible parents to seek a much more locally accountable system that would likely be

viewed as more sensitive and responsive to local issues, values and beliefs. This is just what happened in the 1970's in the United States, and California in particular. There and then, the public lost confidence in the public education system and responsible (and affluent) parents sought a quality and values based education elsewhere. **Research the history of Proposition 13 in California before you decide to weaken the public confidence in our Saskatchewan public education system!**

Choose the Right Target

Before initiating further change to the public education system as a means for possible cost savings, Government must first consider the enormous cost of duplicate education systems in our province. It might be feasible to support a Catholic education in Saskatchewan and meet the requirements of the BNA Act, without destroying the public education system. Does the BNA act require separate boards of education for Catholics? Does the BNA act require a duplicate administration system for Catholics? Does the BNA act require different buildings for students and different bussing systems? If the Saskatchewan Government wishes to save money in governance and administrative costs in education, simply review your funding policies and practices and restrict and/or regulate them! Look first to the system that the Province has allowed, under legislation, to become duplicated and/ or fragmented to serve linguistic or sectarian beliefs! These matters are primarily issues of instruction rather than governance, administrative direction and separate infrastructure!

If the Saskatchewan Provincial Government must save money in education, and particularly in administrative costs, the Saskatchewan Provincial Government has the means to regulate educational administrative costs and allowances. Simply regulate them by establishing grant restrictions or allowable limitations or conditions for use of provincial education grants!

The Saskatchewan Government already bargains and controls the provincial collective bargaining contract with teachers. Perhaps a case can be made against the rising costs of local agreements entered into by individual boards (including Catholic Boards). Why not consider establishing regulatory limits or limitations on how provincial government funding may be allocated. Limit the costs allowable under collectively bargained contracts if you wish (or dare)!

Experience in the health sector amalgamations over the past twenty years has led me to believe that the cost of amalgamating different collective agreements generally gravitates to the higher cost models. The Saskatchewan Government

might be more successful in reducing or rolling back the costs of collective bargaining agreements through exerting increased financial pressures on existing boards rather than amalgamating all public education boards into one. How does the Saskatchewan Government deal with collective bargaining agreements with individual Catholic boards?

Saskatchewan Public Education is the Foundation for Encouraging Canadian Values

The current proposal to further consolidate governance of the public education system in Saskatchewan is very unwise because it would inevitably lead to greater fragmentation and sectarianism in Saskatchewan elementary and secondary education.

I have always considered that the main benefit of a strong public education system is that it brings together young people of different family backgrounds in the same learning environment, while societal values are being learned and differences in cultural or religious beliefs can be discussed, understood and respected. Learning to respect the values and beliefs of other; to learn, work and play with people of diverse backgrounds is fundamental to our Canadian culture. Parents want to know that their children are learning the “right” values; they need to be assured that the education system respects the beliefs of each family and that all values, beliefs and traditions must comply with Canadian laws. This is perhaps the most pressing accountability of locally elected trustees. An education board of provincially appointed “hacks” would not be viewed as being publicly accountable for safeguarding community values. This would result, in my view, in increasing pressure to create more private or sectarian splinter education systems in Saskatchewan.

I recently heard, on a Canadian national news source, a view that Canada remains as one, if not the only remaining nation, to embrace plurality in our society. Canadians have embraced multiculturalism; respecting individual differences in ethnic or cultural diversity and/or religious tolerance. This has historically been the keystone element in building our public education system (and society) where all are welcome and all should be respected. **Why would the Saskatchewan Government wish to weaken this in our society?**

Village of McLean

P.O. Box 56
McLean, Saskatchewan
S0G 3E0



“Highest Point East of the Rockies on the CPR Mainline”

January 16, 2017

To Premier Brad Wall, Elected Officials and the Education Consultative Committee,

I am writing with concern over the many proposed changes suggested by Mr. Dan Perrins in his commissioned report, *Educational Governance Review Report*. While I respect that the Provincial Government, Ministry of Education, along with the boards and trustees have some difficult decisions ahead I do not believe that any of Mr. Perrins' options are serving our communities in their best interest. As an elected official myself, I recognize that decision making is not always easy. You can almost never satisfy one hundred percent of the public. However, we are elected to represent what is best for the majority. In my municipality I believe I speak for the majority in stating that none of Mr. Perrins' recommendations fair well for our public voice. I feel it will be a loss of voice in all of our smaller rural communities like my Village of McLean.

Ten short years ago we saw a major restructuring of divisions by the Ministry of Education. Since that time we, as a community, have worked closely with Prairie Valley School District to establish a great working relationship with both our elected trustees and all employees within PVSD's administration. We have seen our student population rise by approximately 40%, our services within the school become more balanced, and the students in PVSD far surpassing provincial averages. Any further loss in numbers of districts or loss of elected officials could and would have large negative impact on these relationships and results.

I want you to know that I very firmly back the views taken by Prairie Valley School Division and our Saskatchewan School Boards. I would ask that you take this very strong and clear message back to all members of our legislature.

We need to keep our school boards locally elected.

We need to keep decisions closer to our communities.

We do not support further amalgamations.

We do not support changes to our subdivision boundaries.

Thank you in advance for helping bring our voice to the legislature. Your support for our community is greatly appreciated!

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Mark Towers'. The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Mark Towers

Mayor, Village of McLean, Saskatchewan

RE: Outlines for School Board Options

My name is _____ President of _____ Ltd. We are the prime developer in _____
We have supplied the two school sites _____

We have watched Prairie Valley School Division develop over the last ten years with a very detailed assessment of their finances and delivery of programs in all of their diverse locations. As I am a rural resident in the R.M. of _____ it is my opinion that Prairie Valley School Division has done an exceptional job in the above mentioned areas.

Do not tinker with something very successful unless you can guarantee results.

Prairie Valley School Division may be able to increase its size marginally, but it would invite disaster to merge Prairie Valley School Division with the city.

On a side note, my advice to the Provincial Government was not to freeze School Board mill rates for agricultural land, because as farmers (I am one of them) all we would do is capitalize that as an expense and raise the price of farm land. That is exactly what we have done as farm owners.

Simply put: "Please don't try and fix what ain't broken"

Thank you,

SRPSD's

Response to Educational Governance Review Report

January 23, 2017

Understandings

Publicly funded public education is society's best hope for creating a more equitable future for all citizens. Education is a shared responsibility between schools, communities and the government. We recognize the Government of Saskatchewan's responsibility for the establishment and oversight of governance in PreK to 12 education. We understand that change in all functioning bodies happens – it is inevitable.

We feel that changes in governance must support and improve the teaching and learning relationships between all stakeholders, as this is what is truly essential to a successful education system. If change is to occur, we trust that teaching and learning is at the heart of the decisions and that students are the number one priority.

We are the Saskatchewan Rivers School Division #119

We have some concerns with the many factors that may be altered by the proposed change options. We feel that some of these changes may influence teacher time and workload intensification. These factors will also directly affect the most important part of our education community – the students.

Impact on Teachers

After a review of the Educational Governance Review Report (Perrins, December 2016), our group has brainstormed many concerns that may impact teachers and the profession. We are asking the panel to consider these situations in the process of decision making for the education sector of our province. As our contribution to the shared nature of education in this province, please consider the following:

1. Local Agreements: We trust that local agreements will be respected and honoured. How will local agreements be renegotiated if amalgamations occur and what will the consultation and renegotiation process look like? This process may create stress and uncertainty for all teachers involved adding pressures to the daily teaching of our students.

SRPSD's

Response to Educational Governance Review Report

January 23, 2017

2. Job Security: Teachers work for the School Division, not the school. If a teacher has roots in Prince Albert but ends up being transferred to Estevan as part of a single provincial board the added stress may lead to the breakdown of relationships and family, and cause an extra burden for those teachers. If a teacher goes on Maternity leave, will there be an uncertainty as to where they will return to work? If there is a constant uncertainty about jobs or positions, we may lose strong teachers to other lines of work or other provinces and teacher retention becomes an issue. What will happen to teachers in smaller centres? They already feel uncertain about their teaching load and job security. What happens when they are just one small piece of the giant puzzle?

3. Daily Teaching Workload: Right now, divisions know most of their teachers and their strengths and will place teachers who best fit the needs of students. If there is one division deciding the teacher workload, there may not necessarily be the same knowledge base in order to assign teachers in the best interests of the students or the school. Will there be an impact on class size? What are we teaching? Who decides? What impact will this have on special programming? Will Alternative Education classes be dissolved? What will the classes look like? Will students continue to have access to outside resources, such as mental health, occupational therapy, addictions counselling?

4. Policy: We fear that we will lose the strong relationships that we have within our divisions now. We are also concerned about the policies that affect the day to day operations of schools. How long will different processes take? If a teacher needs to take a leave, how long will it take to be granted that leave? If there is an emergency situation within a school and the central office is a long way from that school, how long will it take to be dealt with? If this change occurs, how long will it be before the focus is on the classroom and not on the system change and re-building? How much will this re-structuring cost? Will it take away from the best teaching we can give our students?

5. Relationships with Boards of Education: As before, our boards and school divisions know the strengths of its teachers within their division. One central board or even a few large regional divisions may not be able to build those relationships with those teachers to place them in the best working conditions for the students we serve. How will local issues be dealt with? Every school and location has unique issues that arise that cannot be dealt with a broad brush.

Impact on Students

As a group whose concern is the ever increasing workload on teachers, it is important to keep in mind that any impact upon the students directly impacts the workload of teachers. In response to the report, we wanted to point a few concerns in regards to the impact on students that changes from the new transformational change may have. Please take the following into consideration when determining the direction of change:

1. Local awareness and understanding of needs of students would be strained without local leadership. Given the amount of geographical area, and the demographic differences, the needs of

SRPSD's

Response to Educational Governance Review Report

January 23, 2017

students vary significantly from the North to the South. This variation in needs, and the way local leadership can respond appropriately requires consideration with any changes to the new system. (i.e. Suicide Rates, Mental Health Issues, Transiency, Cultural and Occupational differences...)

2. Many programs that have been put in place (such as Carlton Connections, transitional programming, alternative educational programming, locally developed curricula and other such locally derived initiatives) are in response to local needs, and are often developed in coordination with other local agencies. Without local leadership, how are those relationships going to be maintained? What happens to the in-place programming?
3. Schools are already struggling to meet the diagnostic needs of students. Educational Psychologists, Speech Therapists, and other specialists are in short supply. How is change going to affect/improve this? Will these programs receive enough focus?
4. Teacher-student ratio, as well as appropriate EA allocation to needs ratio, has a huge effect on students' experience in school, as well as the direct one-on-one time which they receive from their teacher. With the changes to the system, will the teacher student ratio increase or decrease; will a norm be set that must be followed provincially? How will possible changes affect multi-grade classrooms?
5. Tell Them from Me, a provincially mandated program, has shown that giving students a voice to in their education has a great effect on student success. Without local leadership listening to and responding to Student Voice, how will changes be implemented, and will these changes be authentic?
6. How will amalgamation affect transportation boundaries and policies? Often these boundaries have been set to respond to specific local needs. Would these local needs be given consideration when realigning boundaries and policies?
7. Teacher materials/programming and learning resources are always a concern. Many teachers have taught a math class of 25-30 students with 3 text books. Laptops or access to technology for students is provided, but is limited due to budget constraints. This directly affects students. With the proposed changes to the system, who chooses the programs that the teachers are supposed to use; how will the resources be allocated; and what is the cost of changing/replacing, or increasing the number of resources that schools are allocated?
8. Change takes time, as does negotiating all of the minute details that would need to be covered in developing such a large change. During this time period, the focus of the educational system would be on creating policy and the aligning of procedures and may not be solely on the students, or on best teaching practice. By not focusing on students and teaching practice, the learning environment of students will without a doubt suffer.

SRPSD's

Response to Educational Governance Review Report

January 23, 2017

Conclusion

Our committee believes that students must come first. We urge the panel to carefully consider the full range of impacts on students and on the teachers that serve them prior to any decision to change educational governance.

A Response to Mr. Perrins Report on Educational Governance:

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Educational Governance Review Report for Kindergarten to Grade 12 written by Dan Perrins. Mr. Perrins must be recognized for the **efficient** way in which he was able to put this report together. To find, review, critique and analyze over 50 documents; to speak to 19 school boards, the Saskatchewan Teachers Federation, the Saskatchewan School Boards Association, the Saskatchewan Association of School Business Officials, a parent group, the opposition education critic, and members of the general public (whose proportional input seems to be largely missing from this document) would have been an arduous task. And then, after that process, analyze and organize data into common themes would have been daunting. And then, develop four recommendations for governance with an extensive list of both pros and cons for each recommendation would again have been a challenging process. And finally, writing a draft copy of the report, editing that report using proof readers, performing additional analysis, writing a final copy, and then printing and distributing a 33 page document all in what appears to be about 25 days. When you consider that this report has the potential to bring about arguably the most dramatic change in educational governance in the history of the province and it was all done in 25 days that is indeed feat. I am sure that there are skeptics in the academic world who have written similar reports and conducted similar research that would say that this could not be done. I am sure those same skeptics might also theorize that the only way that such an extensive study could be accomplished in such a short time frame is that perhaps the groundwork for the study was already done by someone else months ago and all that needed to be done was some minor “tweaking” by a credible external third-party to provide the report with some needed integrity. I may or may not agree with those critics but, it does appear like the report was finalized in a short time frame as there are a number of technical errors and/or shortcomings in the report, especially in referencing. For instance, the following are listed as references but are not specifically referred to in the document...

Canadian School Boards Association. 2015. *Cross-Country Overview of Education Structure for Public Boards of Education*.

Accessed December 1, 2016.

Devarics, Chuck, and Eileen O’Brien. *Eight Characteristics of Effective School Boards*. Center for Public Education.

Alexandria: Center for Public Education, 2011. Accessed November 18, 2016.

Education Encyclopedia. School Boards – Selection and Education of Members. Accessed November 17, 2016

Fullan, Michael. 2016. “The Big Ideas Behind Whole System Reform.” *Education Canada*. Winter 2016: Vol. 56: 4.

Loraine Thompson Information Services, Ltd. 1993. *Final Report of the Saskatchewan Task Force on Educational*

Governance. Saskatchewan School Trustees Association Research Centre. Accessed November 21, 2016.

New Brunswick District Education Councils (DEC). n.d. *District Education Councils: Working Together to Improve Education*. Accessed November 30, 2016.

Also, five OECD documents are in the reference list but there are only two references to those documents.

Mr. Perrins lists 19 documents in “Materials Consulted” but one of those identical documents is also listed in the Reference List.

While these errors may seem not important to Mr. Perrins, my graduate professors would disagree and they would say that those errors take away from the credibility of the document. I also find it interesting that in Mr. Perrins opening letter to the minister, he indicates he was hired on November 15, 2016 but, he was listing references that he accessed on November 8th, 9th and 14th.

———. 2013. *What Makes Schools Successful? Resources, Policies and Practices*, Volume 4. Accessed on November 8, 2016.

———. 2008. *School Boards – School Councils: Pointers for Policy Development*. Accessed on November 14, 2016.

———. 2008. *Policy Brief: Ten Steps to Equity in Education*. Accessed November 9, 2016.

This would indicate that this report was being developed prior to the November 15th, 2016 date that Mr. Perrins refers to in his letter to Minister Morgan. In Mr. Perrins report, transparency is referred to a number of times as being a key quality of good governance. In my opinion, working on a report prior to being officially hired to do so, and then trying to give the

impression in that report that the work on the project only began after being officially hired to compete the report is misleading and not be in keeping with a transparent process.

The report also seems to contain a lot of irrelevant information that has the effect of diverting the reader from the main purpose of the paper (which I believe is governance). A comparison of the Western Canadian provinces by area and school board size is one of those. Mr. Perrin's comparison of Saskatchewan and Manitoba on Page 7 for example, is really not helpful. The fact that both provinces have roughly 1 million people is most certainly a commonality. However, the fact that Manitoba has almost 700,000 of those one million people living within the highway circle that surrounds Winnipeg compared to Saskatchewan's more distributed population makes any kind of comparison of school division size by area and geography in these two provinces irrelevant. Additionally, sighting comparisons of board size on page 8 (largest 22 in Ontario and smallest 3 in BC and Alberta) is really not helpful in discussing governance and using extreme values is rarely pertinent in research. A more realistic number for the size of school boards would be the average board size or the size of board most frequently encountered in that province (which by my quick research seems to be somewhere between 7 and 9 board members). I actually found a School Board in Alberta that has only a single Board member (Northland School Division #61). Therefore the lowest number of board members being 3 that Mr. Perrins states for Alberta and B.C. is inaccurate. In any event, I am not sure why Mr. Perrins would think listing those extreme values of 22 board members being the largest size and 3 being the smallest size would be beneficial in trying to determine a new governance model for Education in the Province of Saskatchewan (other than somehow trying to imply that such a degree of variance in Board membership numbers would indicate that elected school boards don't make a difference?).

On page 9, Mr. Perrins indicates that there is no real connection between Board governance and student achievement. In Michael Fords 1993 study entitled **The Impact of School Board Governance on Academic Achievement in Diverse States** he concludes:

The problem of the American school board is more about perception than reality. No doubt there are school boards that do a poor job, but that is not, as some have claimed, reason to scrap the institution as a whole. The connections between governance and district academic performance identified and explored in the preceding chapters gives no reason to support the notion that democratically elected school boards are fundamentally

flawed. The common finding across the groups in the comparative case study design reveals the school board to be a flexible institution capable of effectiveness in very different situations precisely because there is no one best way to improve academic outcomes.

This quote is not dissimilar from the research conducted by Shepard, Galway, Brown and Weins in their 2013 Pan Canadian Study entitled **School Boards Matter** (see link at the end of the document).

It is also interesting that some jurisdictions that have gone through extensive centralization, are now looking at a more decentralized approach to allow schools to be more autonomous in helping the students in their communities achieve:

<http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2014/01/09/16overview.h33.html>

Denver, Colorado is one of many large systems that are finding it is better for students academically to decentralize their system. Actually, there is a whole country that uses a more decentralized approach as well.

In Finland (whose students do pretty well on the PISA tests that Mr. Perrin referred to in his document), they have a system that responds well to student needs. Here are a few interesting facts about their system:

- Curriculum is determined at the building level by the principal and teachers, and there is no *Common Core*-type curriculum in Finland.
- School boards are appointed by each municipality and the school board selects the CEO, or superintendent.
- No external high-stakes tests are employed before the end of grade 12.
- Most Finnish elementary and middle schools have fewer than 300 students. The largest high school in Finland, in fact, has just 1,400 students.

I invite the Ministry to do a little more research in the area of the effect of Board governance on Student Achievement...there are some relevant studies that are worth consideration.

On page 11, Mr. Perrins refers to the sector plan being “optional” for Boards of Education. While I know that the Ministry is very careful not to use words such as “mandate” or “directive” when floating their expectations for Boards of Education, the reality is that Directors of

Education are not telling Boards that they have a choice in participating in the Ministry initiatives. Actually, in talking to a number of Board of Education members and central office staff members from various regions of the province in the last year, I would say that none of them knew that participation was optional. My understanding (which comes from our senior administration at the school division level) was that the Hoshin Kanri strategic planning process was brought to the Ministry of Education by Dan Florizone who came to Education after implementing that same strategic planning process in Health Care. The process was not an option for Health Care and what we as school based administrators were told was that it was not an option for Education either. If my perception and what I was told (along with many other Educational partners in this province) was incorrect, then a better and more transparent communication system within Education is desperately needed. Perhaps this lack of communication might be one reason why there are conflicting views over current governance structures in this province.

On page 11, Mr. Perrins also referred to the increase in reading rates for grade 3 students between 2013 and 2016. He indicates that in 2013, 64% of grade 3 students were reading at grade level compared to 74% reading at grade level by June 2016. He also seems to credit the Saskatchewan Reads program as being the main reason as to why this increase took place. The Saskatchewan Reads Program was implemented at the beginning of the 2015 school year. I am not sure how Mr. Perrins can determine a correlation between the Saskatchewan Reads Program and increased reading performance, when Saskatchewan Reads was not even being utilized for two years of the three-year time frame he refers to. Additionally, the reliability and validity of provincial data for reading needs to be considered carefully before drawing too many conclusions or correlations. Let me give you an example. In my school, I had teachers who would differ by as much as a full grade level when administering the Fountas and Pinnell test for Reading level to the same student (by the way, Mr. Perrins did not reference the Fountas and Pinnell test but I assume that is what he is referring to as far as reading score data). In conversations with other school based administrators and my superintendent, that same scenario was playing out in many other schools as well. The reasons for this discrepancy are many and varied including teachers not being familiar with the test, the time it takes to master the administration of this test, central office staff who are responsible for teaching teachers how to use the test have varying levels of expertise with the test, first year teachers not familiar with the

test combined with having very little experience in teaching reading, experienced teachers that are teaching reading for the first time without any training in teaching reading, teachers not being given adequate time to do the individual F & P assessment and evaluation of the student and so on (that is not an exhaustive list).

I noticed that when it came to Mr. Perrins study, he personally collected some of the data for his study. That personal collection of data provides an element of validity and reliability since the data is being collected and interpreted by one person (the author of the report). If he would have assigned 1000 people to collect his qualitative data through conversations with Boards of Education, educational partners, parents etc, and then had those 1000 people report their data back to him so he could write his report, would anyone in the Ministry have considered the data valid and reliable? Would the Ministry or Mr. Perrins have trusted the data to make recommendations or decisions? I would hope not. Well, there are about 1000 Grade 3 Reading teachers in this province. They do their testing and submit their results. No one questions their results and it would be rare for someone to supervise the process. Because validity and reliability are not built into this process of data collection and analysis, using this data for anything but an “indicator of success” is in my mind fool hardy. I contend that accurate, valid and reliable data on reading scores for Grade 3 in this province simply does not exist and any direct correlation trying to tie improved reading scores to any single initiative is short sighted. Now I recognize that this will not sit well with many of the directors in this province, especially the ones who are responsible for seeing that reading scores at the Grade 3 level increase. And I also realize that they will defend their data from the ivory tower in which they sit. Again, the reality is that F & P scores may be an indicator of something positive happening, but to quote percentages assuming accuracy to within one percentage point is just poor research and poor reporting. The fact that it is not even the same control group (the 2016 students were in grade 6 in 2006 and a whole new group of Grade 3 students were assessed in 2016), how can you make comparisons?

On page 13, Mr. Perrins indicates that Saskatchewan graduation rates have leveled off in the last 10 years. I am not sure why he states this in a report designed to examine governance structures. Unless his reasoning was to somehow imply that since the amalgamation of school divisions into 2006 (10 years ago) that graduation rates in Saskatchewan have really not changed. If that’s the case, then Mr. Perrin should remember that amalgamation was a forced process and it took time to implement and institutionalize these changes (and there would be

many educators who would say that schools are not at the institutionalization phase of this massive change yet). Obviously there are limited resources to deal with educational issues even when the environment is not turbulent. Amalgamations in 2006 were a turbulent time and it's not surprising that things like graduation rates fell to the back burner while restructuring was taking place. Now that Boards of Education are looking at graduation rates as a specific goal, it will be interesting to see the results in the years to come. School divisions have only been working on graduation rates at the school level as a specific goal since September 2016. So again, I am not sure why Mr. Perrins felt the need to point out that nothing much has changed in the last decade as it has only been a focus for the province in the last year or two.

And whether it is graduation rates or attendance, it seems interesting to me how the Ministry of Education (who appears to be interested in becoming more directive and more in control of how education services are delivered in Saskatchewan) seems to be so out of touch with what is actually happening in schools. For example, a few years ago, I was at a focus group meeting in Kindersley and Assistant Deputy Minister Greg Miller was in attendance. The focus of the meeting was on school improvement but there was a tone of "teachers should be doing more" from Ministry staff when it came to discussing strategies to address the under achievement of some students in the K-12 system and the percentage of students not graduating. One of the comments that I made, in defense of teachers and school based administrators, to ADM Miller at the time was "if you can find a way to get the students to school, I will make sure they are taught and your graduation rates will go up" ...to which he responded with an obvious degree of incredulity, "Do I hear you saying that student attendance is a problem?" When I explained the attendance problem in my school and schools in my division, the same sentiment was expressed by other teachers in our group. Now, here we are a few years later and the Ministry is suddenly very concerned about student attendance. Even within our own school division, I have recently heard comments from senior administration where they said that they were "shocked" about how poor student attendance was in our division. The sad part about that comment is that our senior administration team would have been the only ones in our division who were "shocked". Those of us that have been working in schools have known this for many years but, no one was listening. As a matter of fact, our school division didn't even realize until many years after amalgamation, that they required someone to be designated under the Education Act as attendance officer. But that's another story. For me, the most disappointing and

dysfunctional part of the 2006 amalgamation was the fact that central offices stopped listening to teachers and principals. The Ministry is guilty of the same poor practice.

On page 14, Mr. Perrins seems to indicate that “cookie-cutter” schools are a desire of the Ministry of Education. This is based on his comments where he states that it seems remarkable to him that students in one school division could get a different type of education than another school division in the same province. Now while he doesn’t use the term “cookie cutter”, it most certainly is implied in the text. Research would indicate this is not only not possible but not even desirable. Richard Clark is an educational columnist who says:

In the past 47 years I have studied schooling throughout the country in locations as varied as large cities, affluent suburbs and off-road villages in Alaska. Although I have witnessed many districts trying to achieve uniformity, I have never seen children learn because their school was the same as another school

<http://www.seattlepi.com/local/opinion/article/Cookie-cutter-schools-don-t-improve-student-1268109.php>

Having diversity in schools is self-evident if Mr. Perrins and the Ministry truly believe that school community councils and communities in general should have a “meaningful voice” in the educational of their children. That is what is said in the Ministry literature on School Community Councils...correct?

On page 16, Mr. Perrins seems to criticize Boards of Education for not getting more involved in the decisions made by senior administration. My understanding of the history on the governance model used by Boards of Education within Saskatchewan after amalgamation is that in 2006, Boards of Education in the newly amalgamated school divisions were strongly encouraged by the Ministry of Education and the SSBA to be using the Carver Model of Governance. This model, if implemented and followed in its purest form, does not allow Boards of Education to do the kinds of things Mr. Perrins is accusing them of defaulting on.

http://www.guelphchc.ca/app/webroot/assets/Board_Member_Orientation/Policy_Governance_Summary_-_Carver.pdf

To the credit of many Boards of Education, they recognized that the Carver Model had its short comings. Many boards tried to depart from that model and strike a balance between a Policy Board and a Board that is more “hands on”. Not an easy task without professional development and guidance.

Mr. Perrins also goes on to say that Boards of Education need to be knowledgeable in their role and that is why Boards of Education should be appointed as opposed to elected. Following that logic, does this then mean that MLA's need to be appointed as well? I would think that MLA's need to have a particular skill set if they are to be a provincial leader and in charge of billions of dollars? And what does "having the appropriate skill set" say about school community councils? If Mr. Perrin and the Ministry truly believe that school community councils should have a "critical voice" in the education of the children in their community, would not the same logic say they should also be appointed? If not, how can you only appoint stakeholders at one level and not another?

There are too many other aspects of this report (especially the "Benefits and Challenges" section for each option) for me to comment on without submitting a similar 33 page document myself. I would be happy to share my thoughts further with you at one of your consultation meetings and I would accept the invitation if invited.

Now, after all of that, I am sure if you are wondering if I think that our Educational system needs some changes to improve opportunities and achievement levels of students while at the same time addressing fiscal responsibility? ABSOLUTELY!!

There are many factors that currently exist within the educational system that are impeding student achievement and quite frankly, wasting resources. These include (and are in no particular order) appropriate use and integration of technology into teaching and learning, staffing - recruitment of quality teachers and knowledgeable and experienced central office staff (many current LEADS members have never been or have very limited experience as principals or vice principals or even school team leadership) , an improvement to the teacher education and training programs in this province at both the U of S and U of R, effective leadership at the division level and at the school level, a better understanding on the part of division leadership teams of the change process, the use of valid and reliable data in decision making, a realistic number of people in central office (considerably less than current staffing levels) to provide support directly to schools, a salary grid for LEADS members, an examination province wide of good practices in the field and in individual schools to see what is working and what is not, a mechanism for teacher and school based administrator voice in how to meet the needs of students (and again, this is not an exhaustive list).

Leadership at every level is key and perhaps one question that the ministry should be asking itself is why is there such a shortage of quality principals in this province and why are school divisions having problems finding principals to lead schools, especially in rural areas (oops..I might have triggered another Ministry initiative on something that they did not know existed). I have my own theories on that topic but again, I would be more than willing to share my observations and insights with you at a future date. Based on my experience as a classroom teacher, a Vice Principal, a Principal, a Board of Education chairperson (yes I have sat on that side of the table), and a sessional lecturer at the University of Saskatchewan, I believe I have something to add to the conversation that would be helpful.

In closing, the process of mandated school division amalgamations that took place in 2006 in this province does not appear to have given the province the results that they desired and thus Mr. Perrin's Report on Governance. Contemplating further centralization and amalgamation begs the question...if previous amalgamations have not resulted in higher learning, better opportunities for students and effective fiscal management for the province, then why would anyone think that further amalgamation would lead to that result? If indeed, Mr. Perrin and the Ministry truly believe in Mr. Perrin's research where Boards of Education have little impact on student achievement, then their logic would say that having one Board of Education for the province would likely have the same impact.

I began my response to this report by indicating that I thought the report was probably suspect in terms of its timeframe and its attention to detail. My personal experience in graduate work and reviewing many research studies from refereed journals has been that reports that are written quickly with little in-depth research (like this one appears to be) tend to be reports that are written with backwards design. In other words, the conclusion and recommendations are written first and then the research that supports those conclusions and recommendations are found and added later. That may not have happened here, but it most certainly appears like it has.

Education is an institution where there are not clear answers; there is very little black and white. If educational decision making was black and white, every country in the world and every province or district in the world would be doing things exactly the same. Thinking that this report somehow demonstrates that a new governance model where one Board of Education dictates education for the entire province is intrinsically better than what we currently have seems a little bit short sighted in light of there being quality research to the contrary.

I look forward to an opportunity to discuss your report in a broader forum. However, I also recognize that with only 25 days (allegedly) for Mr. Perrin to write his report, and a similar time frame for consultation meetings that aren't public, that this is "pseudo consultation". My guess is that the decision regarding which model to use has already been made (especially with the recent Health Care announcement) and the consultation process is an attempt at some degree of transparency. I hope I am wrong but, time will tell. I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Some Readings FYI

Denver School Board Sets Course Toward More Decentralized District

<http://www.chalkbeat.org/posts/co/2015/05/12/denver-school-board-sets-course-toward-more-decentralized-district/>

Characteristics of Improved Districts

<http://www.k12.wa.us/research/pubdocs/DistrictImprovementReport.pdf>

Effective Superintendents – Effective Boards

<http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/Documents/Effective-Superintendents-Effective-Boards-Finding-the-Right-Fit.pdf>

Planning and Designing for K-12 Next Generation learning

<http://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/NGT1303.pdf>

Carver Model of Governance

http://www.guelphchc.ca/app/webroot/assets/Board_Member_Orientation/Policy_Governance_Summary_-_Carver.pdf

British Columbia Task Force Report on Rural Education

http://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/education/kindergarten-to-grade-12/teach/pdfs/rural_task_rep.pdf

School Boards Matter – Pan Canadian Study

<http://www.schoolboardsnl.ca/pdf/School-Boards-Matter-Report-Small.pdf>

Size Matters – A Look at School District Consolidation

<https://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/SchoolDistrictSize.pdf>

The Impact of School Board Governance on Academic Achievement in Diverse States

<http://dc.uwm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1334&context=etd>

Response to the *Educational Governance Review Report: Kindergarten to Grade 12*

submitted by:

Parent, taxpayer and trustee with Public Schools

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to Mr. Perrins' educational governance review. I am a parent who has shepherded two sons through the public education system, a taxpayer of this province and city, and I proudly serve the students of Public Schools as an elected trustee. While my board colleagues may share some or all of my perspectives on the report, please consider this my personal response.

Looking at the purpose of the report outlined on Page 3, it appears Mr. Perrins was handed a Herculean task—to come up with a governance structure that addresses everything from improving student outcomes to cost containment to preserving parent and community voice.

Instead of trying to speak to each and every point in the report, I prefer to share some general thoughts and ideas as a trustee but also as a parent and taxpayer.

Students First

I believe that any decision made regarding our education system, whether at the board table or within the ministry in Regina, must consider first and always the effect that decision will have on students. Society's investment in education is long term but students have only a few short years in our system. Their interests must take precedence no matter what pressures are brought to bear on the system, including financial and political. To do otherwise is an abdication of our responsibility as a society.

Democratically Elected Trustees

I also believe very strongly that elected trustees bring value and credibility to our education system. The democratic process of selecting local representatives to oversee local schools creates a level of accountability that would not exist in any other non-democratic structure.

Yes, there is a cost to having elected trustees but there are many aspects of the work that do not come with a price tag. I often describe our work as being like that of a bridge, a bridge between parents and the board table, and between school divisions and the provincial government.

Our connections into the communities we serve enable us to make more informed decisions for our division; the closer the decision makers are to those they serve, the

better the decisions will be. This is local voice, and it is particularly important in Saskatchewan given its geographic and demographic diversity.

The bridge we provide to the provincial level allows us to identify the needs of our individual division and advocate for solutions with those who make the decisions centrally. I would argue there is great value in elected officials dealing with elected officials. A good example of this is Public's agreement with Whitecap Dakota First Nation that saw their school become part of our division. I seriously doubt that agreement would be in place had not there been elected officials dealing with elected officials.

It is also important to note that about 50 per cent of the funding Public Schools receives comes from the ratepayers of . They deserve elected representation.

In addition to our bridging role, trustees also act as shields, protecting public education from undue political interference. The young people of this province are too important to be allowed to become political capital for any government.

Shifts in Governance

On Pages 20-21 of his report, Mr. Perrins details a number of changes he feels must be made no matter what governance structure is in place for education. I concur with a number of these shifts—the responsibility of every public institution is to improve.

In terms of operating efficiencies, there is always room to do better and I see a collective effort across the province to tackle this issue. I would suggest the minister give serious consideration to the 19 opportunities for process and practice changes submitted to him late last year by the province's 28 directors of education, arguably the people who know education delivery the best.

I would also suggest the minister consider building on the momentum generated by the Education Sector Strategic Plan and create a parallel plan for operating efficiencies.

Mr. Perrins points to the need for a stronger emphasis on educational outcomes. Again, I concur. Progress on this front is being made through the ESSP but improving outcomes for students is not the sole responsibility of teachers or schools or boards of education. Significant gains could be made if this government developed policies and invested in programs that address the issue of poverty. I would also suggest a review of our current curriculum, and here's why: in one school in my ward, 35 per cent of the students speak a language other than English at home but they're faced with a math curriculum that is language rich. Are we setting them up for failure by not recognizing in our curriculum the realities of our diverse classrooms?

The minister and his colleagues should also explore other factors that can negatively affect students and their learning: the lingering effects of the residential school system; disparate health-care access for some communities; supports for pre-kindergarten children; lack of integration services for refugees and immigrants; and the list goes on.

Another governance shift advocated by Mr. Perrins is toward requiring a certain set of competencies of board members and mandatory board training. Yes, good governance requires a particular set of skills and those can be acquired through professional development and training but we should not ignore what a group of ordinary citizens brings to the board table—a diverse range of perspectives and expertise; the ability to challenge assumptions and thereby generate creative solutions; and connections into the communities they serve.

On Page 21, Mr. Perrins also suggests the need to “enable First Nation representation on boards.” We have in this province a moral, a historical and an economic imperative to improve outcomes for First Nations, Métis and Inuit students but appointments to boards undermine the democratic process. I would suggest instead school divisions establish advisory panels to help them move forward in a positive way toward.

Options for Restructuring

I cannot support either Option 1 (Provincial Model) or Option 2 (Regional Model) proposed by Mr. Perrins. There are just too many questions, and no answers:

- How does either of these models benefit students?
- When has a government ever taken over an operation and run it more efficiently or effectively?
- How can either model be as responsive to local needs as local school boards?
- While there may be short-term cost savings, what is the cost of shifting focus from students to restructuring an entire sector of our province?
- How do parents with concerns navigate the bureaucracy?

Option 3A calls for restructuring school divisions, another was of saying amalgamation. I have no experience with amalgamation but many of my trustee colleagues across the province have and what I hear them say is that they are still dealing with the fallout from the last round in 2006. Again, it is critical to ask how amalgamating divisions will benefit students. It is also vital that we identify and preserve good learning environments; shoehorning divisions together puts those exemplars at risk.

The final option, realigning boundaries, is the only one worth exploring. It has been a long time since any study of boundaries has been undertaken but it needs to be done thoughtfully and carefully. I can imagine operational efficiencies between

neighbouring divisions but again, care must be taken not to negatively affect student learning or positive learning environments.

Conclusion

It may sound trite to say but democracy is indeed messy. It is also characterized by negotiation, participation, compromise and the ability to tolerate differing views, of which I am sure there are many in this process.

In considering any changes to how education in Saskatchewan is structured, I encourage the minister and his colleagues to tap into the tremendous resource of wisdom, knowledge and expertise that exists in the people who currently serve our students in both elected and non-elected capacities. I believe there are many opportunities and solutions beyond those identified in Mr. Perrins report and it would be shame not to explore them all. While this may not be the most politically expedient approach, it is the one that will serve students best.

I see a real willingness on the part of many to dig in and work together to improve our education system. I count myself among them.

January 12, 2017

Dear Premier Wall:

As a School Community Council Member, I understand that changes are being considered in our education system. As the MLA who represents our area, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community.

I believe the consolidation of school divisions in our province will again set back the advancements that have been made in literacy and numeracy for years. When consolidation occurred in 2006, it held back education for at least five years and cost money rather than saving money. As a result, we are just now seeing significant improvement in student learning. There is ample qualitative and quantitative evidence to support these assertions. Student learning needs to remain at the centre of these decisions. The result of previous amalgamations has historically resulted in the reduction of the number of schools within each respective division. We are urgently concerned about the future of rural schools and whether the reconfiguration of the number of school divisions will compromise their existence. According to research prepared for the *Regina School Board of Education*, (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2007) most contemporary studies of education have concluded, unlike an earlier generation of studies, that small schools are more efficient or cost effective. Please do not compromise the quality of education for our kids!

Education belongs to the community and I want you to know that I support the Chinook School Division and ask you to share these important messages with you colleagues in the provincial legislature:

- 1) We need to keep our school boards locally elected; and,
- 2) We need to keep decisions closer to our communities.

Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

Respectfully,

January 20, 2017

The Honourable Don Morgan, Minister of Education
109 - 3502 Taylor Street East
Saskatoon, SK
S7H 5H9

Dear Minister Morgan:

The term 'transformational change' has been often employed in recent months by politicians and bureaucrats alike, but the intent or the definition of that term has not been made clear. We understand that there are processes in place to ensure that the people of Saskatchewan have a voice in shaping that change. The School Community Council would like to add our voice to the conversation.

For Sun West families, transformational change means personalized learning, which we have been able to utilize thanks to the governing structure we currently have in place. This approach to learning, along with the opportunities our students have thanks to our division Distance Learning Centre, would not be the same with a different structure in place. This is worrisome.

For the past number of years, students and staff in Sun West have been enthusiastically pioneering this innovative educational path, which is based on the belief that students - each with their own unique strengths, weaknesses, interests and preferences - need a voice in determining how and what they are learning. As our schools have come to embrace this way of thinking, we've seen wonderful changes in how our classrooms look, in the language that our children use at school and then at home, and in the choices that our children have in regards to their own learning. In this personalized environment, kids get to take charge of their learning and can learn in a way that best suits them.

Also in line with personalized learning, we have witnessed the creative integration of technology in our classrooms. Our children have regular access to computers or tablets and a limitless library of digital resources to help them explore topics of personal interest to them as they develop the fundamental knowledge and skills mandated by the Province. And because students can work at their own pace, there are opportunities to succeed and grow in ways they cannot when expected to keep up or wait for their peers.

Through the implementation of these innovative practices, we are creating young citizens with the character and critical 21st century skills – leadership, technology, collaboration, social accountability – necessary to excel in the workplace and contribute to successful communities.

The work of Sun West School Division, and other entrepreneurial divisions must not be left to scramble for the crumbs that fall after a massive restructuring. There is great work being done - using lean and efficient processes - to personalize student learning in our schools. We very much hope that this continues regardless of the organizational structure of the education system.

We wish you well in your deliberations.

Sincerely,

School Community Council

January 23, 2017

The Honourable Don Morgan, Minister of Education
109 - 3502 Taylor Street East
Saskatoon, SK
S7H 5H9

Dear Minister Morgan:

RE: Transformational Change = Provincial Commitment to Innovation = Personalized Learning

The term 'transformational change' has been often employed in recent months by politicians and bureaucrats alike, but the intent or the definition of that term has not been made clear. We understand that there are processes in place to ensure that the people of Saskatchewan have a voice in shaping that change. The School Community Council would like to add our voice to the conversation.

For Sun West families, transformational change means:

Personalized learning.

It works and we are watching it happen in our classrooms every day.

For the past number of years, students and staff in Sun West have been enthusiastically pioneering this innovative educational path, which is based on the belief that students - each with their own unique strengths, weaknesses, interests and preferences - need a voice in determining how and what they are learning. As our schools have come to embrace this way of thinking, we've seen wonderful changes in how our classrooms look, in the language that our children use at school and then at home, and in the choices that our children have in regards to their own learning. In this personalized environment, kids get to take charge of their learning and can learn in a way that best suits them.

Also in line with personalized learning, we have witnessed the creative integration of technology in our classrooms. Our children have regular access to computers or tablets and a limitless library of digital resources to help them explore topics of personal interest to them as they develop the fundamental knowledge and skills mandated by the Province. And because students can work at their own pace, there are opportunities to succeed and grow in ways they cannot when expected to keep up or wait for their peers.

Through the implementation of these innovative practices, we are creating young citizens with the character and critical 21st century skills – leadership, technology, collaboration, social accountability – necessary to excel in the workplace and contribute to successful communities.

These innovative practices would not be possible without our locally elected school boards. Every community has a unique culture which is reflected in the school and how the students learn. Having a locally elected board member allows us to speak directly with the Sun West School Division, addressing what our children need the most for their education. More care and consideration is put into their roles as board members as they are accountable to the people they represent and will fight for families and communities. If boards become appointed, we will lose our voice, be stripped of our opinion and students will be seen as a statistic and not an individual.

School is a small rural school with astounding students in Kindergarten to Grade Six. Our students have a greater opportunity of one on one learning with teachers and develop a very strong bond with their peers which is very difficult for some to find in larger schools. If school boards become appointed positions, we fear our school and community will become lost in the shuffle. Restructuring school divisions may lead to our very young students having to ride a school bus 3 hours every day in order to be at school. This would be detrimental to our children's education as they will lose focus, become too tired in class to learn properly and fall

behind their peers. The school is the backbone of a community and without it, small town Saskatchewan will suffer greatly.

The work of Sun West School Division, and other entrepreneurial divisions must not be left to scramble for the crumbs that fall after a massive restructuring. There is great work being done - using lean and efficient processes - to personalize student learning in our schools. We very much hope that this continues as every child in this province deserves the best education possible.

We wish you well in your deliberations.

Sincerely,

SCC

January 20, 2017

The Honourable Don Morgan, Minister of Education
109 - 3502 Taylor Street East
Saskatoon, SK
S7H 5H9

Dear Minister Morgan:

The term 'transformational change' has been often employed in recent months by politicians and bureaucrats alike, but the intent or the definition of that term has not been made clear. We understand that there are processes in place to ensure that the people of Saskatchewan have a voice in shaping that change. The School Community Council would like to add our voice to the conversation.

For Sun West families, transformational change means personalized learning, which we have been able to utilize thanks to the governing structure we currently have in place. This approach to learning, along with the opportunities our students have thanks to our division Distance Learning Centre, would not be the same with a different structure in place. This is worrisome.

For the past number of years, students and staff in Sun West have been enthusiastically pioneering this innovative educational path, which is based on the belief that students - each with their own unique strengths, weaknesses, interests and preferences - need a voice in determining how and what they are learning. As our schools have come to embrace this way of thinking, we've seen wonderful changes in how our classrooms look, in the language that our children use at school and then at home, and in the choices that our children have in regards to their own learning. In this personalized environment, kids get to take charge of their learning and can learn in a way that best suits them.

Also in line with personalized learning, we have witnessed the creative integration of technology in our classrooms. Our children have regular access to computers or tablets and a limitless library of digital resources to help them explore topics of personal interest to them as they develop the fundamental knowledge and skills mandated by the Province. And because students can work at their own pace, there are opportunities to succeed and grow in ways they cannot when expected to keep up or wait for their peers.

Through the implementation of these innovative practices, we are creating young citizens with the character and critical 21st century skills – leadership, technology, collaboration, social accountability – necessary to excel in the workplace and contribute to successful communities.

The work of Sun West School Division, and other entrepreneurial divisions must not be left to scramble for the crumbs that fall after a massive restructuring. There is great work being done - using lean and efficient processes - to personalize student learning in our schools. We very much hope that this continues regardless of the organizational structure of the education system.

We wish you well in your deliberations.

Sincerely,

On behalf of parents and the
School Community Council

January 23, 2017

The Governance Panel
K12govconsultations@gov.sk.ca

Dear Governance Panel,

The news of an upcoming decision to be made regarding the K-12 public education system in Saskatchewan has myself and many others concerned. The Perrins report has offered 4 solutions to the challenges the current system faces for consideration. While Perrins did present a comprehensive report, the speed with which these decisions need to be evaluated and made is troublesome. The future education of our children is not a decision to be rushed and the pros and cons need to be evaluated properly.

We have the privilege of living in a democratic society; a privilege I do not take for granted. Currently our locally elected school boards do play a large role and have a direct impact on our schools not only in student learning, but also in the form of supports for staff and faculty. Having a locally elected school board demonstrates to our children and the future leaders of our communities that their voice does matter and that they can make a change, lending hope for the future generations. I worry that if we lose our locally elected school trustees and turn to larger school divisions with appointed trustees, we lose the ease with which we can express our cares and concerns, ultimately losing the democracy that has been fought so hard for to preserve.

Growing up in the Saskatchewan school system has provided countless opportunities for myself. I appreciate the education I was able to receive living in our province. Coming from a rural area, I do see the need for there to be equal opportunities for students across the province. Further amalgamations may not be the answer to this. Initiatives and innovations that have been realized in our current school divisions have huge potential for our students and I worry that the work currently being done will be lost. For example, the Sun West Distance Learning Center in Kenaston that was headed up by Sun West School Division is an asset to not only our school division, but to the entire province. Other projects are in the works and may lose their funding and be lost if the local elected school boards are not able to continue with the work they have started.

There is no doubt that there is a need for efficiencies to be identified and more communication, transparency, and accountability in how the funds are allocated and spent between school boards and the government. Further investigations need to be made to see how this can happen while keeping our current school divisions intact. Should further amalgamations take place, how will the concerns of the local communities be heard? What processes will be put in place to ensure the needs of the geographically different communities are met? I am directly involved in our local SCC and feel that the councils are still struggling to find their place. In order to be effective, the SCC relies on the local school board trustee. Will a representative still be able to attend our local meetings?

Change is imminent, and I hope that the government is careful and thoughtful in their deliberations, ultimately keeping in sight the importance public education plays in not only our future, but the future of society in Saskatchewan.

Sincerely,

Dear Minister Morgan,

Thank you for the opportunity to share our views on the Educational Governance Review Report authored by Mr Dan Perrins. We have read the report with great interest. As members of the School Community Council, we, too, are interested in ensuring that the focus is on getting as many as possible resources to students.

As SCC members we are in the enviable position of working closely with all the people who have an influence on our children's education. We sit on a council with the staff of the school, we have regular access and frequent interaction with our trustee. We have had a chance to have a quick word with you at the sod-turning at the site of our new school. These relationships are the impetus to make positive things happen at our school.

As an example, a discussion with planners at the Regina School Board revealed that new playground equipment wasn't in the budget for the school and much of the existing playground equipment was no longer usable, either because of wear and tear or because of changes to safety regulations. Parents and staff were adamant that playground equipment was a crucial component of physical education and the healthy growth of children.

As well, in our community, school playgrounds are where all the families in the neighbourhood come to play in the absence of other facilities. Outfitting a school playground is another way schools play an important role in our community.

So the SCC worked with architects, the contractors and city planners to include playground equipment in the landscaping plan. The SCC then created a committee to raise the money to pay for the equipment. That committee has raised over \$50,000 and almost all of it is from the rea community!

Along the way our trustee, the designers, and the planners and supervisors from the city have worked with us to incorporate the equipment into the workflow of the project, minimizing the impact of the changes to the schedule and thus the cost.

Another example speaks directly to the positive impact of a committed community on the students. The leaders and staff at School have made raising the reading levels of the students a priority. Through a comprehensive program designed by the school's leaders and supported by staff, parents and other volunteers, who gave hundreds of hours of their time reading one-on-one with students, 20% more Connaught students are reading at grade today compared to January, 2016.

This is 20% improvement year-over-year. And this was achieved despite an increase in enrolment of 50 students (roughly a 24 percent increase in the student population). That is an extraordinary accomplishment under any circumstances.

I mention both of these because they are examples of local engagement that directly benefits the learning outcomes of children and strengthens the community.

The Perrins Report presents a hierarchy of proposals with the first option being the most centralized of resources and administration. Looking at this hierarchy, we find ourselves thinking about two aspects of education at the local level: first, it is our view that education isn't a cost,

it's an investment, and second, any time an opportunity to vote is replaced by a mandate to appoint, it is a loss — a loss of citizens' rights, of accountability, of responsibility and of freedom to choose. It is a loss not only of citizenship but of moral authority.

At School we have a community of support for our students. It includes parents, staff, city and provincial regulators and administrators, and elected officials. It also includes the community itself: businesses, churches, banks, community organizations and committed individuals who see helping as a way to contribute. All of us understand that there are times when we must all exercise fiscal restraint. But that restraint shouldn't unravel the support that long-term investments, such as our children, need. It also shouldn't be done at the expense of fundamental democratic principles such as choosing our representatives by election. We tentatively acknowledge support for Option 3B, pending clarification of some details.

Thank you for the opportunity to make our case,

Respectfully,

Members of the School Community Council of

January 22, 2017

Honourable Premier Brad Wall
Room 226 - 2405 Legislative Drive
Regina, SK
S4S 0B3
email: premier@gov.sk.ca

Dear Honourable Brad Wall, elected officials and the Education Consultative Committee,

I am writing with concerns over the proposed changes suggested by Mr. Dan Perrins in his Educational Governance Review Report. While I appreciate that our government and the residents of Saskatchewan are facing challenging financial times and there are difficult decisions to be made, I urge you all to consider the long term consequences to not only our children, but all rural communities should broad spectrum amalgamation take place. I do not believe that any of the options put forward by Mr. Perrins are in the best interests of my children or my community of

As stated on Page 22 of Mr. Perrins' report the role of the board of education is to “determine program and service levels to respond to community needs and interests.” With further amalgamations of our school divisions, the board of education will be further out of touch and in fact work against community needs and interests. I am concerned that with further amalgamations, many rural schools will close. The legislated rural closure threshold of 51 students needs to be maintained. Further school closures would result in more children being transported on Saskatchewan highways and grid road systems. As a parent of two small children in _____ I have grave concerns about my children having to risk school transportation past the Global Transportation Hub.

Interestingly, in Mr. Perrins report on page 22, he states that “during the transition period, a focus on restructuring may compromise the focus on student outcomes in the Plan for Growth and ESSP”. This is not acceptable, failing our children to save money is unacceptable, these are our future lawmakers, healthcare providers, etc. I do not want my children to fall through the cracks during this “transition period”. As noted in Mr. Perrins report the transition in 2006 took approximately 5 years. That is the entirety of my daughters' remaining primary education and a large portion of my sons'.

Mr. Perrins reported that with one provincial school division, there would be “greater opportunity for sharing and implementing effective practices and results from one regional service area to another”. There is absolutely no reason this cannot be done now, even with the current 28 school divisions. In 2017 electronic means of communication enhance the efficiency of sharing information. His opinion on this is wrong. What Mr. Perrins fails to consider is the fact that different geographic areas of our province are dealing with a variety of different situations, there are pockets of different cultures,

different socio-economic status and different family circumstances that require customized approaches. Amalgamating 28 school divisions into larger school divisions will impede educators and school boards abilities to customize their approach to education. Amalgamation will not raise the performance of the students that are struggling, it will detrimentally impact the students that are meeting learning objectives.

On page 23, Mr. Perrins reports that one large school division will allow for continued accountability to the community through school community councils. In many rural communities, the rural closure threshold must be maintained in order for those schools and their community councils to exist. I believe that if rural schools close, those communities will disappear. I find it interesting that Mr. Perrins reports that there would be more transparency with larger school divisions, in spite of him also stating that one large school division would result in “reduced communication between the board and community” and “the public's access to the decision makers would be reduced.” Larger school divisions would be less transparent and less accountable to communities than our current 28 school division system.

In summary, I want what is best for my children. My husband and I moved to rural Saskatchewan because of the education system in place in _____ I firmly believe that Prairie Valley School Division is meeting the needs of my children and the children of _____. I believe that having a strong support network of friends in the community and a school in the community in which we live is of the utmost importance to my children's success. We need to keep our school boards locally elected. We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. I do not support further amalgamations or further changes to our subdivision boundaries.

Regardless of what decision you make, whether you choose option 1, 2, 3a or 3b from the Educational Governance Review Report, or if it is something else entirely, I respectfully request that you present your decision to the stakeholders and communities for public review and input prior to implementation or legislative changes. This would allow stakeholders the opportunity to point out any unintended consequences that may arise as a result of your decision.

Respectfully submitted,

c.c Honorable Minister of Education Don Morgan, Q.C.

c.ci Honorable Lyle Stewart, MLA Lumsden-Morse (email: lumsdenmorse.mla@sasktel.net)

c.cii Educational consultative committee (email: K12govconsultations@gov.sk.ca)

January 22, 2017

Honourable Premier Brad Wall
Room 226 - 2405 Legislative Drive
Regina, SK
S4S 0B3
email: premier@gov.sk.ca

Dear Honourable Brad Wall, elected officials and the Education Consultative Committee,

I am writing with concerns over the proposed changes suggested by Mr. Dan Perrins in his Educational Governance Review Report. While I appreciate that our government and the residents of Saskatchewan are facing challenging financial times and there are difficult decisions to be made, I urge you all to consider the long term consequences to not only our children, but all rural communities should broad spectrum amalgamation take place. I do not believe that any of the options put forward by Mr. Perrins are in the best interests of my children or my community of

As stated on Page 22 of Mr. Perrins' report the role of the board of education is to “determine program and service levels to respond to community needs and interests.” With further amalgamations of our school divisions, the board of education will be further out of touch and in fact work against community needs and interests. I am concerned that with further amalgamations, many rural schools will close. The legislated rural closure threshold of 51 students needs to be maintained. Further school closures would result in more children being transported on Saskatchewan highways and grid road systems.

Interestingly, in Mr. Perrins report on page 22, he states that “during the transition period, a focus on restructuring may compromise the focus on student outcomes in the Plan for Growth and ESSP”. This is not acceptable, failing our children to save money is unacceptable, these are our future lawmakers, healthcare providers, etc. I do not want my children to fall through the cracks during this “transition period”. As noted in Mr. Perrins report the transition in 2006 took approximately 5 years. That is the entirety of my daughters' remaining primary education and a large portion of my sons'.

Mr. Perrins reported that with one provincial school division, there would be “greater opportunity for sharing and implementing effective practices and results from one regional service area to another”. There is absolutely no reason this cannot be done now, even with the current 28 school divisions. In 2017 electronic means of communication enhance the efficiency of sharing information. His opinion on this is wrong. What Mr. Perrins fails to consider is the fact that different geographic areas of our province are dealing with a variety of different situations, there are pockets of different cultures, different socio-economic status and different family circumstances that require customized approaches.

Amalgamating 28 school divisions into larger school divisions will impede educators and school boards abilities to customize their approach to education. Amalgamation will not raise the performance of the students that are struggling, it will detrimentally impact the students that are meeting learning objectives.

On page 23, Mr. Perrins reports that one large school division will allow for continued accountability to the community through school community councils. In many rural communities, the rural closure threshold must be maintained in order for those schools and their community councils to exist. I believe that if rural schools close, those communities will disappear. I find it interesting that Mr. Perrins reports that there would be more transparency with larger school divisions, in spite of him also stating that one large school division would result in “reduced communication between the board and community” and “the public's access to the decision makers would be reduced.” Larger school divisions would be less transparent and less accountable to communities than our current 28 school division system.

In summary, I want what is best for my children. My husband and I moved to rural Saskatchewan because of the education system in place in . I firmly believe that North East School Division is meeting the needs of my children and the children of . I believe that having a strong support network of friends in the community and a school in the community in which we live is of the utmost importance to my children's success. We need to keep our school boards locally elected. We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. I do not support further amalgamations or further changes to our subdivision boundaries.

Regardless of what decision you make, whether you choose option 1, 2, 3a or 3b from the Educational Governance Review Report, or if it is something else entirely, I respectfully request that you present your decision to the stakeholders and communities for public review and input prior to implementation or legislative changes. This would allow stakeholders the opportunity to point out any unintended consequences that may arise as a result of your decision.

Respectfully submitted,

c.c Honorable Minister of Education Don Morgan, Q.C.

c.ci Educational consultative committee (email: K12govconsultations@gov.sk.ca)

January 22, 2017

Honourable Premier Brad Wall
Room 226 - 2405 Legislative Drive
Regina, SK
S4S 0B3
email: premier@gov.sk.ca

Dear Honourable Brad Wall, elected officials and the Education Consultative Committee,

I am writing with concerns over the proposed changes suggested by Mr. Dan Perrins in his Educational Governance Review Report. While I appreciate that our government and the residents of Saskatchewan are facing challenging financial times and there are difficult decisions to be made, I urge you all to consider the long term consequences to not only our children, but all rural communities should broad spectrum amalgamation take place. I do not believe that any of the options put forward by Mr. Perrins are in the best interests of my grandchildren or my community of

As stated on Page 22 of Mr. Perrins' report the role of the board of education is to “determine program and service levels to respond to community needs and interests.” With further amalgamations of our school divisions, the board of education will be further out of touch and in fact work against community needs and interests. I am concerned that with further amalgamations, many rural schools will close. The legislated rural closure threshold of 51 students needs to be maintained. Further school closures would result in more children being transported on Saskatchewan highways and grid road systems.

Interestingly, in Mr. Perrins report on page 22, he states that “during the transition period, a focus on restructuring may compromise the focus on student outcomes in the Plan for Growth and ESSP”. This is not acceptable, failing our children to save money is unacceptable, these are our future lawmakers, healthcare providers, etc. I do not want my grandchildren to fall through the cracks during this “transition period”. As noted in Mr. Perrins report the transition in 2006 took approximately 5 years.

Mr. Perrins reported that with one provincial school division, there would be “greater opportunity for sharing and implementing effective practices and results from one regional service area to another”. There is absolutely no reason this cannot be done now, even with the current 28 school divisions. In 2017, electronic means of communication enhance the efficiency of sharing information. His opinion on this is wrong. What Mr. Perrins fails to consider is the fact that different geographic areas of our province are dealing with a variety of different situations, there are pockets of different cultures, different socio-economic status and different family circumstances that require customized approaches. Amalgamating 28 school divisions into larger school divisions will impede educators and school

boards abilities to customize their approach to education. Amalgamation will not raise the performance of the students that are struggling, it will detrimentally impact the students that are meeting learning objectives.

On page 23, Mr. Perrins reports that one large school division will allow for continued accountability to the community through school community councils. In many rural communities, the rural closure threshold must be maintained in order for those schools and their community councils to exist. I believe that if rural schools close, those communities will disappear. I find it interesting that Mr. Perrins reports that there would be more transparency with larger school divisions, in spite of him also stating that one large school division would result in “reduced communication between the board and community” and “the public's access to the decision makers would be reduced.” Larger school divisions would be less transparent and less accountable to communities than our current 28 school division system.

In summary, I want what is best for my grandchildren, my community of _____ the people of our province. I believe that having a school in the community in which we live with locally elected school board members is of the utmost importance to children's success and community growth. Many small businesses exist in communities and their existence is threatened should the population of a community decrease with school closures, assuming large amalgamations would lead to school closures. Locally elected school boards would be much more accountable and more informed on factors impacting our community and students than appointed board members from outside our community. I do not support further amalgamations or further changes to our subdivision boundaries.

Regardless of what decision you make, whether you choose option 1, 2, 3a or 3b from the Educational Governance Review Report, or if it is something else entirely, I respectfully request that you present your decision to the stakeholders and communities for public review and input prior to implementation or legislative changes. This would allow stakeholders the opportunity to point out any unintended consequences that may arise as a result of your decision.

Respectfully submitted,

c.c Honorable Minister of Education Don Morgan, Q.C.
c.ci Educational consultative committee (email: K12govconsultations@gov.sk.ca)
c.cii Honorable Don McMorris, MLA Indian Head - Milestone (email: mcmorris.mla@sasktel.net)

January 22, 2017

Honourable Premier Brad Wall
Room 226 – 2405 Legislative Drive
Regina, SK
S4S 0B3
email: premier@gov.sk.ca

Dear Honourable Brad Wall, elected officials and the Education Consultative Committee,

I am writing with concerns over the proposed changes suggested by Mr. Dan Perrins in his Educational Governance Review Report. While I appreciate that our government and the residents of Saskatchewan are facing challenging financial times and there are difficult decisions to be made, I urge you all to consider the long term consequences to not only our children, but all rural communities should broad spectrum amalgamation take place. I do not believe that any of the options put forward by Mr. Perrins are in the best interests of any children or my rural community, nor any rural communities.

As stated on Page 22 of Mr. Perrins' report the role of the board of education is to “determine program and service levels to respond to community needs and interests.” With further amalgamations of our school divisions, the board of education will be further out of touch and in fact work against community needs and interests. I am concerned that with further amalgamations, many rural schools will close. The legislated rural closure threshold of 51 students needs to be maintained. Further school closures would result in more children being transported on Saskatchewan highways and grid road systems. With an increased number of students being bussed, the increase for the risk of accident and injury will increase simply because of the complexity of the bussing situation and daily road time.

Interestingly, in Mr. Perrins report on page 22, he states that “during the transition period, a focus on restructuring may compromise the focus on student outcomes in the Plan for Growth and ESSP”. This is not acceptable, failing our children to save money is unacceptable, these are our future lawmakers, healthcare providers, etc. I do not want any children to fall through the cracks during this “transition period”. As noted in Mr. Perrins report the transition in 2006 took approximately 5 years. That potentially can represent the entirety of remaining primary education for many children.

Mr. Perrins reported that with one provincial school division, there would be “greater opportunity for sharing and implementing effective practices and results from one regional service area to another”. There is absolutely no reason this cannot be done now, even with the current 28 school divisions. In 2017 electronic means of communication enhance the efficiency of sharing information. His opinion on this is wrong. What Mr. Perrins fails to consider is the fact that different geographic areas of our province are dealing with a variety of different situations, there are pockets of different cultures, different socio-economic status and different family circumstances that require customized approaches. Amalgamating 28 school divisions into larger school divisions will impede educators and school boards abilities to customize their approach to education. Amalgamation will not raise the performance of the students that are struggling, it will detrimentally impact the students that are meeting learning objectives.

On page 23, Mr. Perrins reports that one large school division will allow for continued accountability to the community through school community councils. In many rural communities, the rural closure threshold must be maintained in order for those schools and their community councils to exist. I believe that if rural schools close, those communities will disappear. I find it interesting that Mr. Perrins reports that there would be more transparency with larger school divisions, in spite of him also stating that one large school division would result in “reduced communication between the board and community” and “the public's access to the decision makers would be reduced.” Larger school divisions would be less transparent and less accountable to communities than our current 28 school division system.

In summary, I want what is best for not only my grandchildren, but for all children. I firmly believe that Prairie Valley School Division is meeting the needs of my grandchildren and the children of . I believe that having a strong support network of friends in the community and a school in the community in which our son and wife live is of the utmost importance to my grandchildren's success. We need to keep our school boards locally elected. We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. I do not support further amalgamations or further changes to our subdivision boundaries.

Regardless of what decision you make, whether you choose option 1, 2, 3a or 3b from the Educational Governance Review Report, or if it is something else entirely, I respectfully request that you present your decision to the stakeholders and communities for public review and input prior to implementation or legislative changes. This would allow stakeholders the opportunity to point out any unintended consequences that may arise as a result of your decision.

Respectfully submitted,

- c.c Honourable Minister of Education Don Morgan, Q.C.
- c.ci Honourable Lyle Stewart, MLA Lumsden-Morse (email:
lumsdenmorse.mla@sasktel.net)
- c.iii Educational consultative committee (email: K12govconsultations@gov.sk.ca)

January 22, 2017

Honourable Premier Brad Wall
Room 226 - 2405 Legislative Drive
Regina, SK
S4S 0B3
email: premier@gov.sk.ca

Dear Honourable Brad Wall, elected officials and the Education Consultative Committee,

I am a resident of the town of _____ Saskatchewan and have serious concerns regarding the proposed options for amalgamation of the Saskatchewan school divisions. My wife and I both were born and raised in small towns in Saskatchewan and made the choice to reside in a small town to raise a family.

One of the main reasons we chose the town of _____ was the presence of an elementary school. We both attended rural elementary schools and benefited from the advantages that rural schools offer, namely better teacher to student ratios, more one-on-one instruction and the fact that is a close-knit community where we know everyone and feel safe knowing who our children are playing with.

My concerns about the proposed amalgamation and changes to the school boards are listed below and I will elaborate on each individually:

- 1) Potential loss of current Rural School Threshold for Closure Legislation
- 2) Effect on Rural schools caused by amalgamation with urban centres
- 3) Quality of Education for our students- both during the transition and ongoing
- 4) Loss of Community Voice
- 5) Loss transparency and contact with appointed school boards who do not understand the community impact of decisions made
- 6) Additional local consultation on community impact - once the Government has made their final decision on this matter, prior to implementing and changes/legislation

My primary concern with the proposed changes to the school divisions is the potential for closure of many rural schools across Saskatchewan, but particularly _____ School in _____. I am aware that in 2008 the government put in place thresholds on the minimum number of students a rural school must maintain to be protected from any risk of closure by a school division. This legislation was in response to a number school closures that occurred subsequent to the amalgamations of school divisions in 2006. This was to my understanding an unintended consequence of the 2006 amalgamations, but one that resulting in many communities suffering. I commend the government for recognizing this issue and implementing the 2008 legislation setting those rural school thresholds for closure to prevent further losses. My concern though, is if the legislation regarding school boards is revised once again in 2017 to allow more amalgamation, that it could easily be overlooked, resulting in more rural school closures. If these thresholds are not maintained it could have a devastating impact not

only on our community school, but on our community as a whole. I can guarantee closure of our school would devastate the Town of . I have had many discussions with other members of the community and they have all stated that if there was no school here, they would move and leave the community. The school here is a primary draw for our young families and without the school, the community will certainly wither and possibly cease to exist. I implore you that should you move forward with any of the listed options for amalgamation or any other changes to the educational system that you **ensure these legislated rural school closure thresholds are maintained in the new system.**

My second concern with the four options, as listed, comes from the lack of details we currently have, which only leaves us speculation. My concern is that due to our proximity to Regina that our school could possibly be amalgamated into a school division which includes urban Regina. Regina has good schools providing good education but considerations for urban students and rural students are not the same. If the same school board was making school division-wide decisions for both rural and urban schools/students, I fear the rural students would have a much smaller representation simply due to numbers and not have their needs addressed. However, locally to those students and their families, it could have major consequences to their education and community. Rural and urban schools, face significantly different issues and challenges. **I would like to see the representation of the rural and urban schools remain separate in any of the options of amalgamation.**

My third concern is with regards to the education my children and all students in Saskatchewan are receiving both during this transition and ongoing into the future. As Mr. Perrins stated: “during the transition period, a focus on restructuring may compromise the focus on student outcomes in the Plan for Growth and ESSP”. Our students are the future of Saskatchewan and I personally have seen the negative impact even simple things can have on a student's educational outcomes. I am a

One recent example of how small changes can affect students came across my path. This student had multiple changes in teacher (in the same school) throughout his Grade 1 school year and the school reported to parents that this entire class was 34% behind the typical expected Grade 1 performance levels. These students are now playing catch-up to try and regain the lost ground. I can only imagine the potential impact of school-division wide changes. Our students depend upon us to ensure they receive a proper education and we cannot fail them; these students are our future doctors, politicians, nurses, teachers, etc... If any changes in the school divisions are made the utmost attention must remain on maintaining the education of our students as the priority. In addition, my concerns regarding the ongoing quality of the education is due to the potential for larger school boards which are less in touch with our communities trying provide blanket, cookie-cutter education to every student in every school. These large school boards will not have the local insight to be able to make customized teaching/educational changes to local schools/classrooms based upon their individual needs. Our students will suffer with this generic blanket approach. The future of our province will suffer as well.

My fourth point is simple - with larger school divisions we will lose our community voice. Mr. Perrins' report concurs with this point: “reduced communication between the board and community” and “the public's access to the decision makers would be reduced.” Our children's voice and their needs must be heard in order to provide them the best possible education. With amalgamation of in 2006 our community voice was reduced to 4% in this new large school division. However, with the hard work of committed local board members our voice was carried to the board. Despite the board

receiving our voice, decisions are being made that are to benefit the school board and have zero benefit to our community. In fact, these decisions have a great negative effect to . When the funding model for the education system changed to a single-payer funding model, lost its' tuition agreement with Luther High School. In the interim Prairie Valley School Division coordinated an alternative solution to have students attend other Regina High Schools. This interim solution is coming to an end with Prairie Valley's stated mandate to have our students attend Lumsden High School. This decision is beneficial to Prairie Valley as they will receive more funding with our students in their school. However, for families this becomes an impractical system with great added expense. The majority of residents, and thus students' parents, work in Regina and so for parents wanting to attend their children's extra-curricular activities it would involve a significant increase in travel time and distance resulting in greater expenses. In many circumstances parents would be unable to attend due to the strain on additional time required off work to travel to such event. Also, and more importantly our students would have increased travel time of 30 minutes compared to 10 minutes to and from school and the travel would now be on grid roads instead of paved highways. The safety factor to be considered here is not insignificant. I am explaining this all to illustrate the impact a large school division has on a local school. This decision was not made in the best interests of our students; it was a financial decision to benefit the school division. Further amalgamation will only increase the frequency of this type decision being made without the best interests of our students being the primary deciding factor.

My fifth point is with regards to the potential of appointed school board members rather than elected. Our elected board members understand our local communities, local schools, local students and our individual local needs. An appointed board member becomes a political position to a person with likely no community ties perhaps resulting in "good business decisions" being made but not decisions that consider the quality of education our students are receiving and the impact of those decisions on our students, local schools and communities. I would like the school boards to remain elected positions.

Finally, it is my opinion that further amalgamation would bring no benefit to our students and their education. I would ask the Saskatchewan Party to reconsider this process and to leave our school divisions as they are. As an additional point I am a staunch Saskatchewan Party supporter and have been happy with their work for Saskatchewan. The parties' main support comes from rural communities and the effect of this type of this decision on rural communities should be thoroughly assessed and considered by the government. This decision will certainly affect all of our futures as it has the potential to make or break our children's education as they indeed are the future. In any case, I would put forward that whatever decision the government does make and move forward with that you bring the final decision back to the public before enacting any legislation or making changes so that the impact of the decision on each local school can be made clear and any unintended consequences are not overlooked.

In summary my personal feedback is as follows:

- 1) In any option, the legislated rural school closure thresholds must be maintained.
- 2) Any amalgamation should maintain separation of urban and rural schools given their diverse needs.
- 3) The education of our students must remain the priority at all times and cannot be impacted negatively by any amalgamation option both during the transition and in the future. Any policies or mandates required must be in place to ensure this.
- 4) Amalgamation will result in loss of community voice in the education system, therefore I oppose any options which involve further amalgamation.

- 5) Elected school board member must remain the status quo. Appointed school board members will be detrimental to the quality of our students' education and will not be in touch with the local communities.
- 6) Regardless of the decision made, stakeholders (school boards, teachers, student community councils, students and families) must be consulted a second time prior to any new legislation being enacted or changes being made. This will allow stakeholders to provide feedback on the impact of this decision on their school/community and ensure no unintended consequences are overlooked in the process of implementing your final decision.

Thank you for consideration of my concerns and for making the education of our students the determining factor in making your final decision.

Respectfully submitted,

c.c Honorable Minister of Education Don Morgan, Q.C.

c.ci Honorable Lyle Stewart, MLA Lumsden-Morse (email: lumsdenmorse.mla@sasktel.net)

c.cii Educational consultative committee (email: K12govconsultations@gov.sk.ca)

January 22, 2017

Honourable Premier Brad Wall
Room 226 – 2405 Legislative Drive
Regina, SK
S4S 0B3
email: premier@gov.sk.ca

Dear Honourable Brad Wall, elected officials and the Education Consultative Committee,

I am writing with concerns over the proposed changes suggested by Mr. Dan Perrins in his Educational Governance Review Report. While I appreciate that our government and the residents of Saskatchewan are facing challenging financial times and there are difficult decisions to be made, I urge you all to consider the long term consequences to not only our children, but all rural communities should broad spectrum amalgamation take place. I do not believe that any of the options put forward by Mr. Perrins are in the best interests of any children or my rural community, nor any rural communities.

As stated on Page 22 of Mr. Perrins' report the role of the board of education is to “determine program and service levels to respond to community needs and interests.” With further amalgamations of our school divisions, the board of education will be further out of touch and in fact work against community needs and interests. I am concerned that with further amalgamations, many rural schools will close. The legislated rural closure threshold of 51 students needs to be maintained. Further school closures would result in more children being transported on Saskatchewan highways and grid road systems. With an increased number of students being bussed, the increase for the risk of accident and injury will increase simply because of the complexity of the bussing situation and daily road time.

Interestingly, in Mr. Perrins report on page 22, he states that “during the transition period, a focus on restructuring may compromise the focus on student outcomes in the Plan for Growth and ESSP”. This is not acceptable, failing our children to save money is unacceptable, these are our future lawmakers, healthcare providers, etc. I do not want any children to fall through the cracks during this “transition period”. As noted in Mr. Perrins report the transition in 2006 took approximately 5 years. That potentially can represent the entirety of remaining primary education for many children.

Mr. Perrins reported that with one provincial school division, there would be “greater opportunity for sharing and implementing effective practices and results from one regional service area to another”. There is absolutely no reason this cannot be done now, even with the current 28 school divisions. In 2017 electronic means of communication enhance the efficiency of sharing information. His opinion on this is wrong. What Mr. Perrins fails to consider is the fact that different geographic areas of our province are dealing with a variety of different situations, there are pockets of different cultures, different socio-economic status and different family circumstances that require customized approaches. Amalgamating 28 school divisions into larger school divisions will impede educators and school boards abilities to customize their approach to education. Amalgamation will not raise the performance of the students that are struggling, it will detrimentally impact the students that are meeting learning objectives.

On page 23, Mr. Perrins reports that one large school division will allow for continued accountability to the community through school community councils. In many rural communities, the rural closure threshold must be maintained in order for those schools and their community councils to exist. I believe that if rural schools close, those communities will disappear. I find it interesting that Mr. Perrins reports that there would be more transparency with larger school divisions, in spite of him also stating that one large school division would result in “reduced communication between the board and community” and “the public's access to the decision makers would be reduced.” Larger school divisions would be less transparent and less accountable to communities than our current 28 school division system.

In summary, I want what is best for not only my grandchildren, but for all children. I firmly believe that Prairie Valley School Division is meeting the needs of my grandchildren and the children of . I believe that having a strong support network of friends in the community and a school in the community in which our son and wife live is of the utmost importance to my grandchildren's success. We need to keep our school boards locally elected. We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. I do not support further amalgamations or further changes to our subdivision boundaries.

Regardless of what decision you make, whether you choose option 1, 2, 3a or 3b from the Educational Governance Review Report, or if it is something else entirely, I respectfully request that you present your decision to the stakeholders and communities for public review and input prior to implementation or legislative changes. This would allow stakeholders the opportunity to point out any unintended consequences that may arise as a result of your decision.

Respectfully submitted,

- c.c Honourable Minister of Education Don Morgan, Q.C.
- c.ci Honourable Lyle Stewart, MLA Lumsden-Morse (email:
lumsdenmorse.mla@sasktel.net)
- c.iii Educational consultative committee (email: K12govconsultations@gov.sk.ca)

Good Afternoon Sir

Thank you for the opportunity to share my thoughts. My wife and I have young children currently in the Prairie Valley school division. In our opinion are receiving a high quality education, that is engaging and fun for the children. The staff and management of the school are engaged with the students and the community as a whole. These are some the attributes that attracted us to the school and rural community in which we live in. We are very pleased with the level of commitment and personal ownership the school staff and Prairie Valley School Division as a whole puts into developing our children's academic well-being. We are very concerned with the potential of a large scale enterprise management system, that can potentially lose touch with the grass roots issues and what is "real" at the local level.

As many corporations and military's can attest to, if you lose touch with core activities on the ground, you will not be successful in reaching your objectives. In this case, the failure is at the expense of our children's education, which must certainly be unacceptable. As a manager within the Federal government, I can appreciate the allure of the potential economies of scale of a centralized system, I can also assure you that these economies are not always realized and usually come at a cost to the client and end user- teachers and students.

The challenge to the board of education is to find the wisdom and foresight to look past the low hanging fruit of a centralized system and find an alternative that does not jeopardize the education of our youth. The hub of many rural communities is the school, it's a rally point and the source of not only education, but many community youth development programs. The potential closure of these community assets will have a wide spread effect on the communities, greater than just education. Furthermore, bus travel times for the children will certainly increase limiting the opportunities of the children to become involved in the student social and sports programs.

It's not enough to put good people with great intentions into positions of power, a well thought out strategy and organizational structure must be put in place for these people to be successful. Understand the gravity of this decision and realize the long term effect that will be the legacy of this board. Today's youth are tomorrow's leaders, do not trade the future of this province for limited gain and make an informed, educated decision that will serve all of our communities now and into the future.

Sincerely

Jan. 19/2017

To Sask. Government Review Process,

As concerned parents, we would like to bring attention to the confusing message presented by the provincial government concerning education. The government has indicated that transformational change is needed. Is this transformational change being instigated to improve the quality of education for the students in Saskatchewan? Sadly, this does not seem to be the case.

In light of the 1.2 billion dollar deficit, the options presented in the Perrins review all seem to be about finding money for our provincial government. Will the money saved by amalgamating School Divisions, reducing staff, most probably increasing student-teacher ratios, reducing educational supports and taking away locally elected school boards be worth the impact that it is going to have on our children who attend our publically funded schools in Saskatchewan? It does not seem that the cost savings will be funneled back to classrooms to improve education for our children. Our children, Saskatchewan's future, will end up with less not more.

Rural communities are concerned. There already seems to be a lack of acknowledgment of the grassroots concerns facing our communities. In the school division that we live, LSSD#202, there is the ever-present need for supports in a changing society. The needs of children coming from disadvantaged situations continue to grow. Sometimes school may be the best hope that they have to rise above the challenges they have. Classrooms are more diverse and complex than ever. Teachers need to be supported to fulfill the task given to them. Our schools need to be centres of learning, with professional staff at all levels, having the tools and resources to work with to give children the best start in life that they possibly can.

We ask that you consider the following:

- 1) Keep school divisions representative of the demographics of the area. Amalgamating School Divisions, or going to one School Division province wide, takes the voice away from local needs and concerns. If the decisions are centralized in one location in the province there will be a degrading of the quality of education, especially in rural areas. Staff and principals in small rural schools will be left with less resources and less support.
- 2) Keep elected boards. They can deal with concerns and situations on the local front and provide the level of accountability needed for proper decision making.
- 3) Strive to increase student outcomes. Give students the best possible chance to becoming contributing members of a democratic society. Provide the supports and resources that are needed to support our children.

There is a need for the government to act within its means. However, we ask that the government not take away from our schools and our children and therefore pay for it even more in the future.

Thoughts provided by:

SCC and parents

Dear Ministry of Education,

As a staff member in the Prince Albert Catholic School division, I would like the Ministry of Education to consider the following as feedback to the Dan Perrins report:

- 1. Catholic education is important.** The Minister has made a commitment to continued Catholic education in the province. I am pleased with this response and I would like to affirm this with the Minister and Ministry of Education. I applaud the Minister of Education on valuing the Constitutional Right to have publically funded Catholic Education in this province.
- 2. Student achievement is a priority.** Our school division is in the midst of completing the next three-year strategic plan and has had statistically meaningful academic improvement for our students in the last three-year plan 2014-2017. I encourage our Ministry to support our next three-year plan (2017-2020) that staff, parents, community stakeholders, School Community Councils, Catholic constituents, trustees and children are developing that will help our children meet the 2020 provincial growth plan.
- 3. Relationships are important.** As a staff member in the Catholic education processes, I would like to have the Minister of Education consider local relationships and partnerships in administering and managing the educational affairs of the school division. These are important as our school division operates efficiently and has one of the highest graduation rates of success in the province for all students especially First Nation, Metis graduation rates. I believe in developing long term, positive relationships with staff, parents, community stakeholders, School Community Councils, Catholic constituents, trustees and children to respond locally to our children in Prince Albert with the goal of supporting students to be engaged citizens who have a strong sense of self and community.

In conclusion, I thank the Ministry of Education for the opportunity to provide feedback at this critical time.

Yours in Catholic education,

January 17, 2017

Date

January 20, 2017

Dear Minister Morgan,

Re: K-12 Education Governance Review Advisory Panel

We have examined the Educational Governance Review Report as a School Community Council with both the PVSD Board and members of our community. We understand the importance of achieving the targets in the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP) as efficiently and effectively as possible, especially given the financial challenges the government is currently facing. However, we do not feel that the options presented in this report will result in significant cost savings without negatively impacting the quality of education for our students, eroding community voice, and affecting the sustainability of our community.

- We support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for students and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP).
- We do not support the concept of an appointed Board of Education. We believe local voice is an essential part of a successful school-community relationship.
- We do not support any of the 3 models presented in the report. We feel forced amalgamation puts our school, and many like it, at risk of closure.
- We want to know what potential changes there will be to the rural school closure thresholds that are currently legislated. We feel this is a critical consideration in evaluating the options.
- We would like to see a permanent solution for high school transportation and are concerned what impact forced amalgamation will have on bus ride times for our students.
- We believe that further progress can be made in existing school divisions to find sector-wide efficiencies and cost-savings and recognize that the government may need to be more directive in requiring these sector-wide efficiencies to be realized.

We urge you to do further research, most notably on the points raised above, before making a decision that will ultimately affect the quality of education for our children.

Sincerely,

School Community Council

cc: Lyle Stewart, MLA
Warren Steinley, MLA
R.M. of Sherwood
Town of Grand Coulee
PVSD

K – 12 Education Governance Review (Perrins Report)

School Community Councils Feedback

January 1, 2013

CONCERNS:

- Seems like a large change brought on suddenly. Why?
- Short Timeline has potential for hast errors! (3 week study, followed by report out just before Christmas, 3 week consultation)
- What is the rationale for this? Time frame is so short – could be status quo for a year- more consultation
- Let Divisions find efficiencies on their own
- No dollar amount provided in the report about costs of the proposed options.
- Little or no reference to students or student learning in the report
- Our school division is not like other school divisions
- How do you meet the individuality of students/schools and divisions?
- No warning – how come this wasn't brought up at election time?
- Centralization is not favourable.
- Why elected and appointed? – Why not both public and separate included?
- If appointed – where is local voice?
- Appointed Board, appointed CEOs – no Local Voice
- Options decrease Diversity
- Autonomy of schools and school divisions is a good thing that may be lost.
- Classroom impacts – Student/teacher ratio
- Reallocating efficiencies - will proposed savings be put back into education
- Consideration to Raise taxes should be included
- How would these options affect student-teacher ratios, and class size ratios?
- Will schools in smaller communities have closures because of options?
- With change to boards/division how will feedback and communication to/from communities and families remain effective?
- If it is money then raising taxes may be an option.
- All our divisions have unique situations and are so different. If we don't have local decision making how will we deal with these unique situations?
- Lack of clarity on First Nations involvement and participation?
- Need someone local to call/phone/talk with and someone with vested interest and lives in the community.
- Will staffing levels change?
- Too much focus on business model (not on students)
- Everyone has a say now with our current size structure, will we be heard in a larger system?
- How fast can major decisions be made if local contact is not there? (ie: fire at Meath Park School)

BIG QUESTIONS:

- Why are you doing this?
- Why?– its unproven
- Amalgamation timeline – Why the rush?
- What benefit or harm is this doing to the students? They are our priority.
- What are the cost savings for each option? - (3)
- What exactly are the efficiencies? (in dollar savings and providing quality education)

- How will they know the needs of each region?
- What are the biggest issues for student today?
- What was the cost of this report?
- Should a 3rd part be brought in for consultation?
- How about raising taxes to fight the deficit?
- How can a government make such an important decision in such a short time frame?
- Why is the "status quo" not a choice?
- What role would SCC's have in this new system?
- Transparency – what details are available financial/Education branch?
- What is the financial savings audit showing for all options?
- Where will short term / long term finances be allocated?
- Can larger purchasing agreements provincially save money and save current division boundaries and structures?
- Please explain why the separate school divisions are not required to change their structure ie: public division should also mean separate (Catholic division).
- Is it right to tax people for education but not provide a voice?
- What other areas within education have they investigated to save costs rather than divisional structure changes?
- Have any of these models been researched and found effective?
- Why the short time frame for changes of this magnitude?
- What is the saving going to be? Health board? 10 to 20 million – doesn't make sense.
- Where is the evidence of financial savings, will it be retained?
- What happens to professional support staff/special needs now determined by local need?

Submission to the Advisory Panel on Education Governance

Jan. 23, 2017

Introduction

Thank you for this opportunity to have input into decision-making on the democratic structure of our education system.

Together our members offer a voice for one of the most important ingredients of education governance, the electors.

Through nearly a decade of outreach to our members and beyond – via public forums, surveys, research, and workshops – we can confidently state that, no matter the issue, there exists consistently strong elector support for transparent, accessible governance that invites local involvement, and that upholds the role of electors and their elected representatives, as described by the Education Act. As your panel lacks a member who expressly represents electors, we feel it is important to bring these perspectives to the table.

Local governance

The research report provided to your panel contains a well-considered section on the concept of governance. However, it is worth looking more specifically to local governance and its importance to the efficient, effective delivery of social goods.

The term 'local governance' emerged in the mid-1980s over concerns that increasingly centralized economic and political structures had created a democratic deficit, leading to citizen disengagement and, consequently, reduced support for public projects (Barber, 1984; Dahl, 1994; Institute on Governance, 2005). Local governance has been defined as "meaningful authority devolved to local units of governance that are accessible and accountable to the local citizenry, who enjoy full political rights and liberties" (Blair, 2000, p. 21). In 1999, the United Nations Development Program recommended strengthening local governance as a means to "implicitly and explicitly address issues of the relative distribution of powers, balancing of functions, services, activities and such between the center and local levels, and/or between the public sector and civil society/private sectors" (UNDP, 1999, pp. 26-27).

Over the years, this concept has gradually become more institutionalized through the establishment of institutes such as the Vancouver-based Centre for Civic Governance (see www.civicgovernance.ca), and the acceptance of local governance discourse as part of the toolkit for urban planners and developers (Moulaert, Swyngedouw, & Rodriguez, 2001). In a study of local governance initiatives in six countries, Blair (2000) argued that democracy, not just decentralization, is the key component to its success. This involves ensuring citizens hold a genuine seat at the table, and have the ability to hold their local representatives to account:

The central idea of participation is to give citizens a meaningful role in local government decisions that affect them, while accountability means that people will be able to hold local government responsible for how it is affecting them. Together these two processes are what constitute the heart of the 'democratic' component of democratic local governance. (p. 22)

If we apply these central principles to public participation in education decision-making, it implies at minimum there exists:

1. A right to vote for local representatives.
2. An expectation that public service planning and delivery is informed by locally-chosen, locally-accountable boards.
3. An ability to ensure large bureaucratic structures and funding models remain flexible to local needs and aspirations.

Far from detracting from system efficiencies, such measures open the door to more nimble, nuanced responses to the challenges in our schools and classrooms.

The role of electors

We are fortunate in Saskatchewan to already have the basic structures of local governance built into public education. Under the Education Act we, the public, hold a recognized role in governing the education of our children. Through the Act and its regulations, we hold annual electors' meetings, participate in School Community Councils and, most importantly, elect trustees to represent our interests as parents, community members and ratepayers. Hastening the abolition or contraction of school boards effectively disenfranchises a whole population of its legislated right to participate in education governance, which is contained in the Education Act's words, intent and spirit.

The provincial government, beset by a resource revenue setback, has indicated a wish to dramatically alter these provisions in a hunt for cost-savings. However, short-term budget crises do not give license to so easily contravene the spirit of the current system, which indisputably recognizes we electors have a voice and a public responsibility to participate in education decision-making. The government has a duty to consider the existing voter-rights of citizens of this province, and to seriously engage directly with electors around any measures that would substantially weaken or disenfranchise them of their voting power. Weakening democratic foundations should never be a go-to solution for short-term budgetary problems, particularly as there is no compelling research evidence to support the theory that eliminating local governance provides either long-term cost savings or improved student achievement scores.

The role of school boards

Over the years, we have worked with many parents who are in conflict with their local school boards. Nonetheless, there is general support for the concept that we should have local trustees that we elect and hold accountable at the ballot box, and local school board offices that we can approach for immediate information and assistance on daily matters.

Recently, requested submissions on ideas for educational transformation, in preparation for the Summit, which invites a much broader discussion of potential education reforms than what is afforded in the scope of the provincial government's review. Out of 22 detailed submissions received, one suggested 12 school boards, one suggested no less than six, while the remainder of governance-related comments spoke strongly for no further amalgamations. Of note, none supported the entire elimination of school boards; this upholds the similarly unanimous response Mr. Perrins encountered in his conversations with the public.

To summarize, electors view the elimination or further amalgamation of school boards as an invitation to deepen the inefficiencies that are already unfolding from an increasingly overly-centralized model of education governance. As one example, they have seen the inefficiency of the province's top-down decisions on P3 school builds, which did not take into account local planning priorities or even whether or not school divisions had access to land in the selected areas.

Comments of our members included:

"Eliminating elected boards is a horrible idea. Making larger school divisions will take away parental and community input...a shared services body like 3sHealth would add another level of impersonal bureaucracy, centralize and privatize services."

"School boards should be locally elected. They should not be eliminated. The more removed the funder is from the receiver, the greater the waste and misuse of funds."

"We should not try to overhaul a complex system in a month or two, during a budget crisis, without proper consultation, evidence/research, without understanding what the impact of prior amalgamations were."

"Our province is too big and schools spread out. How can one board know the needs of so many schools in such large divisions?"

"No financial savings in reducing divisions. Cutting funding to LINC [Local Implementation and Negotiation Committees] agreements will not allow divisions to maintain services to students."

“Time and effort spent consolidating school boards could be much better spent simply concentrating on delivering education services, by supporting our school boards, teachers, students and communities.”

It is not surprising that the province should seize on eliminating school boards as a response to budget shortfalls and lagging test scores. As Land (2002) points out, it’s common for central government officials to blame school boards for perceived system shortcomings and to seek their elimination. Researching the U.S. system, she comments:

By design or in effect, many of the recent educational governance reforms constrain, alter, or eliminate school boards. However, little discussion and less research has focused on how school boards can operate most effectively within these new governance structures or what the consequences of school board elimination would be. (Land, 2002, p. 247)

In short, it’s far too easy to reach into the hat and pull out school board amalgamation as a solution to chronic problems. As one of our member submissions states: *“No major change agenda should be undertaken without first clearly stating what the desired outcome of the change is. Is it to save money? Short term? Long term? Is it to ‘improve’ education? If so, how do you define this?”* These questions have not been fully addressed in this review process, nor can we expect them to be fully addressed between now and the next provincial budget.

Further, in communications with our members and the public, it is abundantly clear there is little to no appetite for yet another administrative revamp. People are far more interested in looking deeply into how we can improve our children’s learning experiences. Being on the same heavily standardized, centrally-dictated track for several years with few measurable gains suggests it is time for new listening and thinking. Ideas we have heard include more holistic, balanced curriculum, increased hiring of First Nations teachers, support for school community councils, more time and freedom for teachers to teach, increased support for community coordinators and education assistants, smaller class sizes, improved teacher-student ratios, and renewed attention to basic school maintenance, to name a few.

On the budgetary side, there is strong support for reinvesting school divisions with the power to set their own mill rates and maintain control of their own reserves, as a

means to raise funds locally to meet local aspirations. The move away from this model has been fraught with inefficiencies and budget shortfalls. As well, questions have been raised regarding increased emphasis on hiring lean consultants, and replacing made-in-Saskatchewan in-house curriculum and classroom materials with high-priced products and services from global multinationals such as Pearson Education. Our members also question the 2011 decision to increase funding of private religious schools, and to add in a whole new class of qualified independent schools. If we are to re-examine education spending, these are the types of relatively recent decisions that are much more open to revisiting, in comparison to opening up and revisiting the foundations of our governance under the Education Act.

The role of democracy

In difficult times, education invariably benefits from more democracy, not less. Allowing local communities and their elected representatives to have input into pressing problems provides effective, efficient planning. While central bureaucracies tend to view variances in the system as a deficit, the view from the ground is quite different. Local variances and voices can be very beneficial, and should be allowed to flourish. There are few known benefits to be gained from eliminating or amalgamating school boards, and many potential problems, starting with the immediate drain on attention, time and resources that could be better spent supporting the learning needs of our children.

Local school boards and their electors may at times trouble the waters of power, but that is their function. Checks and balances are required by democracies. Governments under political stress often move to centralize power, claiming it will be more efficient. We on the ground know the opposite is true. Nothing is more *inefficient* than centralized bureaucracies that distance themselves from public input.

In your discussion of education governance, we hope that upholding the democratic rights of citizens is paramount. As well, we urge you to impress upon our provincial government leaders that education – like democracy – is simply an investment that must be made through thick and thin, in good times and bad, for the sake of our future.

References

- Barber, B. (1984). *Strong democracy: participatory politics for a new age*. Berkley: University of California.
- Blair, H. (2000). Participation and accountability at the periphery: Democratic local governance in six countries. *World Development*, 28(1), 21-39.
- Dahl, R. A. (1994). A democratic dilemma: System effectiveness vs. citizen participation. *Political Science Quarterly*, 109(1), 23-24.
- Institute on Governance. (2005). Roundtable on the democratic deficit: Citizen engagement and consultation, Toronto March 29, 2005. Ottawa: Institute on Governance.
- Land, D. (2002). Local school boards under review: Their role and effectiveness in relation to students' academic achievement. *Review of Educational Research*. 72(2), 229-278.
- Moulaert, F., Swyngedouw, E., & Rodriguez, A. (2001). Large scale urban development projects and local governance: From democratic urban planning to beseiged local governance. *Geographische Zeitschrift*(89), 71-84.
- United Nations Development Program (UNDP). (1999). *Decentralization: A sampling of defintions. Working paper prepared in connection with the Joint UNDP-Government of Germany*. New York: UNDP. Retrieved from http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/documents/decentralization_working_report.PDF

To the Honourable Brad Wall:

We are writing you this letter from the vibrant community of _____ of our wonderful province. Just to give you a little history,

At that time, there was a primary, elementary & a high school. He still lives on the same farm that he was raised on and we have had the opportunity to raise our children here as well.

We have raised _____ who all attended _____ School, with our youngest graduating this year. We could say, at this point, “Whew, we’re done with all this and we don’t need to voice our opinion”, except we do! We are seeing all the young families who have either chosen to stay in the area or have recently moved back home to raise their families in small town Saskatchewan. Isn’t this what our government wants, growing a strong Saskatchewan? Our young families will continue to develop and grow here. We also have hopes that our own children will have the opportunity to choose to return and work & live on the farm that we have had in our family for over 100 years and which has been watched over and developed by 4 generations.

It has recently been brought to our attention that there is a new plan being considered for further school amalgamations. In the last round of school amalgamations, 3 schools in our area were closed and the students now attend Fox Valley School. According to the 2016 report on School Levy’s Collected in Ward 1, the rural municipalities that our school attendance now draws from contributed \$6 MILLION to the 2016 tax levy. In this same year, our K-12 school received a paltry \$65,000.00 to fund supplies and activities for our students. To give a comparison, \$42,000.00 per child was collected and approximately \$460.00 per child was received back for their education. This funding seems extremely low for what is being contributed to the levy. Even before the closure of neighbouring schools in the last amalgamation, our services/programs for our students were dwindling to say the least. Fox Valley used to have many more programs, services and options but now has basically the three R’s offered with some options by taking online classes. We know the larger rural schools in this area still have more options to offer students, and, of course, urban schools even more so. Are rural students less worthy of education funding and also having a voice than urban students? With the recently proposed amalgamations, we fear once again that the future of our student’s education will be compromised. This boils down to decreased funding in rural centres, increased funding in urban centres, poorer quality of education in rural centres, longer bus rides which equals less family time & down time for students, culture shock and ultimately school closures. School closures are generally the death knell for small communities which are, in our opinion, the backbone of our province. We have seen closures in our area already and if not for the fact that we still have a centrally located school that remained open and the sheer tenacity & love of small town living and all that it offers from our neighbouring communities, we would have more ghost towns. If this should change in the future, you can be sure these towns will

empty in order to avoid long bus trips for students and a want for quality family time! This would equate to a population of suitcase farmers and saying good-bye to family farms & small communities, which helped build this province and will continue to do so given the opportunity.

We are asking you to look past the dollars and cents and look with common sense when dealing with rural education. Surely, it must occur to our government officials that some of your constituents choose this wonderful rural lifestyle and don't want to live in urban centres in order for our children to receive a quality education and still want our voices heard by electing our own representatives.

We understand the economic struggles in Saskatchewan at this time. Our community is also part of the oil/gas sector and as farmers we have weathered many economic storms. We are asking you, Brad Wall, to stand up for the future of Saskatchewan of which a rural lifestyle has had a long history and wants the opportunity for a longer future. Please consider all residents of Saskatchewan when deciding the outcome in these proposed amalgamations. Education should be the last place that should be on the chopping block. Our children are our future. Leave our school boards the same. Let us have our local voice.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

cc: Doug Steele, Cypress Hills MLA

Hon. Don Morgan, Minister of Education



Village of Buena Vista

1050 Grand Avenue
Buena Vista, SK
S2V 1A2

Phone: 729-4385 Fax: 729-4518
Email: buonavista@sasktel.net

January 20, 2017

Honorable Don Morgan Q.C.
Deputy Premier and Minister of Education
Room 361, Legislative Building
2405 Legislative Drive
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4S 0B3

Re: Education Governance Report

Dear Minister Morgan:

As the Mayor of the Village of Buena Vista, I had the opportunity to meet with the local School Community Council at _____ School to review the Educational Governance Report prepared for you by Mr. Dan Parrins.

Overall the Report was informative, well researched, and appeared to touch most of the areas that need to be dealt with in considering what “system of governance and structure is needed to achieve the outcomes of the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP)”. The report does however; raise some concerns that may affect our community.

We are currently in the process of completing our Official Community Plan (OCP), to direct growth and development of future community infrastructure. A critical element in potential for success of our OCP includes the number of young and growing families we can attract as residents. Where _____ is conveniently located within the Regina trading area; includes _____ School; and a very supportive community environment, you will appreciate that the school is a critical element in reaching our plan.

In the report, Mr. Parrins has identified a number of successes in reducing the cost of our educational system with the application of ESSP, but it will take some time to condition and reorder the structure, to fully realize the full potential of the plan. I believe the ESSP

.../2

has the potential to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of our educational system, if we give it time. Furthermore, where the cost of governance in the Saskatchewan education system represents 0.6% of the total cost and the ratio of students to Boards is the second lowest in the country, I would question the potential for any major cost savings through further mergers of school districts.

I commend you and your Department for the effort made to date and hope that you will give the Educational Sector Strategic Plan the time to fulfill its potential.

Regards,

Bill Dinu

Bill Dinu
Mayor, Village of Buena Vista

cc Lyle Stewart, MLA
Town of Regina Beach

January 20, 2017

The Honourable Don Morgan, Minister of Education
109 - 3502 Taylor Street East
Saskatoon, SK
S7H 5H9

Dear Minister Morgan:

RE: Transformational Change = Provincial Commitment to Innovation = Personalized Learning

The term 'transformational change' has been often employed in recent months by politicians and bureaucrats alike, but the intent or the definition of that term has not been made clear. We understand that there are processes in place to ensure that the people of Saskatchewan have a voice in shaping that change. School Community Council would like to add our voice to the conversation.

For Sun West families, transformational change means:

Personalized learning.

It works and we are watching it happen in our classrooms every day.

For the past number of years, students and staff in Sun West have been enthusiastically pioneering this innovative educational path, which is based on the belief that students - each with their own unique strengths, weaknesses, interests and preferences - need a voice in determining how and what they are learning. As our schools have come to embrace this way of thinking, we've seen wonderful changes in how our classrooms look, in the language that our children use at school and then at home, and in the choices that our children have in regards to their own learning. In this personalized environment, kids get to take charge of their learning and can learn in a way that best suits them.

Also in line with personalized learning, we have witnessed the creative integration of technology in our classrooms. Our children have regular access to computers or tablets and a limitless library of digital resources to help them explore topics of personal interest to them as they develop the fundamental knowledge and skills mandated by the Province. And because students can work at their own pace, there are opportunities to succeed and grow in ways they cannot when expected to keep up or wait for their peers.

Through the implementation of these innovative practices, we are creating young citizens with the character and critical 21st century skills – leadership, technology, collaboration, social accountability – necessary to excel in the workplace and contribute to successful communities.

What we have in Sun West is unique in the province and with transformational change our initiatives may be put on hold while the rest of the province catches up. Sun West is the only

school division in the province with an extra priority A3. The Student Engagement priority is where the Board developed Policy 18 on 21st century skills and the use of technology to help prepare students for the future.

To give an example: _____ recently facilitated a technology in elementary math session for the SK Teachers' Federation professional development unit that included 18 participants from various areas within the province. (Chinook School Division - Swift Current in the south to Saskatoon area to Northern Saskatchewan) and technology access for students is quite limited. Even in Swift Current, our _____ was surprised that they didn't want to learn about iPad apps because they don't have those devices, but wanted web-based programs; the same request was from a teacher with _____ French Immersion. Other areas had just a cart that could be signed out rather than in-class access. Some schools are still operating with low bandwidth so even if they have devices, only a few can access the internet at one time. Sun West's Superintendent of Education responsible for our Distance Learning Centre meets with Sask Tel to ensure that we all have bandwidth appropriate for our school size and needs.

We also recognize that technology is a tool and that students should not be utilizing technology all day long. This is where our Policy 18 is applicable because Sun West has spent the last three years focusing on the 21st century skills of collaboration, critical thinking, creativity, and digital citizenship.

The work of Sun West School Division, and other entrepreneurial divisions must not be left to scramble for the crumbs that fall after a massive restructuring. There is great work being done - using lean and efficient processes - to personalize student learning in our schools. We very much hope that this continues regardless of the organizational structure of the education system.

We wish you well in your deliberations.

Sincerely, _____

SCC Chairperson

, Rosetown



BOX 10, BALGONIE, SASKATCHEWAN, S0G 0E0

• PH: 306-771-2522

• FAX: 306-771-2631

January 20th, 2017

Honorable Minister Don Morgan
Minister of Education
2405 Legislative Drive
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4S 0B3

Dear Honorable Minister Morgan,

RE: Recommendations in Educational Governances Review (D. Perrins)

Please accept this letter on behalf of the Rural Municipality of Edenwold No. 158 with respect to *The Educational Governance Review Report* written by Dan Perrins. The proposed alterations to the current governance structure of our school boards in Saskatchewan is a concern to our Municipality and we are confident that our concern is shared at the regional level.

While the Rural Municipality of Edenwold is not home to any schools, our citizens are served locally by six (6) schools including five (5) elementary schools and one (1) high school, which are located within the boundaries of the urban municipalities in our region. These schools are part of the Prairie Valley School Division. The families of the RM of Edenwold benefit greatly from having these schools in our community and particularly from the fact that the school board, which oversees the operation of the schools, is elected locally. It is a priority for the Municipality to uphold the current structure in order to ensure that decisions made regarding the operation of the education system in our area take into account the unique needs of our students and the unique geographic, cultural, social, economical and demographic setting in which it is operating.

The RM of Edenwold is also concerned that amalgamation will result in centralized schools and limit the possibility for new schools to be developed within our community. Our Municipality has invested in infrastructure and roads in order to enable our community to grow. We have seen incredible growth in the residential and commercial sectors in the last ten years, and because we are managing the growth well, we expect this trend to continue. However, if we are not able to respond to the educational requirements of our citizens, this will restrict our ability to grow and thrive as a Municipality.

We respectfully request that you reconsider recommendations put forward in the *Educational Governance Review Report* and understand that the communities in our region:

- Wish to keep school boards locally elected,
- Wish to keep decisions closer to the communities that they serve,
- Do not support further amalgamations and,
- Do not support the changes to subdivision boundaries.

The Rural Municipality of Edenwold respects the decision of the Provincial Government, Ministry of Education and the boards and trustees and would like to take this opportunity to thank you for acknowledging our concerns and bringing our perspective to the legislature in the upcoming discussion regarding these recommendations.

c. c. Premier Brad Wall

The following are the views and opinions submitted via the consultation website. The comments appear verbatim with only minimal editing of information such as names, phone numbers, email addresses, profanities, defamatory statements, etc.

<p>The best solution is to amalgamate our local catholic and separate boards. These two systems operate in the same communities, doubling admin costs and positions needlessly.</p>
<p>As a teacher and parent in the Living Sky School Division, I worry about there being too few school boards. As a rural community I fear we may be forgotten and brushed aside as outliers to the "norm". The rural communities in our great province matter and having division representatives that live close by and understand the diversity and struggles that we have is important.</p>
<p>We already have little voice in our district. It should remain the same as it is now or even smaller districts. I voted and helped elect a trustee, that's the way it should stay. I would also like to comment on the state of Rosthern schools, they are in complete disrepair and this needs to be addressed NOW!</p>
<p>As a substitute teacher with GSCS I have been to nearly all the schools in the division and have seen the effect of less funding. School boards have less money and as a result can hire fewer teachers and other staff. This means that there are more students in each class, in some cases over 30, and less one on one attention from teachers and educational assistants. As a result many students get overlooked and do (not) reach their full potential.</p>
<p>I believe they should amalgamate the divisions for a number of reasons: 1. I have seen teachers unfairly awarded jobs due to nepotism that exists within the individual divisions. 2. Consistency in protocol and processes 3. Roles and responsibilities of these the non-teaching employed individuals may be better defined if they are all employed under one system.</p>
<p>I am not in favour for this. You keep taking away from our children's education with cut backs. My kids use to have a 20 to 1 teacher ratio but now 5 years later my child has a 28 to1 ratio. With this I see way more cut backs causing us to have less teachers and in my son's case it would look like 43 grade 5 kids 1 teacher and no extra help. Please think wisely it's not always about how many dollars we are spending vs how much money can we save.</p>
<p>To whom it may concern: With respect to the governance of education in Saskatchewan, I am struggling to see the logic behind the proposals to restructure school boards. The NDP amalgamated school boards down to 28 divisions and this did not reduce the financial burden on the government. The Saskatchewan Party was quite vocal in raising concerns about this when the NDP amalgamated divisions, but seem to have no concerns when attempting to do the very same thing. While there are certainly disparities between the divisions (LINK agreements for example), I do not believe that amalgamating divisions or appointing school board trustees is the answer. I firmly believe that elected school board trustees allows for more transparency and accountability. As a parent, I do not want my child in a school division bigger than what we already have. Prairie Spirit School Division encompasses a large geographical location as it stands and this presents challenges with staffing, finding subs and conducting extracurricular activities. I want the best possible education for my daughter, and always strive to give the best possible education to my students, but I believe that if we're going to truly fix our education system, fixing the funding formula is the first place we should be starting. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you.</p>
<p>Having been involved in two amalgamations in the past all that is gained is that decisions get made further away with less understanding of the direct impact on schools. Education is a human experience. Appointed boards are political. We elect a government through public input. Education of a community's children needs a community's input. It appears this government is trying to bypass democracy by pushing an agenda that does not value learning but is dictated to by dollars. The latest report warns of the losses due to removal of local input into education. Just like the last review a government did for our education. Democracy is allowing the people having a say in the process. Appointing boards is degrading, manipulative and undemocratic. That simple. That plain. The discussion about a centralized health board MAY save 20 million is positive. However, that is less than one percent of a billion dollar deficit. Look another direction</p>
<p>Locally elected boards are important in identifying the unique issues of its community. Regina catholic is fiscally efficient, and successful in the initiatives it has undertaken. Our students are successful because of our commitment to reading, writing, math and graduation. Parents are choosing a faith based education for their children. I would hope that government doesn't trump the wants and needs of its stakeholders.</p>
<p>Regina Catholic Schools are already run in an efficient manner. Our students are very successful and we achieved this at a less cost per pupil than many other school divisions in the province. Amalgamation will only erode the good work being done by most school divisions in this province. As parents, we have voted in good faith for our school board trustees. To remove these, would be nothing short of getting rid of democracy.</p>
<p>Mr. Perrins, I am writing in support of locally elected school boards. In my opinion, it would be a mistake for the government review panel to consider anything else.</p>

<p>Working for RCSD has shown me the true value of faith and education going hand in hand. Having divisions in the size they are now allow the divisions to operate by treating each student as a person. By divisions being combined, students risk the chance of being just a number, a stat. The value of a good education cannot be counted in dollars and cents it can only be counted in the bright young minds that graduate from our schools.</p>
<p>Amalgamation would address inequities. The nepotistic, self-serving, and sanctimonious approach to administration in a small population leads to a myopic and dysfunctional organization. People removed from the politics the trustee system that would be appointed by the government would be a more functional board. With limited amount of decision making with more than 95% of the budgets for school division decided, pool the remaining resources and utilize the money available to address inequities.</p>
<p>The research is out there. Amalgamations are not a benefit to anyone, in particular to our students and in particular to our First Nation and immigrant families. They constantly struggle to have their concerns met and communication is key! Financially, it's been proven there is no gain. With all due respect, read the research. Do the research, rather than doing what is popular, or the latest trend in education.</p>
<p>Thank you for offering the opportunity to respond to the proposed changes in school governance and the size and configuration of individual school divisions. The real work of education takes place in our classrooms and all see the importance of ensuring that the resources required are directed towards them. The high cost of administration must be controlled but the general public may not see the costs involved in maintaining a minimum of THREE PUBLIC EDUCATION SYSTEMS in our province while this report addresses only one, the public system. The catholic and French school divisions remain unaddressed. Some may suggest that First Nations school systems, even though they may be a single school such as we have in the north, are yet a fourth such division with all the amenities of larger school divisions. Our larger school divisions where catholic school divisions operate are putting forth huge budgets to cover advertising their school divisions. Catholic school divisions are no longer as put forth in the BNA Act but offer education to "families of faith" and have not only opened their doors to non-Catholic students but advertise to encourage them to join. If our government continues to put forth the formation of fewer school divisions, what will prevent catholic school divisions from demanding co-terminus borders? The catholic church only has to request a vote of its members and no government can stop such requests. While I appreciate our government's desire to filter funds to our classrooms, they are missing the big picture. The minorities of the catholic, French and First Nations appear to have greater influence than the general public. Sincerely yours,</p>
<p>Being from a small community (in a division predominantly made up of small communities), I lean towards option 3 on Dan Perrin's report. To lose the accessibility, transparency, and approachability of a local school board would unwind the confidence that our children's interest are being looked after.</p>
<p>Prairie Valley School Division underwent major restructuring just ten years ago. As a result of that major change we have less elected local voice for our communities. Any further change in local voice or our school division boundaries would not be in the best interests of our children and our communities. Education belongs to the community and I want you to know I support Prairie Valley School Division and Saskatchewan's school boards and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature: We need to keep our school boards locally elected. We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. We do not support further amalgamations. We do not support changes to our subdivision boundaries. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.</p>
<p>I would like to keep the governance of the school divisions as separate and local as possible. We choose to have our child at a Catholic School for a reason. We want the best education and atmosphere possible and we find this to be the best option. We do not support the amalgamation of school divisions.</p>
<p>Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support Saskatchewan school boards and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues. We need to keep our school boards locally elected; and, we need to keep decisions closer to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.</p>
<p>1. We need to keep our school boards locally elected. 2. We need to keep decisions closer to our communities.</p>
<p>I believe that each trustee should be elected individually based on our community and their needs, also the demographics are different in every community. Locally elected representation is very important; our school division is big enough. How is the government going to know what is going on in my community and each and every other one? This is the most ridiculous thing I have ever heard!</p>
<p>Try cutting some of the higher-ups, such as superintendents, consultants and coaches. Save the jobs of teachers and all support staff.</p>

I wanted to provide some input on the proposed education changes. I have worked in the IT departments of 2 school divisions in our province. As an on-site computer technician, I was responsible for 8 schools in small towns up to 100KM apart. While this distance is small compared to some divisions, the travel time required impacted the amount of time I had available to service the technology needs of my schools. If the government decides to expand these divisions further, I am concerned that there will be even less time for technicians to be able to do onsite support. Remote support solutions have gotten better however there are many tasks that require onsite support such as a school losing connectivity access or a hardware failure. To illustrate the complications of travel, here is a scenario: Schedule service visit to school 1 and plan day to ensure all requests in the school are complete. 8:00am: Travel 85km to school 1 to begin work. Get to school at 9:00am (reduced speed required as schools are in rural areas with varying road conditions). 9:15am: Receive emergency phone call that an entire school's network is down and must respond to school 2 100km away. 10:30am: Arrive to fix school 2 and repair by 1:00pm. 1:00pm: Complete other tickets in school as I am already there by 2:00pm. 2:00pm: School 1 is now 100km away from school 2 and by the time I would arrive, I would have to turn around and head back to division office. Decision is made to head back to division office early and do as much as possible remotely. As you can see, distance causes many inefficiencies and problems. Should the school divisions get even larger, the problem would only get worse. Thanks for taking time to read this.

Keep Boards ELECTED LOCALLY. Moving decision making further away from the community is a BAD idea.

I believe:

- Locally elected boards matter. The roots of Catholic education lie in the ability to make local decisions.
- Regina Catholic Schools is one of the highest achieving divisions in the Province of Saskatchewan. Amalgamating Catholic boards will distract our attention from our priorities. School division amalgamations are disruptive and time-consuming.
- The Regina Catholic School Division has been fiscally and financially efficient. Changing governance or amalgamating school divisions is not the answer to the financial challenges that the government is facing.
- We need to keep our focus on reading, math, writing, graduation and attendance – things that matter to students and families.

The input of parents, teachers, taxpayers and other members of the public is very important. I am concerned that with low voter turnout that there is not a fair and diverse group of people being elected and able to be the voice for all. A diversely appointed board along with some more advocacy roles involved, either elected or appointed, would potentially open to a wider range of stakeholders. I see the rural boards as especially needing the chance to keep their opinions local and not centralized too far away.

More support required for students with anxiety and depression issues. A larger focus necessary on life skills including bullying, self-esteem, and how to deal in a positive way. As these issues normally originate in school.

Parents and children deserve to have a choice in how their children are taught. That is best determined with elections. I do not agree with further amalgamations for the school divisions.

Catholic Education is extremely important and must be continued. Things are not run the same in both types of divisions, as priorities are different. It is more than just a course or a prayer; it is a daily way of life. When mentioning the idea of there no longer being Catholic schools, my children were devastated. "Why would they do that, Mom? They don't understand how much better it is in our schools!!!" I strongly oppose amalgamation of school divisions. Different regions have different priorities and do not all understand individual needs of students in a particular area. It would be very detrimental to students to amalgamate boards for that reason alone. Many school divisions have already made cuts and shown to be financially responsible despite all the increases in costs and challenges facing them. You are not an educator, you do not understand schools and yet you continue to make changes that make it harder for students and staff alike. Please DO NOT amalgamate all the boards (or any of them) and create more headaches for staff and students. In the long run, I don't think it will actually save any money, but is likely to cost learning and the ability of staff to help students in their area. Thanks,

I do not want to see our local elected boards amalgamate into fewer boards. Larger areas covered by fewer boards lose touch with what the needs are in their school division. Please keep things the same; it didn't work great in 2006 when boards and school divisions were combined. They found little to no cost saving and no benefits to students and teachers, if anything it became harder for teachers and students in a big school division.

Local school boards are imperative to the success of our schools and rural education. It is important to know as a tax payer and as a parent that the decisions are made by local representatives who truly understand the needs and challenges of our local schools and families. Saskatchewan is a diverse province which needs to be represented in our education system. Please do not amalgamate our school boards!!

Use some common sense and bring the old math system back. Good Lord I have not heard of such silly rubbish in my whole life.

With the governance changes, please consider implementing a provincial policy/requirement to ensure the safety of little Type 1 Diabetic children in Saskatchewan schools. Right now, these children are at high risk of seizures, coma, and death in our schools. Type 1 Diabetic children are the forgotten sick kids in Saskatchewan schools. They are left to fend for themselves at a very young age. Or - they are left with untrained Teacher's Assistants who have no healthcare background, which puts these kids at high risk for suffering seizure or coma or dying at school. Parents of Type 1 Diabetics in Saskatchewan run back and forth to school several times per day, which is not only extremely exhausting, but not having a highly trained individual in Type 1 diabetic care right at the school leaves the diabetic children at high risk of seizures, coma, death. We have heard that Argyle Elementary School and Dr. A.E. Perry School have set a gold-standard for Type 1 diabetes management at school in Regina. Every Type 1 diabetic (Catholic, Public, Private systems) deserves the chance at superb health and safety in their schools (educational equality for these little kids!), which these 2 schools have set! Teacher's Assistants at these schools are required, as part of their job description, to: • Administer insulin for high sugars and at lunch; (working with the parent via text or phone call to assure the correct amounts of insulin are given) • Check blood sugars several times per day; (especially before, during and after very active times, such as gym/recess) • Work with the parent to keep blood sugars in range, all day; • Give high sugar snacks/juice to treat low sugars, and try to prevent low sugars; • Ensure (by checking sugars, providing extra snacks) that the Type 1 diabetic is going to be ok to go home on the bus (or walking) after school. • Administer glucagon if necessary. • Double check that the Type 1 takes all of their important supplies home, and has a high sugar snack on hand for the bus ride/walk home. The Teacher's Assistants are hired knowing that they will have to do these jobs, and are hired based on having qualifications that fit the above job responsibilities. MEDEC and LiveWell could provide excellent, and very in-expensive training sessions for Teacher's Assistants and Teaching Staff each year (in a large conference-type session). Parents with little Type 1's at Argyle and A.E. Perry schools can actually send their child to school and trustingly/safely say "Bye, I will see you after school". This is not the case in most schools I would like to see every school in Regina and the rest of the province meet these standards. Please consider a provincial approach to Type 1 Diabetic care at Saskatchewan schools, similar to the approaches that already exist at A.E. Perry and Argyle Schools as you revise the governance structures for our school systems. Please give Type 1 kids equal opportunities as every other healthy child in Saskatchewan to return home each and every day safely to their parent's arms. Thank you kindly.

I believe that keeping school boards local is important, and do not believe it will save anything in the long run to amalgamate school divisions.

I do not believe amalgamated school boards are the answer. It takes decision making out of local communities, and there is little to no understanding of local needs. Saskatchewan is already one of the lowest in the country for education results. Don't make it worse. If I cannot get excellent education for my children here in Saskatchewan, we will move to another province and pay our taxes into a working system. Amalgamation will chase away young families and workers in industry. Don't set us back thirty years. Invest in education and in the future of this province, our children.

Locally elected boards matter. The roots of Catholic education lie in the ability to make local decisions. • Regina Catholic Schools is one of the highest achieving divisions in the Province of Saskatchewan. Amalgamating Catholic boards will distract our attention from our priorities. School division amalgamations are disruptive and time-consuming. • The Regina Catholic School Division has been fiscally and financially efficient. Changing governance or amalgamating school divisions is not the answer to the financial challenges that the government is facing. • We need to keep our focus on reading, math, writing, graduation and attendance – things that matter to students and families.

The government's priority in considering changes to the current system must NOT be "efficiency" (saving money). The number one priority needs to be quality of education, combined with encouragement to the boards to keep working at finding efficiencies that don't jeopardize the educational goals that are in place. The report provided by Dan Perrins names a number of issues that do need to be addressed other than the number and size of the divisions, so some changes are required. When he does set out the options for restructuring, he clearly lists the pros and cons of each option, and he stresses the importance of the governance shifts (p. 20) that need to accompany any move to restructure. My own view is that 28 divisions is not too large a number for a province the size of Saskatchewan. Were First Nations and Metis representatives consulted in the process of preparing the report? And finally, we have nearly 800 municipalities in this province. If reduction in numbers needs to happen, that's the place to do it.

Is the amount of reporting and paperwork teachers now have to do responsible for better quality education or is it just one more thing to do that has no bearing on whether they do a good job or not? Or is the paperwork a way for poor teachers to cover their own job?

In general I think we think we have a very good system. I am surprised at how little homework there seems to be, how often the kids have a "party" or "free time" at school and how many days they have off. It certainly feels that the education system does not challenge the comfort zone of kids. I would like to see some financial classes introduced to the curriculum. Money management is an essential part of life and the existing school system offers virtually no education on this front.

Greetings, as your online system only allows for 512 characters I am using email to submit my comments and suggestions. After reviewing the Perrin's report I believe the following to be the best path forward. 1. The public boards will be amalgamated to the extent that no individual board will govern a jurisdiction of less than 5,000 students. The net result will be no more than 8 public boards. 2. The separate boards will be amalgamated to the extent that no individual board will govern a jurisdiction of less than 5,000 students. The net result will be no more than 5 separate boards. 3. The Engelfeld Separate Board to be amalgamated to the nearest largest separate school board. 4. The number of elected school board members for any school division will not exceed 7 elected trustees. 5. The provincial government will have the option to appoint 2 trustees at large based on a competency matrix being completed immediately after each provincial board trustee election in order to determine gaps in board competency and to fill them appropriately from a pool of voluntary trustees. The appointments will occur at a time not more than one month after the first meeting of the newly reconstituted board after the most recent election. The appointments will end with the four year terms of the elected trustees. The appointments will be made by the provincial Minister of Education upon the advice and recommendations of the Board and Administration of each school board. 6. The appointed board members will serve to protect and advance the interests of the provincial government at the Board of education table along with the interests of the students and the region. 7. The anticipated administrative savings of this amalgamation will be in excess of \$30 Million dollars annually once fully implemented. 8. In exchange for existing boards accepting this amalgamation the provincial government will mandate that no classroom in the province will have in excess of 25 students within a classroom of the same grade under the guidance of a single teacher. 9. Wherever possible First Nation schools will adhere to the prescribed curriculum of the provincial government, will contract for best practice services from existing school boards, (Example Dakota Dunes - Saskatoon Public system - new Stonebridge School). 10. Term limits to be instituted amongst existing boards to ensure they remain dynamic and relevant. No more than (two) 2 consecutive (four) 4 year terms followed by a minimum of (one) 1 term off, at which time past trustees can again stand for election. 11. One single busing system, (public and separate) to be managed and under the control of the province as one single large entity paid for directly by the province of Saskatchewan to achieve the maximum economies of scale, standardization, efficiency and safety. Significant public sector saving will be found and will allow Board members to focus on instruction and education rather than transportation. warmest regards,

There are serious problems with further amalgamation of school boards, without significant cost savings. Education delivery needs vary by region, and only local elected officials can best direct those needs. Autonomy through election is very important - education should not become a political arena by government appointment of trustees; government appointments of school boards sounds like an assumption that 'government knows best' rather than the people whose children/grandchildren attend the schools. As governments have seen time and time again, centralization does not necessarily lead to lower costs or better services; in fact, quite the opposite. Not recognizing different regional / socioeconomic / urban vs rural needs by school boards as essential makes me question the depth of analysis into the options presented. One large board, or even four, would not allow for proper service delivery. There is, of course, some room for examining the boundaries of the boards and perhaps adjustments should be made - this should be a part of a regular review, as with all boundary lines. Either leave the structure as-is, or examine boundary lines for better balances and efficiency between the existing divisions. Continue to allow taxpayers to elect our school board officials. I tried to comment, but a 512 character limit is useless and, frankly, insulting. There is no room for actual feedback on even one option, let alone several.

Dear Laura Ross: I understand changes are being considered in our education system. As the MLA who represents our area, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community. Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support Saskatchewan school boards and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature. We need to keep our school boards locally elected; and we need to keep decisions closer to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community. Sincerely,

Keep our school boards locally elected. Keep decisions closer to our communities. Education belongs to community. Our Children are the most important piece in this puzzle. Keep our decisions to the ones who interact with our children daily - OUR COMMUNITY.

<p>Our school boards must be locally elected. Having elected members who have personal experience with our education system provides depth and stability for our board. We will not continue to see the success our Catholic Board has seen if we allow government appointed board members. We need to allow educators and local boards to provide for our most important natural resource - our children. Their schooling and well-being should never be an option as a governmental cost-cutting measure.</p>
<p>I tried calling the Regina catholic school board trustee last year to discuss a concern/issue I had during the school year. I left a message on their voice mail to please call me back and never heard from them. That was my experience as a fairly new resident with the Regina catholic school board.</p>
<p>Why do we still allow the Catholics to teach kids about their invisible sky wizard? It's 2016. Religion and education do not belong together. An incredible amount of time is wasted learning about fictional characters during their school day. It's absurd that this is still happening in Canada.</p>
<p>Locally elected boards are essential to our education system. Keeping our locally elected boards of education helps to ensure that the individual needs of the children in a community are met. Amalgamating school boards has been proven (in other provinces) to be a costly and time-consuming process that results in very little cost savings in the long run. As a parent of children in elementary school, I believe the best way of ensuring continued educational success of our children is to have democratically, locally elected school boards.</p>
<p>I think everything is going good, but the students elementary ones should have scheduled breaks e.g.) recess.</p>
<p>I agree that the roots of Catholic education lie in the ability to make local decisions. My vote would be to NOT amalgamate Catholic boards. I feel very strongly that we should find other ways to save money.</p>
<p>Been saying it for YEARS, neither school system needs as many board members (and the like) This number could be (should be) cut to 5. Teachers make way too much money for all the days off they get. A 20% pay cut would bring things in line with what year round workers make. There has been way too much time and resources spent on forcing our kids to learn all about the proud Indians we have in this province. It was on the news the other day about how Saskatchewan ranks 10th in education in 3 very important categories- reading, math and science so let's quit wasting the teachers time and forcing them to educate our kids about our Indians and let them put their time to teaching our kids about will prepare them for life after school. Also allowing kids to talk freely in class and be able to be on their computer devices at will is not good.</p>
<p>As a parent of children in the Regina Catholic Separate School division, it is important to me that school boards are locally elected and that decisions are made at the community level. School divisions need to be able to adjust and accommodate to local student needs. Amalgamating school divisions or changing to a centralized governance structure will not meet the needs of students. There are other educational reform items that the government could consider - such as doing away with the terrible math programs - that could make a positive difference for our students.</p>
<p>I believe we could do without so much administrative staff and focus more on staffing in the school system. We could use more EA's in some of our schools. Start after September long week-end. Cut back on the week off in November and the week off in February. Thank you for your time.</p>
<p>I love the school is in. My only problem is with the playground. We have been doing fundraisers several times a year to raise money for a new playground. We have been putting money towards a new playground for the and we have yet to hear any news about when this will happen. The playground is old and the kids deserve to have a new playground. I'm hoping the school will get more help to make this happen.</p>
<p>I'm happy that we came here to CANADA and my children become a part of Catholic School. They had so many good experiences to share with and as they get nearer to grade 12 we are happy and proud parents because through your schools here I see a good future for my children.</p>
<p>Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support Saskatchewan school boards. We need to keep our school boards locally elected and we need to keep decisions closer to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.</p>
<p>A separate, catholic school system is important to my family. More than ever it is essential to raise our children in a faith-centred atmosphere where children are encouraged to deflect society's "me first" culture. I believe that regular teachings on the life of Jesus and his example of loving one another will help children grow into responsible, caring individuals with a gift to serve.</p>

The first thing we need to ask is what we are educating our kids for? Are we educating our next generations so they can fill positions for jobs in the future that do not exist, or to create an environment where they can create their own and other jobs? Our K-12 education system was built on theories and needs from the Industrial Revolution; where we needed people who didn't need to think creatively and just do the job in front of them. We created institutions that shoved old methods down our throats so we can regurgitate it...unfortunately, our students are now just throwing up. The world is a hundred years past that revolution, yet, our education system keeps churning out the same robots as we did 100 years back. I think, it's time to go back to the drawing board and redefine the needs. Technology is the forefront of our lives and we need to embrace the fact that we need entrepreneurs more than we need government employees. Government and its ways have become obsolete, because we have retired robots building a new system...Duh! Here's an idea, lets create a system that empowers students to take risks and deal with the consequences. Let's create a system that does not test everyone on the same scale, because...guess what? Everyone doesn't end up doing the same job. Let's start by hiring ministers who are actually more interested in the welfare of the kids, rather than building their own political career. It is obvious that the only system that exists today that can harness a student's full potential is the Montessori System. If we do not employ this system, we as a society will be left far behind the rest of the world. The reason being, we will graduate students trying to change things they have never learnt how to change and a world that is changing constantly. Look around us...the most successful people around us were people who dropped out of the public system. They are successful despite the system...the rest turned into lawyers and joined the government or work for the successful people...just tells you how valuable public education really is. Change is inevitable...Radical Change is Evolutionary! How is it that, there is no one from industry on this panel? If we intend to create true leaders and creators, we cannot have a panel without successful entrepreneurs? To build a system that can create smart individuals for the future you need a panel of individuals who have previously built something of value for the community. It is time for Radical change.

Lower teachers' pay, Lower admin pay also, Stop building school we do not really need. I am talking about the Sacred Heart and Connaught. Make a teacher do after school stuff. Lower wages they get more if they do the after school activities. Example every school has at least one play. I think 2 would be ideal. All sports have a team. These activities help the school become a community. Do not waste money on special interest groups. Stop all the talk about bullying and get the teachers to open their eye and see what is really happening.

I cannot got back to the last house I owed and tell people it my house I sold it done deal. Why would pay a person more because they have more degrees. The job is the job if your qualified you're qualified. Teachers raise. They go up in steps plus raise stop that. first year 38000 next year 38500 those are the steps do not raise each step as they get there (this was an example I am sure they make more). Go back to only needing 2 years of schooling. Get more teachers lower wages simple supply and demand. Do not let all teachers belong to the same bargaining unit, if you have good management which they do not as they are from the same system we could see real change. Do not give teacher 3 months off. first 5 years you get 3 weeks like everyone else move up according. As more parents work they actually like kids in school, so year round school. It will take work but it can be done. I have lots Ideas but hopefully you're smart enough to figure out my concepts. No teacher should make 70 grand for 7 months work. No teach should be able to retire before 65. Check out how much that would save us a year. If you can retire before 65 you were paid too much.

The Separate Catholic School System must be maintained. Many people I know, Catholic and Christian (Non-Catholic) enroll their children in the Catholic School System as it integrates spiritually, mentality, and physicality all together. There are 3 parts to our lives and the public school system is moving more and more away to being completely non-spiritual which has already serious negative effects on society to the point where people have had enough and are starting to react. We see this now in the US with the election results and many other parts of the world.

It is important to me that school boards remain elected. This is to ensure the board remains accountable and sensitive to the needs of the school community. If boards are appointed they will not have the same connection to the students, parents and teachers. As well, if board members are appointed there is a risk that such appointments will be made on political basis rather than based on merit. Greater efficiencies may be gained if greater controls and instructions are given to boards to ensure, for example, a common standard of materials and equipment. I trust that there will be hard evidence to support any amalgamation of school boards. It seems that the larger the school board, the greater the amount of compensation that has to be paid, along with increased administration, such that any efficiencies may be erased.

I do not think school divisions should be amalgamated. Keeping autonomous divisions helps students and their families to get the best education and make the best decisions for the students. I also greatly value having my kids in a Catholic school in order to help instill Catholic values.

I believe our schools need to fail children who are not equipped for their grade levels. I raise grandchildren and have asked over the years to have one held back as she was pushed on every year from kindergarten on. When I finally raised enough of a fuss in grade 8 as I knew she could not enter high school the way she was. They finally agreed to have her tested. She tested at a grade 2.5 level and was going to be entering high school the following year. This to me is absolutely absurd. I am not a teacher and I knew she was so lost. She went to Sylvan learning for a year and 1/2 and they were able to get her to her grade level. She is not a stupid child she needed the basics which she never received. Over the years it has been very frustrating. Every parent teacher interview started with the teacher telling me she was not working up to her potential. Well they were right in one way. Which if they would have had her tested years before when I asked them to she would not have felt so inadequate throughout her elementary schooling. This young child begged to be held back and given a chance to catch up but we were told the school board would not allow them to keep her back. Common sense should tell you if they are lost in elementary school they will almost certainly give up and quit in high school. Perhaps this is the mandate of our governing bodies to keep them uneducated so it costs them less for education. When I was in school a child was not just pushed on from grade to grade. We had to know the work and be able to do it. What we have today is a glorified babysitting service not an education system. The way it is now designed why do we need teachers as it matters not if they can teach as the child will be pushed through anyway. Someone needs to stand up for the children and stop this insanity.

I completely disagree with the changes proposed. This is LEAN driven. The only thing LEAN has done from my experience working in another large government system is create more work and less staff to do it. I am very upset that this would even be considered for our children's education - because it will negatively impact them in so many ways. My suggestion is to leave the local school boards as is and if there are problems with certain boards than address those boards individually. Work with them directly in improving their problems do not change an entire system to do it. It won't work!!!! Every community has different needs and therefore having local boards to address diverse community needs is crucial. This is all about MONEY. It's not about education for our children. It's about how to do things cheaper. It is so disappointing to hear that these changes are even being considered.

Thank you for your openness in receiving input on this important question. The Catholic School boards have proven to be fiscally and financially efficient, producing very positive outcomes in students and our communities. A key part of this has been in keeping decisions local through locally elected boards. I strongly encourage our government to keep this practice, which has ensured high quality at minimal cost for many years.

I understand changes are being considered in our education system. Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support Saskatchewan school boards. We need to keep our school boards locally elected; and, we need to keep decisions closer to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community they live in. Therefore, after reviewing Mr. Dan Perrins Governance Review Report, it is my hope that the Government of Saskatchewan implements the shifts in governance as highlighted beginning on Page 20 of his report and if a new direction is needed for Saskatchewan school divisions; that the Government will give strong consideration to implementing Option 3B - Realigning Boundaries as outlined on Page 26.

If the Sask party would stop and smell the roses the education system already has a panel of people called the school board. There always was but Sask. Party wants power and control. Next they are going to want to P3 the panel lol.

Dan Perrins mandate was to explore governance options that will focus on student success. Most of the report seemed to focus on efficiency and accountability to the gov't. Nothing in his report seemed to indicate which option would be best for student success. Any kind of drastic change should be based on demonstrated best practices elsewhere. Again the report showed that other provinces that have adopted different governance options are either very different in geographical size or population to us and therefore cannot be valid comparisons. The report could also not demonstrate that significant improved student success was archived in provinces that adopted new governance models. In the past I served on an appointed health board in Alberta. While there was good diversity of backgrounds and expertise represented by the appointments, there was also an obvious bias towards appointing individuals that had connections with the ruling political party. This kind of situation further erodes the confidence that communities have that their voices are being listened to rather than the party line being force fed to all involved with little true alternative perspectives considered. Please put students first!

Looking for further savings in the Education system by amalgamating school boards may look like an easy win for our current government, but it comes at the expense of our children's future. Several times our government has tried to find "savings" by forcing practices into environments they were not effective in - the LEAN initiative into Health Care for example. The LEAN practice originated in automobile manufacturing, and although it is an effective practice there, it did not to my knowledge, save the taxpayers of the province the money it was expected to. And at what detriment did it do to our health care system? To amalgamate school boards looking for \$ savings, the negative impact to the understanding, and local grass roots understanding of our kids and their needs, will be felt. The 6 person panel appointed to even investigate this possible change, will undoubtedly burn through more cash than the government will find in savings. The government should focus on how they can positively impact school programs through ADDING funds instead of continually SUBTRACTING from our children's learning process. Portable classrooms, overcrowded schools, inequality in results compared to peer provinces (ACTUAL QUANTIFIYABLE DOCUMENTED RESULTS), is all we have seen from our government's stance on education. Let's focus on what is right, and stop wasting time on looking for efficiencies where they may not exist, and if they do, the cost of change will be more than the cost to be saved.

I do not support the further amalgamation of school boards and divisions within our province. I agree with the Saskatchewan School Boards Association that there are no further savings to be had. I do believe that this would only lead to further job losses, as preparation time is lost and therefore prep. Teacher positions will be eliminated. Each school division has its own unique needs and as such, decisions to meet those needs can't be effectively made provincially or by an appointed board. I do believe that there are savings to be found by amalgamating the 296 Rural Municipalities, one of which has only 73 people living there. Cutting that number down to around 100 would make much more sense than making larger school divisions or just one.

I support status quo for our school division and board of trustees. Thank you.

I understand changes are being considered in our education system. Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support Saskatchewan school boards and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature. We need to keep our school boards locally elected; and, We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

To whom it may concern, I'm writing this letter to you to share with you my concerns with the governance review of the School boards. Although I understand the government of Saskatchewan is in tight financial restraints and that sometimes these restraints can lead to good decisions to make our public services systems more efficient, it is unclear at times to the public exactly what the goals of significant changes are- and truly what is the motivator to make the changes. It can appear that finances is the single and most dominating motivator - and as you can imagine to us parents that can seem misguided when we think the long term success of our children's education should be the ultimate goal. I do believe in appropriate and accountable reviews of how our education system is operating, but I believe that accountability and appropriate governance is best served at a smaller, local level where boards have actual and tangible connection to their schools and outcomes. I believe perhaps the government should review their accountability mechanisms for their school boards, and would argue that improved accountability is achieved by supporting effective and local level boards and school divisions with clear and high strategic goals and expectations. I personally have worked in public sector work as a health care executive and can honestly say that we've achieved higher accountability and better outcomes by sustaining a localized governance structure with clearer expectations, better strategic goals - goals which all understand and can truly see how each and everyone of us can see how we each can work together to achieve that goal. I would urge your review committee to not only look at structure, but also consider better strategic alignment to achieve the outcomes you truly are looking for. Taking away local governance I believe is not necessarily the answer. Also I would suggest that the public would benefit from hearing from the province on what the true goal of the review is, why it is being requested - and perhaps an explanation of "why now?" Would this review have been requested a few years ago when financial times were stronger? If the motivation is finances - that's okay as long as the goal is long term education positive improvements and outcomes - at the child/classroom and school levels then please advise us how you believe this review will indeed achieve this. Please understand that generally I support proper accountability reviews and efficient public services governance, however in this case I'm not sure a more centralized model (i.e. fewer school boards with larger service areas) is the correct path to follow. Thank you for considering my thoughts and concerns with this review. Sincerely, a concerned Mother of 2 elementary school children.

KEEP LOCALLY ELECTED BOARDS!!!!Keep status quo or as close to for number of boards there is no real cost savings!!!And if there is any cost savings it is done at the cost of achieving our educational goals and DEMOCRACY!!

Please keep trustees elected And we need to keep decisions closer to our communities.

My thoughts on the Amalgamation: You guys (Gov't) have been controlling everything and everything you touch goes downhill. Infrastructure Roads, Home Maintenance and now Education. Since you have taken over the Mill rate (AND BASICALLY FORCEFULLY, TOOK CONTROL OVER THE PEOPLES MONEY AND DECISIONS AND DENIED US OUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO MANAGE OUR OWN MONEY AND COMMUNITY DRIVEN BUSINESS OF EDUCATION) I have seen budget cuts every fiscal in extent of 500,000 and up yearly. YET YOU CONTINUE TO RAISE OUR TAXES AND KEEP CUTTING US. Your history shows the same with other such services you touch and take control of. Department of Roads and Transport, City infrastructure, and on and on. Our roads in our cities Saskatoon etc., are falling apart, sink holes. I was one such person that almost lost my house because of one of YOUR failing and neglected water mains flooding out my home. Trying to get you to cover your damages was like banging my head against a wall. You guys are bad for business and only think about yourselves and not your community. (THE VERY PEOPLE THAT PAY TO MAKE YOU A GOVT, WE ELECT YOU, WE HIRE YOU TO BUDGET, AND YOU RUIN EVERYTHING) you raise the taxes to increase infrastructure , then impose laws to restrict us and force us to do your dirty work (THAT WE THE PEOPLE ARE NOW PAYING MORE FOR THE SERVICE) We are charged more. We have to shovel your sidewalks groom your trees as to not wait a year for you to provide that service when your trees are rubbing the asphalt off our home shingles. OUR PROPERTY. We get fines if we cannot shovel our sidewalks because we are away or sick. our elderly etc. Now you're attacking education, to go lean. I'll tell you something: Since you took over the mill rate our company has gotten unbearable to work for. I seldom get coffee breaks without fighting for them, I work 8-4:30 (8.5 hrs. a day) and only get 1/2 hr. lunch and rarely get to take my coffees.

Our company

BECAUSE OF YOUR MISMANAGEMENT AND BUDGET CUTS only pays

incurred by the company's use and your failing roads and infrastructure damage. You people want to amalgamate and elect your own people to manage education, (OUR COMMUNITY, OUR MONEY, NOT YOURS.) I don't even have kids to educate so to me it's like your stealing from me and I'm sure many others. You want to screw up even more things in this province by cutting costs and moving more of your uneducated people into managing things that OUR ELECTIVE are more trained and qualified for than you. You want to cut jobs costs, yet given your track record we still Won't see any of the gain in our communities and schools as far as funding goes. And now you will control it all and continue to plum it us to fail, while cutting jobs and more funding. You want to go with a privatization model and sell off our crown corps like SaskTel etc. Because of your foolish decisions ALBERTA and EDMONTON FLATLINED. ECONOMIC CRASH. People lost their shirts sold their homes left. Privatization. EDMONTON highest vehicle insurance rates in the country as an e.g. Now you're trying it here. Ohh and might I add, in cutting your own people that build your economy. and trying to do away with pensions too, you continue to give handouts and tons of money to the

People should have the right to breathe clean air. What I'm Saying here, Is you people (This Gov't) is destroying this province. And though it's my constitutional right to my opinion you don't even have to take my word for it. The writing is on the wall. Check the news posts and media ,radio. 1400 homes now sit empty in Saskatoon alone.. People are leaving the province and selling because of your mismanagement. I can't even sell my house because of the problem you feed on both sides of me in my neighborhood. I will soon be one of those people. I who administers and services an entire division or city of people. I too am fed up with your foolish mismanagement. PRIVATIZATION and AMALGOMATION CUTTING PENSIONS INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING and TAKING CONTROL OF OUR VERY ESSENCE OF LIFE HERE. I am against. On my opinion and allow our people to manage our money and continue to serve our communities and have our own EDUCATED electives to run things and STAY OUT OF OUR BUSINESS. Your just there to manage our money and divvy it up to keep our society going. This gov't was not formed or hired by the people of Saskatchewan and Canada to Control and reform us. You're hired and elected by us the people to keep things running smooth and not run us into the ground. On my opinion, this gov't cannot manage or budget money. I am against your leaning out and taking control of our board electives and costing people their jobs and homes to ruin something they do well for this province.

The government wants to cut funds education to school boards in Saskatchewan. I KNOW this is wrong. I believe it was 2007 when the ministry took away the ability for school boards to fund themselves. It is now 2017. In order for the ministry of education to LOOK GOOD, the minister nor premier has NOT increased that funding to the school boards since then!!!

Trustees are either subservient to their electors as a whole or/and the communities where they live. Most trustees have two or more schools, some up to twenty-five miles away; therefore community input can vary from school to school. In view of the fact that each school has an SCC (school community council), putting them in a better position to represent their communities. Thank you for the opportunity to make my views known. I believe it is important to look at the money we spend on Governance. The two divisions in Saskatoon spent 1.5 million on Governance, while the total amount was 11 million. If education is our priority, the classroom is where we should be looking to improve.

Locally elected boards matter. The roots of Catholic education lie in the ability to make local decisions. Regina Catholic Schools is one of the highest achieving divisions in the Province of Saskatchewan. Amalgamating Catholic boards will distract our attention from our priorities. School division amalgamations are disruptive and time-consuming. The Regina Catholic School Division has been fiscally and financially efficient. Changing governance or amalgamating school divisions is not the answer to the financial challenges that the government is facing. We need to keep our focus on reading, math, writing, graduation and attendance – things that matter to students and families.

What needs to be explained how changing governance will "focus on student success". Is a lack of focus on student success due to the system of governance? All indicators PISA, etc. Would suggest that there definitely is a need to focus on student success. Clarify how any options outlined are going to positively impact students.

It is extremely important and valuable for our children and community to continue in the manner in which the Catholic School Board is ALREADY successful. Locally elected people making decisions for our local children. Leave it alone. Find other ways. There are many other areas to make a difference where it will actually benefit children.

Please consider: We need to keep our school boards locally elected; and, We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

Thank you for this opportunity. I'd welcome less boards overall although I do still see their value. In education in particular, the GOS still needs to ensure the stakeholders and parents have opportunities to engage and have their say regardless of the governance structure. I would also support moving to just a provincial wide education system and disband the Catholic school divisions. I think education is a right but religiously based education should not be funded by the tax payer.

I do not believe the Regina Catholic School Division would benefit from this change as I see many advantages to having locally elected representation and our division is efficient. That said, I think divisions outside of bigger centers like Regina and Saskatoon could benefit from some of the proposed changes as it would create efficiencies.

School boards must retain the ability to govern and make decisions that affect them at a local level. There is much diversity within Saskatchewan and in order to best meet the learning needs of students and communities, I urge the Ministry to allow our voices to be heard. The Regina Catholic School Division is achieving and surpassing ESSP targets, financially efficient and transparent, and always willing to share openly with stakeholders at the government level to help other school division within the province. Disrupting the success and focus we have established on our students' successes in math, reading, graduating, preparing early learners for school.... all while retaining our Catholic distinctiveness and mission according to our strong faith tradition would be detrimental to everything we've worked so hard to establish for almost 120 years. There is no 'one size fits all' when it comes to teaching our students - nor is there such a 'fit' for the way we support and govern our schools, teachers, administrators, communities, and most importantly our Children of God. Therefore, I pray that we are allowed to maintain our autonomy and decision making abilities - as locally elected board matter greatly in carrying out our vocation as educators. Thank you for your consideration.

Dear Panel: Please keep school boards locally elected. As well, please advise the provincial government, that if the purpose of this review is to find cost savings in the education sector, another option is to ensure that all revenue sources in this sector are being explored. It is now common knowledge that daycares operating in school board properties are: 1. operated by third parties and 2. not subject to property taxes Please note that under Sections 262 and 265 of The Cities Act - these daycares should be subject to property tax as they are not tax exempt businesses. Minister Harpauer agrees with this. SO... raise revenue by taxing these daycares, rather than wringing out a few million \$ in cost savings from large centralized un-responsive school boards. Thanks.

My main opinion on these options is that the Catholic systems continue to exist. I do think that maybe another look at the borders for School Divisions is a good option but as I do not work in the public system I am unsure if this is necessary.

I would like to express my concern regarding the possibility of further amalgamations of school boards in our province. While I realize the money saving value of such a move, especially during this time of economic difficulty for Saskatchewan, yet in the longer run, larger and larger school districts tend to promote a 'one size fits all' philosophy that desensitizes trustee boards to the particular needs of our students and our schools. Locally elected boards are much closer to the educational needs of their areas and are able to listen to the grass-root level concerns of the districts they serve. Therefore, I would have serious reservations about amalgamations and caution those in charge of making these decisions about the longer range consequences of such a move. Thank you.

Prince Albert Catholic and Public needs to amalgamate into one school division not two. The busses are running separately as they can't get along with the more dominant Public School system and are costing thousands of dollars when the schools could become one system and run one bus instead of two. This is not environmentally friendly. Public Schools also have schools with large classrooms and their rural school doesn't have enough students to justify keeping the school open like East Central school when the buses drive by everyday all the way into the city. The children that attend Catholic schools don't go to church anyway so the churches can start to give private Catholic teachings without doing it in school especially when they are so behind in reading and writing compared to other provinces. Sask Rivers school division is doing so well compared to the Catholic school division and the Catholic School division needs to concede to their better more efficient and dominant partners in Prince Albert.

It seems to me that further amalgamation would only hurt our vulnerable students. Already, the wait time is measured in months (and sometimes up to a year) to get testing done. Without testing, we are not funded for additional aide time or more teacher time. Our divisional staff are on the road for hours at a time. Currently, our school is 125 kms from central office. That means that time that could be spent with students is spent on the drive. Please don't amalgamate the divisions. It will harm our students.

Hi, I have had both my children complaining for last month or so about verbal bullying at school. I have mentioned it to the Principal of the school and my son has said it's less prevalent but my daughter still complains of "verbal abuse". I would like to see teachers and administrators of schools to be more recognizance of verbal bullying and making an effort to change it. My kids have requested once already to be transferred to another school. I however am trying to give the "school" a chance to improve my children's school experience by ending the problems. I know kids nowadays have this belief that telling on people will not do anything. All I can do myself is let the administrators of the school know what's going on, and hopefully they can fix said problems. For most part I am happy with education of my children. Thanks for your time.

Catholic education is important and needs to remain in our province. Families should be able to choose faith based education for their children. It is critical that locally elected school boards remain intact. We need to keep our decisions in our own communities. Creating one large school division in a province the size of Saskatchewan is not feasible. The needs of school communities are very different throughout the province. Locally elected school boards understand the needs of their communities and work to ensure that those needs are being met. Education should not suffer as a result of a government who finds itself with financial difficulties. School divisions are doing everything possible to cut costs as mandated by the Ministry of Education. However, education is a service industry and not big business. We need to ensure that our students' needs are the first priority.

I'm so happy my baby girl attended to a Roman Catholic school, thank you.

Combine them into one schoolboard to improve efficiency and reduce costs. It seems odd to me that a religion still gets its own school board.

Over the last few years I have attended the Regina Catholic school division public consultation sessions on building for the future. The statistics presented by the RCSD clearly indicated an unexpected growth in enrolment in the RC elementary schools with much greater numbers of children in each and every school. At these meeting me and others expressed concern that within five to seven years (now about five years) that the RC high schools would be bursting at the seams. Well, as of today my concern and others at the meeting is still a big concern. With current no plans to build a new Catholic high school in east Regina, I predict within five years Catholic high schools will not be able to handle the students. Regards,

The less administrative overlap the better. Fewer school boards. Can't lose any teaching positions or prep teachers.

We need to keep our school boards locally elected. We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community. Please consider these factors when conducting your review.

I am a newly retired teacher. I see our school division and many others getting so large that it is impossible to have the fluid relationships and communication necessary to have adequate flow of information. I am not in favour of larger, "top heavy" divisions. I believe strongly in the evidence supporting the rule of 150 - up to 150 people in an organization makes it possible to sustain a viable and open network, but over 150 creates separate factions that erode the lines of communication, awareness, and the process of meaningful decision making. I recall vividly during informational meetings leading up to the last division amalgamation that there would be more local autonomy. Just the opposite came to pass and I have seen no evidence that "bigger is better". However, the benefits of a very small school division such as the one I began my career with were absolutely evident; the network of communication was very uncomplicated, relationships between the levels of personnel allowed for policies to be established more proficiently, and the culture of the organization encouraged autonomy and trust. Larger divisions create more distance between the decision makers and the students, leaving the front line workers - teachers and EAs - increasingly voiceless. As well, change becomes incredibly bogged down in trickling through the geographical and political layers of larger divisions, and change - huge change - is required quickly for Saskatchewan to best prepare its youth for a vastly different economic and social world than our current curriculum outcomes and age/grade system serves. (Also, when school division boundaries do not coincide with health care boundaries it becomes a very onerous task to establish mental health services for the increasing needs of our students.) Student Services teachers are required to have more training than regular classroom teachers, are given management responsibilities (EAs), and have an over-arching responsibility for a multi graded, ever increasing population of students requiring specialized services, yet are not supported with a wage (different than classroom teachers) that reflects this, resulting in a huge lack of qualified persons to take these positions, resulting in classroom teachers being overwhelmed and under supported for the diversity of student needs. Our provincial school systems need leadership that has the foresight to put resources upstream of the negative outcomes that create pressure on our health, welfare, and judicial systems. We desperately need a provincial system that allows for maverick thinking in order to radically break free from the current competitive model of learning and "assessment" that does not serve the potential of our youth. It is not the political system of divisions that really needs to change, it is what we are delivering that needs to change. According to the Assessment for Learning Across Canada, our school system sees a steep decline in student engagement starting in grade 5, and progressing by about 10% each year afterwards. The education ideology that is driving our provincial curricula is flawed and every new initiative that has been developed during my educational career of 32 years has only been a rearrangement of a philosophy that is based on academic "success" and not human need for meaningful learning. From numerous professional discussions, I know my evaluation of the curriculum and its outcomes is shared by many teachers and EAs, all of whom are very aware of what students actually need as opposed to what we are told that they need, but whom are caught between serving the political mandate of curriculum and serving the students' "real-life" best interests. There are educational models (ex. - Finland) that produce prolific evidence of successful educational beliefs and practices yet Saskatchewan students continue to be fed an antiquated system of content driven outcomes that does not serve their needs as learners or citizens.

Not failing students creates individuals who develop poor work habits but want to be paid well. For years now if you ask an Employer who he would hire for an employee he will say, "I prefer seniors from the 1940-1960 era- they know how to think and work-know their math too." "Next I will hire Mexicans or Philippines because they are not afraid to work, willing to learn and/or work for less" Students at an early age figure out they don't have to work hard to go through the education system. I volunteered to help in an elementary school and I saw smart little ones close up their books and say "I don't have to do anymore, I am way ahead of Johnny/ Suzy" (Johnny moves on to the next grade with him and he is having difficulty because he doesn't quite understand the preliminary things from the grade before that they were in!? Johnny/Suzy are going to get so far behind in the system that they will give up/be quitters, maybe turn to things that make them feel good (drug and/or alcohol) or find a job that they can do with minimal pay. There is a saying, "It is not a disgrace to fail, but it is a sin to give less than your best at everything you do." If we don't have standards or goals to achieve what are we doing. Nothing! You cannot develop pride in what you do if there are no set goals to achieve and kids are the quickest to pick up on things to achieve but if we as adults don't help and encourage them to work at achieving those goals we fail them by not giving them a goal to achieve. If everybody wins then why do anything to give it "Your Best" I also believe by giving them computers they lose their ability to understand or think something through. In life we need more than "just an answer" we need to understand how we get that answer. Respect for each other is so important but when we stress that everyone can achieve passing without respecting teachers' wishes/plans , doing anything beyond what they individually want to do we lose that child's respect or concern for anything or anyone.

I support locally elected boards. I believe we need to keep decisions in our communities.

The transformational change and this report are very encompassing, however I feel the primary focus was on boundary changes and board consolidation. I believe there are deeper “structural issues” that should be explored and considered as well during this opportunity of transformational change. The facility assets are in incredibly poor condition despite a history of being well funded. The Education districts are run by educators and are fully education focused. Being program focused, education districts have a history of “robbing” the maintenance budgets to fund more program delivery. This is structural flaw that is also very apparent within Health Regions. My suggested brief outline is brief and lacking in depth. I believe that third party social agencies should reorganize separating program delivery from asset management.

Recommendations for Capital Infrastructure Part 1 - Convert social infrastructure (exception Universities*) into government agencies/crowns responsible for the maintaining and delivering accommodation space to third parties agencies (school divisions, health regions, etc.). Establish a client focused landlord/tenant relationship, structured very similar to the Central Services model. Health and Education would be separate agencies to ensure that as “landlords” they are responsive to the very specific needs of their clients. Third parties would lease space from the “governing bodies” responsible for providing and maintaining those spaces. Central Services is currently structured in this manner and the overall facility condition index (FCI) of the properties managed by Central Services is within accepted industries standards. Demonstrating (when compared to current third parties FCI) how a dedicated asset management organization is highly effective when separated from the program delivery aspects of a Ministry or third party tenant. Advantages: a. dedicated focused expertise to run and maintain facilities; b. consolidation provides greater efficiencies for dedicated trades and specialization (i.e. HVAC, building controls technicians, etc.); c. creates a customer based relationship; d. ensures social service agencies are focused 100% on their identified program delivery; e. removes incentive of Health and Education Boards to “rob” maintenance budgets. Thereby creating an increase in deferred maintenance and legacy costs; f. ensures greater transparency and accountability for the managing of government/taxpayer assets; g. promotes effective, comprehensive and creative asset resource utilization; Part 2 - Infrastructure agencies of Central Services, Education and Health** would have a mandate to provide client services, asset management, maintenance and major renovation up to five million dollars. Advantages: a. establish, monitor and maintain good industry standards for maintenance practices for all government agencies; b. agencies would be able to provide and support specialized services due to economies of scale; c. provides a separation from service and program delivery; d. asset management would be industry focused. Part 3 - Establish an Infrastructure Division/Ministry that would responsible for providing capital work over five million dollars for all government owned infrastructure. (modeled after Alberta Infrastructure) The agency would consolidate the capital roles of the Ministries of Central Services, Education, Health, Highways and Infrastructure, Justice and Parks, Culture and Sport, and Saskatchewan Housing Corporation into one comprehensive organization with a specialized focus on capital project delivery. Advantages: e. able to establish, maintain and monitor standards for good capital procurement practices for all government agencies; f. provides a level and transparent “playing field” within government for all Ministries with project requirements over five million dollars; g. provides consistent, reliable and verifiable report outs on all projects; h. manages and monitors the project portfolio; i. manages, monitors and coordinates inter agency integration for greater efficiencies; j. provides expertise with qualified Project Management Professionals (PMP) in project delivery; k. identifies and ensures projects are aligned with the governments strategic goals and objectives; l. provides and establishes a source of documentation, guidance and metrics for project management and execution; m. works with senior leadership to select projects with the greatest alignment to the strategic goals of government, ensuring a sound business case, and the highest benefit to cost ratios; n. land transactions and strategic planning on land acquisition for the province; o. coordinate federal funding negotiations with relevant Ministries; * Universities campus are significant institutions with facilities management teams that are more closely aligned with a small city. University campuses also have significant fund raising abilities that set them apart from other third party social infrastructures. They have and maintain an in-depth level of available expertise to manage their large asset base effectively. ** Healthcare facilities are very unique and require special consideration that is not apparent within other program delivery models or social agencies. It is imperative that urban centers of Regina and Saskatoon are stand alone. Each has tertiary hospitals that must and should receive the full attention of the maintenance and support services within them. Currently our rural sites are captured and support with the city hospitals. Rural sites are only provided minimum support because of the importance of ensuring tertiary hospitals remaining operational at all times. Creating a drain on the tertiary hospitals and choking the rural healthcare sites as they cannot get out from under the cities shadow. It is in the best interest of both to be separated. Allowing the hospitals in cities of Regina and Saskatoon to focused on their critical mandate for ensuring healthcare remains in Saskatchewan. Should we lose one of these sites, healthcare in that region will not be able to continue. They are that significant. The separation will also allow rural sites to become larger to gain economies of scale. Rural sites also have very significant issues that their unique situation

requires a completely different focus when compared to the urban sites. One KEY element should this model be considered is the rural sites must be S.G.E.U. unionized and the city sites can be C.U.P.E. This is based on the structural differences of the two contracts. The S.G.E.U. contract allows for freedom of management to create multi-site positions. The C.U.P.E. has very restrictive language and is not multi-site supportive. C.U.P.E. is "community site" supportive which works very well within the city environments. Without free and nonrestrictive multi-site ability any changes to rural sites will not create any economies of scale or improvements to asset management delivery.

Considering the size of the province and the scattered populations, I could support three divisions: Regina, Saskatoon, and the North....any other lesser grouping with be unworkable and inefficient.

I have finished reading this very comprehensive report which takes in many pages of previously known data and compiles it into a different format. There is no new information here. The premise to this report is that "bigger is better - in the long run". Larger school divisions will create greater efficiencies. "Initially it will cost money to make the changes but in a few years these cost will be recovered by the efficiencies of amalgamation." After working in education for 30 years and travelling North America to find best practice I feel confident in saying that you have missed the target. Larger schools and school divisions in the states have lower outcomes. Larger school divisions in Saskatchewan have good outcomes that can become better. To reach your 2020 target you have to look deeper into the issues where the concerns lie. The correlation between reading levels at grade 3 and grade 12 graduation rates had never been greater. Research across the globe proves that. If you want to get better outcomes, save money, and have a more effective community I would gladly explain to you what needs to be considered. By eliminating inefficiencies with in educational school divisions and between agencies serving children and families not only would hundreds of millions be saved but healthier families, increased attendance, increased engagement, and improved outcomes would result. Less obvious but noted in the essence of the report is that the government (sask-ed) is having great difficulty getting all school divisions and schools on the same page with regards to governance, instruction and assessment practices. By creating larger and fewer school divisions it will be easier to monitor and communicate what is expected. This is false thinking. A larger school division that disagrees with the direction would be a bigger anchor to move. Look at which schools and school divisions are performing well, identify best practices, provide leadership that will result in these practices being communicated and implemented. Enact new legislation that ensures these practices are being followed. The keys to improved outcomes are safety, attendance, reading, engagement and a focus on learning. Families, students, demographics and society have changed much since 1975 and 1995. The education Act has very little power to enforce these five areas. Give our leaders the tools to enforce best practices in our schools, students and families and outcomes will increase. With increased outcomes, fewer social problems, and agency cooperation efficiencies will then be achieved. Here are examples at different levels. Education: If we continue to place students with very little language in age appropriate school settings how do we expect them to very be successful? How do we know reading is the top indicator but a high percent of our students do not have English or French as a first language and while major resources are put into these children learning a language at the age of 14 is going to take more than a few months and yet they will fall behind or never catch up. This support of language acquisition at all levels is taking valuable time away from teachers who have to provide grade level instruction to those who have been in the system for years. Social Services Ask yourself, Is a Social Services system that does not react to students who do not attend school or families who do not send their children to school ever going to be successful. If we continue to focus on treating the problems because our children do not attend school rather than working to get them to school we are fighting a losing battle with these children and therefore the families. What incentive do they have to send their children to school? (Very little as they don't know what they are missing) What consequence do they receive if they do not attend? (None of relevance. A suspension! A letter! Not even a comment from Social Services themselves) Other Governance Ask yourself if 61 MLA's is needed to represent our population? There is an inefficiency. Do a survey of 100 people in Regina and ask them to name more than five of the MLA's in the city and you will find few who can. Consider the man hours put into this report and the number of people who work out of schools but are counted against education funding. Let's cut governance at all levels. Rather than increasing school divisions to eliminate boards of educations simply reduce through legislations the number of board members, superintendents, Sask-ed positions, and central office personal at all levels and the saving would be enormous and no effect on decreasing outcomes and in fact may make decisions and change easier so these internal amalgamations would create the efficiencies suggested in the report with up front savings rather than upfront costs. As suggested earlier if you want to make a change that matters, one that improves our system and one in which, students, families and taxpayers would support just let me know. Chances are I know someone who has the answer and know ever more that can make it happen. Thanks for asking

If common services (HR, Accounting, IT, Bussing etc.) can be centralized there could be a great cost savings with more than likely an increase in service. We for so long in this province have refused to look outside the box to make things better or more affordable. In the end we need to lighten the load of the taxpayer and this to me seems like a great way to do that.

Kindly keep our Catholic School Divisions separate with locally voted in school boards. Thank You!!

Education Minister Don Morgan is considering doing away with locally elected school trustees in favor of a provincial school board appointed by the provincial cabinet. We strongly disagree and here's why. In 1990, we were engaged by the Progressive Conservative Minister of Education to review Saskatchewan school finance and governance. After considering theoretical and philosophical constructs underpinning a variety of governance models, we concluded: The delivery of education should be through a system of local jurisdictions established by the provincial government and functioning within a governance structure of locally-elected boards of education. The membership on the boards consisting of lay people should be elected from among the electors of the school division (Langlois and Scharf, p. 229). We saw education as a public good, fundamental for good democratic citizenry, to be delivered through a partnership among parents, communities and the government. We believe this to be as true today as it was then. Removal of the community, as represented by local boards of education, would create a structure within which parents, as individuals, would have to deal with the centralized government. The parents' ability to deal with a governing body close to them would be eliminated and the pivotal educational pillar upon which a democratic society is built would be destroyed. After two years of study and consultations, we recommended, among many, that: 1) School divisions needed a critical mass to provide a full range of services to the pupils in their care; (2) The number of trustees on boards of education be increased to ensure access by the public; (3) School councils at the school level be elected by parents to advise school principals and boards of education on issues of importance to the operation of their schools; and (4) Within the parameters of provincial policies, boards of education should exercise local autonomy to address the unique needs of their communities and encourage innovation in the delivery of school services. Diversity is the way to progress. The Minister's proposal to put the education of public school children in the hands of a single provincial board appointed on a partisan basis effectively transfers the power to govern schools from local communities. This flies in the face of the participatory democratic model that has been in place even before the province was formed. In his report, Dan Perrins, who was hired by the Minister to conduct this review, describes the model as follows: With appointed boards, local voice is diminished and government authority is increased. The appointed board is accountable to government. Their direction can be set more readily to align with the interests and values of the appointers. They can be relieved of their role if they do not fulfil their mandate or do not achieve desired results. (Perrins, p.20) In our view, Saskatchewan people will not accept this authoritarian model. In his consultations, Perrins failed to find any support for an appointed provincial board of education. In fact, Perrins did not recommend it, choosing instead to present four governance options, including the present system with minor modifications. According to Perrins, only the 18 public school division boards would be disestablished. The separate school divisions would remain intact. For example, Saskatoon's public schools would be governed by the provincial board while the Catholic schools would still be governed by a democratically elected board of education. How will this work? What will parents who no longer have access to their local trustee do? Will they simply move their children across the street? Or will they leave the public system and establish their own private schools? In other words, what are the unintended consequences of the Minister's proposal? Such a system, one set of schools governed provincially and the other governed by a local board of education, cannot stand the test of time. How long would it be before someone would call for a plebiscite to undo the constitutional protections the religious minorities have? Or, how many communities will petition the Minister to establish a separate school division as currently exists with the Protestant school division in Engelfeld? With all the unanswered questions, why is the Minister considering such a proposal? In the absence of any significant rationale, it appears the state of provincial finances is driving this action. A provincial board appointed by the Minister would not likely oppose cuts to education funding, likely coming in the next provincial budget. But, who will advocate for the children? Are short term financial issues a good enough reason to do away with school trustees? Would it not be better for the Minister to engage with the boards and their administrators to deal with the issues? In fact, according to the Perrins report, these efforts are ongoing. To conclude, we respectfully urge the Minister to take the appointed provincial board of education model off the table. We believe that individuals dedicated to excellence in their schools, elected by an engaged public, are the best means to improving the quality of our schools. The principles of school governance we advocated in 1991 are just as valid today as they were then. Respectfully submitted,

As a parent of four now-grown children who attended schools in this province, and as a soon to be grandparent of a future student, I want to express my STRONG support for locally elected school boards. My husband and I have always actively participated in elections for our school boards and greatly appreciate the passion and commitment of local trustees in ensuring our schools respond to the needs of our children. We are dismayed at the idea of appointed boards, and are totally against the idea of taking away this democratic, far-more-locally responsive elected system. Decision-making by locally-elected representatives, responsible to the voters at a local, grassroots level is vastly preferred to the appointment of some elite "expert". In appointment situations, the appointee far too often turns out to be someone's political crony or the appointment becomes a plum job given as a reward for past service rendered to someone in power. (For the same reason, I am strongly in favour of an elected Senate.) Please do not eliminate our elected school boards. It would be a huge blow to democracy and would damage education in our province. I also would speak in favour of SMALLER districts and SMALLER schools as better serving children than these huge amalgamations that is the trend at the moment. It is ridiculous to create these gigantic school divisions, with head office miles away from the realities of the local situation. Smaller, local, responsive, and elected -- these are the best ways to meet the needs of the children, rather than needs of bureaucrats and big government. Decisions that are made far away from the community cannot be as good as those made at the local, most immediate level. (For the same reason, I don't want Ottawa telling the province what to do. Again: smaller and local/regional is better than a bigger, far-off government.) And finally, please continue to protect Catholic schools in our province. Catholic schools provide parents with a much-valued educational option, and make the entire education system better as both public and separate school systems strive to offer the best to students. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Dear Warren McCall I wish to express my concern regarding the possible changes to school divisions. I am quite worried about the direction the government appears to want take by the amalgamation of school boards. I believe that school boards at a local level is a necessity in order to best serve each community and it's individual needs which includes keeping the separate and public school boards as separate entities. Please keep the interests of our community as your top priority and do not amalgamate school boards Thank you

I would like to see French language instruction from Kindergarten to grade 12. I am not francophone but I believe that it's important for our kids to learn a second language.

It is most important to maintain our Catholic School System. I thank the minister for his support. If our budgets get cut more, the impact on our students will be immense. We have already cut everything we can. The only thing left is teachers. Amalgamations, one School System elsewhere in Canada, have not saved ANY money.

Hello I like the approach of this report. I prefer the regional model for the public school systems as I believe representation of the south, mid province, and Prince Albert north would be very important as the needs of the South East may be different than the needs of the North West. I would like to see the boards made up in a similar way to how the health governance boards are made up...rather than elected boards interested individuals submit a resume and are chosen based on their competencies. This gets away from board members coming from one background. I would like to see the separate school boards amalgamated into one board representing the catholic education system. Primary importance is that children ages 1-6 have the proper supports to enable them to enter grade 1 and thrive. This is not just the responsibility of the education system, but the health care and social services systems working in coordination. When looking at the size of our student population we should be able to achieve the 2020 targets if all departments work together. Reduction of overhead and recognizing specific regional needs is key to success.

Disappointed that the government who claims to place "Students First" and has tasked school divisions to reach ESSP targets by 2020 is now cutting boards and school divisions off at the knees through cuts and what can only be perceived as "threats" to cut. The process of amalgamation is time consuming and having lived through it 10 years ago, I know that it takes years (last time a decade) before any real financial savings can be realized. Board offices will be consumed with the process of amalgamation and not instruction and assessment which will make achieving the targets to truly place Student's First a secondary function, not the primary function as it should be. I am all about realizing efficiencies and certainly agree that some small amalgamation of fledgling boards is possible as well as a need to reduce the number of elected board members from 10 to perhaps 5-7, but there does need to be some local voice and reasonable time lines. The subterfuge of a "consultative process" leading to the release of the Perrins report (a month) is insulting to me as a tax payer and citizen. Just shoot from the hip. This report was drafted long ago. Tell citizens the true story and let's work together to manage quality education that is financial efficient and sustainable. Our kids deserve it.

I believe in locally elected school boards. They give a voice to the grass roots. Parents and students need to have a voice that will be heard when issues arise that are important to them. School Districts are large enough.

I strongly disagree with the proposal of replacing elected school boards with appointments. Elections provide the public (taxpayers) with a say in who/how our school boards are governed. Removing that would be undemocratic, and, I hope, beneath the current provincial government. Unless the current provincial government has made a turn and is now embracing bureaucracy, bigger government, and authoritarianism. I'd also put forth that further school division amalgamations would not be of any benefit whatsoever. Being part of a small rural school and having lived through the first round of amalgamations, I can tell you there was a tremendous amount of fear, anger, resentment and stress experienced by staff, students, families and communities that accompanied that process. In the end, I don't believe much money was saved. What is in place now is efficient and effective. Student's needs are being met. Initiatives within our Division are yielding impressive results. I appreciate this may not be the case in all school divisions throughout Saskatchewan; however what's happening here is working.

This is a dumb idea or making a large school division. I have been a teacher in Regina Public in the past... (18 years but not for the past 12 years) I never thought there was a difference between a public/catholic environment... but there is!! Not only in the course offerings but the Catholic faith is in front in a Catholic school. This one element would be lost quickly if there was no autonomy of school divisions. You say you want the student outcomes to be in the forefront... but making the school divisions larger our students are risk will be lost. It is the local superintendents, teachers and support staff that allows these students to be successful. Every region in our province has specific concerns... to 'cover' with one brush will not work. Again if student achievement is in the forefront... then keep the school divisions sizes the way they are.

I believe we should move away from multiple school boards in the same communities. Some areas have two, three or more school boards when one could more efficiently administer education. Example. In Moose jaw there are two school boards and a few private schools. This results in one area of town having 4 elementary schools within 4 blocks all providing the same services.

I have taught in Saskatchewan since 1970. I am still active as a substitute teacher, coach and mentor. I have some concerns about the three options presented by the Review of K -12 Committee. The review was completed in one month. Is this the value that is placed on Education; One month to do a review. Hardly seems feasible to me. Was there a hidden agenda with a plan already in place when the Review was announced? I also would like to know why the stakeholders were not informed in a timelier manner. I found very little about the review and proposals in newspaper or in local news. Saskatchewan is a very diverse province. There is already a very obvious rural/urban split. Many rural School divisions are very large geographically. The options that you have presented will benefit the bureaucratic agencies. The School Divisions , with elected trustees,; not appointed trustees, are aware of the uniqueness , peculiarities, socio-economic and cultural factors that determine the issues and best practices for each Division. Rural Saskatchewan has lost its voice and the grass roots are not heard anymore. The Government is proposing a "one fix all" solution which cannot work. Research and knowledge of what has happened in other provinces does not support your proposals. But then, a month would hardly have been enough to perform due diligence. You simply cannot sacrifice the education of our young people for expediency. What works for one area does not ensure success in other areas. Appointed trustees will become part of the bureaucracy, will not save money, will not be in tune with grass root issues, and will likely end up running Education like "big business." Schools are a reflection of what is happening in our society. I do not understand how Education can be presented as a separate, isolated entity. We need to start with the very basic problems. Youth is one of the two most vulnerable groups of our society. Schools can and do make a difference. The issues facing our youth need to be looked at and studied in depth and from all perspectives This cannot be done in one month. I understand that there are some present School Divisions that are not operating efficiently and appropriately. I know that there are also School Divisions that are working very effectively and appropriately. Would it be reasonable to work with the School Divisions which need to improve? Or do we believe in being regressive and change what is "not broken" at considerable cost to taxpayers without due diligence. In closing, I am very dissatisfied with the way this whole process has been handled. I feel insulted that it was done so quickly, without opportunities for input from taxpayers. I feel that there might be a hidden agenda, that decisions have been made long before today and we are sacrificing the future of our youth for expediency. I sincerely hope that the decision to have one Health Board for the Province is not a precursor for Education. I forgot to ask about the Catholic School Boards. They have a constitutional right to have elected trustees; not appointed trustees. This will become a very contentious issue. As a Catholic, I would definitely want to send my children and grandchildren to a Catholic School. I would be able to exercise my freedom to vote for an individual to do what is best for the education of my family. The closest Catholic School is eighty miles away. This would impact the rural, less populated areas where it is not feasible to have two systems: Catholic and Public. Furthermore, it would cause a further divide in our society.

<p>Restructuring Health and Education is like trying to saving a few bucks a month by not buying your heart medication. Please keep the status quo. Oil prices will rise again but when services are cut they are often cut for good. I believe smaller communities will suffer the most from the proposed changes which have no guarantees of working.</p>
<p>I understand changes are being considered in our education system. Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support Saskatchewan school boards: We need to keep our school boards locally elected; and, We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.</p>
<p>I understand that changes are being considered for our education system. I believe that education belongs to the community and that for Catholic education, it is important to make local decisions. Amalgamating Catholic school divisions will distract from the local priorities and this would amalgamation would be disruptive and time-consuming. We need to focus on reading, math and writing skills which are very important to me as a parent in the Regina Catholic school division. Thanks.</p>
<p>Education is very important for all stakeholders. The children in this province deserve the best education. Education is a basic right for all children and this right is our responsibility to uphold. Money spent in this province needs to benefit a child's education not just get by on what the government thinks the BUDGET should allow. Teachers work tirelessly for the benefit of our future generation without many people knowing the cost to their personal time. People in health care are always tooting their own horn but rarely does one see the hours teachers put in on their own time with no benefit other than the joy it brings their students. Catholic education is also very important. It was put into place many years ago and has had a positive impact on education ever since. There is an element to a Catholic education that cannot be put on paper with research results but exists strongly in each school. Education is one of those things like the commercial says "PRICELESS" so as a province let's invest in all of our children and give them the best education we can.</p>
<p>I would be in support of change that would improve student outcomes for all children in our province at less cost to the people of Saskatchewan. I do believe the ESSP has been a positive step in that direction. School boards should exist for the purpose of providing the best education possible to students. So if there is a better way than what is currently in existence, I would be for it. However, as a reader of the report, I saw nothing as to the specific cost savings of any option.</p>
<p>Re-structuring is not necessary -it will waste money, cause major disruption and provide few future benefits.</p>
<p>Locally elected boards matter. The roots of Catholic education lie in the ability to make local decisions. • Regina Catholic Schools is one of the highest achieving divisions in the Province of Saskatchewan. Amalgamating Catholic boards will distract our attention from our priorities. School division amalgamations are disruptive and time-consuming. The Regina Catholic School Division has been fiscally and financially efficient. Changing governance or amalgamating school divisions is not the answer to the financial challenges that the government is facing. We need to keep our focus on reading, math, writing, graduation and attendance – things that matter to students and families.</p>
<p>Hi, we built our house in _____ in 2009 and one of the main reasons we decided on _____ was the small town atmosphere. My wife and I were both raised on farms and went to small schools in _____ so _____ decided that was also best for our kids. We are very happy with the education our kids have been receiving at _____, the smaller classrooms, and teacher-student relationships. We would like to see this continue. _____ is a growing bedroom community and want the elementary school to stay as it is. We pay large amounts of money to taxes (similar to living in the city) and don't want to have our children's education potentially compromised by them getting moved to Regina. We are getting frustrated by the year after year rumors about our community school closing and where our children will be "shipped". This story seems to change year to year. This is not an acceptable state to be left in. We want to see our School left as is and don't see a benefit to any amalgamation for cost saving measures. Our children's education comes first even with a Provincial Deficit. Thanks for your time.</p>
<p>Hello: I thank you for your goal of trying to support students learning. However, I fully agree with our division's comments below: Locally elected boards matter. The roots of Catholic education lie in the ability to make local decisions. Regina Catholic Schools is one of the highest achieving divisions in the Province of Saskatchewan. Amalgamating Catholic boards will distract our attention from our priorities. School division amalgamations are disruptive and time-consuming. The Regina Catholic School Division has been fiscally and financially efficient. Changing governance or amalgamating school divisions is not the answer to the financial challenges that the government is facing. We need to keep our focus on reading, math, writing, graduation and attendance – things that matter to students and families.</p>
<p>We need to keep our school boards locally elected and I oppose school division amalgamation. Decisions that affect our students' success and achievements need to be kept closer to our communities.</p>

My child attends a catholic school in a pretty rural location. I feel that large school divisions do not understand and would not be able to meet the needs of the students in our area. They usually take the majority of the funding and make decisions based on cities, not towns.

I am very concerned to have a government appointed school board. Our current school board is highly functioning, thoughtful, dedicated, and most importantly representative of diverse communities and cultures. I fear an appointed board will not bring a diverse voice and will mostly be made up of educated, middle class to upper middle class employees who do not necessarily have a passion for the work or a representative viewpoint. It is very Canadian to have elected boards. Let's not become the first province to become an American system. -I am concerned about too much amalgamation of school divisions. It makes sense to me to amalgamate very small school boards, but not large urban centers. The administrators in charge of running our school division should not be a one hour+ drive away, they should be accessible to our schools regularly. Also rural and urban school divisions have very different needs. So do northern communities. This gets lost to the majority when school divisions are too large. -more bureaucracy hurts students and impedes a school's ability to do what works at the school level for a unique community. We do not need to waste money, time and red tape with middle men. Individual schools and school divisions need to remain autonomous to best meet the needs of their students and community. I fear this will happen if school divisions become too large and decision making isn't allowed at the ground level.

I am very disappointed the CUPE was not consulted when the other employee groups and unions were. I believe that Saskatoon Public is very top heavy in Out of Scope and Management employees. Those that work at the schools are the ones that deal with students and are suffering with over-crowded classrooms, reduced support staff and wages. I hope that when the decision to amalgamate school divisions that the Out of Scope and Management employees would be cut down as well so more funding can help out at the schools. Thank you

This government funds English as an additional language students at the lowest level of any government in Canada, and as a result these students struggle more than they would with adequate programming and instruction, stay in school longer, or take longer to become employed. The result is these students cost the government far more money in the long run, due to extra years in school and delays in joining the workforce. This government's approach is not pragmatic, instead it is purely ideological, and it is not working. This is probably a waste of time, but as long as the focus is on cost and not outcome of education, the education of students in Saskatchewan will suffer. It is telling that little of the report mentions students or learning. As long as the approach to education begins with the ideological concepts that are hostile towards educational professionals, nothing will improve. I have been teaching for 27 years and not once has anybody from the current government asked me, in any capacity, how I believe money could be better spent to help my students. All we are asked is how to spend less.

Regardless of the outcome of the structuring of the school boards, I would hope to see some change down the chain so that our children are receiving a higher education. Specifically targeting the math and science areas. Our children are not being adequately prepared for post-secondary education or entering the work force. This reflects in the poor standings compared to other provinces and much worse when compared with other counties.

Hello, I would like to request that kids from 4years old should be able to go to FULL DAY Kindergarten. In Saskatoon Public School, kids can only start Half-Day Kindergarten from 5 years old. In cities like Toronto, Kids go to Kindergarten from 4 years old. From my personal family experience, I have found that Kids learn a lot and get ready for future competition when they start Kindergarten from 4 years old. Appreciate for taking your time to read this message. Thanks

Larger and larger school divisions leads to a loss of that personal touch that can make interactions in Professional Development seminars that much more efficient. My belief is a large bureaucracy at the school board level does not lead to improved student outcomes, because the inter-teacher, administrative, etc. communications become that much less personal and leads to alienation of the front lines, with the board office. As well, I worry about the loss of our ability to profess our faith in our schools, as we have done for more than 100 years in Sask. Because of crosses in every classroom, regular liturgies, etc. Catholic schools are different, and more personal, than public schools. Any transformational change needs to accept our Catholic distinctiveness and Catholic history. Thanks,

I think that the government is making poor decisions in regards to our children's education not only are you cutting budgets but now you are looking at cutting resources to our teachers and amalgamating school divisions which will greatly reduce the support to our teachers. This government should be ashamed of themselves for trying to limit our children's futures especially when the stats for our children's education are one of the lowest in the country. We should be striving to give them the future and opportunities they deserve.

The assessment policies that have been put in place have been a great asset to how student achievement has been measured. Co tinier work in that area would be a great survive to students. Funding for the schools needs to be revisited. There is an extreme lack of support services, specifically EA's, for students with exceptionalities. Schools and school boards need to be better funded and given more autonomy with the funding. Teacher professionalism and autonomy needs to be reviewed as well. Teachers should be given the ability to make decisions based on what is best for their students and given support to do so. Rather teachers often given prescriptive policies that don't always do what is best for the individual student.

Way too much management, put the money where things physically get accomplished. Quit treating teachers like gods and untouchables and make them show positive results.

As an experienced grade 7 teacher, I see the importance of keeping specialists in each elementary school building and to continue to have the prep time minutes provided in our current contract. The current prep time provided to Saskatoon Public school teachers allows us to plan, connect with parents, colleagues and other agencies, assess, gather and prepare all the hands on materials needed for teaching. This valuable time is used well by me and my colleagues while my students receive French, and Band by the specialist teachers. This provides quality education for all. With the increase in EAL students, large class sizes (I currently have grade 7 students), increasing issues of poverty, less money for resourced based teaching and technology, this preparation time built into our current contract is NECESSARY for quality education for all. Transportation (busing) is an area I see that can be cut that will not impact education but save money that can be used in the classroom.

I am not going to add my approval to the proposal of moving the role of the school board farther and farther away from the classroom - to say Regina - does anyone on the board know where Kincaid is without looking at the map or having someone point it out to you? As a parent with children in a rural school - I am worried about factors that will come into play when school divisions are amalgamated and numbers are crunched!!! Is my school going to have to worry about school enrollment numbers that may cause them to close because of low numbers??? It happened before when our last school boards were amalgamated, our schools in the country are already stretched to the limits as to how far a child has to ride the bus from home to the school doors. You close any more and those children will face bus rides of over an hour in the morning and evening!!! Will these new school boards cut teachers and support staff for not only our "normal" children but for those with special needs, not everyone lives in the city and has access to support and opportunities that the special aides in the cities have access too - we have children here that have learning disabilities and have a right to a quality education which can be gained with the help and support of special aid teachers. With shutting down the hospitals, taking away the department of highway depots, the centralizing of businesses such as equipment dealers and grain handling systems, our rural communities are slowly dying, as people that were not tied to the farm and the farming community through work moved to the city to find employment. It left our communities gutted, yet we still have to look after our children and supply them with an adequate education that competes with the urban schools. When we moved to the bigger school divisions such as Prairie South it was not without controversy and without standing up for our children, are those fights going to rekindle because our government wants slash a few office jobs which should have never been there in the first place. Our children come first - not a CEO that needs to make \$300,000+ to pay for his house in the city and vacations to the Caribbean - we need teachers and value added courses that are offered in the rural schools to give an extra advantage because most of them will stay here and continue on with family tradition if given the opportunity!!!! So I am not in favor of amalgamation - taking decisions farther and farther away from the classroom and placing them in the hands of those in the city who know nothing of what happens outside of city limits. As it stands parents are still sitting on school boards and parents are still consulted about decisions being made - what will happen once it gets taken away and the board members are elected - will parent's worries or concerns even be heard anymore, will rural schools close because there is not enough students in the desks to make it worthwhile to pay someone to teach them or to keep the lights on??? Our provincial government has consistently for decades tried to centralize everything - to take everything out of the country and make it citified and they have damn near crippled us - I live on a century farm, and farm 2 other century farms as well (family ties) - I want my children to stay here and have the opportunity to live in the country and raise their children in this lifestyle, but if the government continues on their path to bring everything and everyone into the city - there won't be anything left!!! If you want to do anything, offer more classes suited for kids out in the rural community - bring in teachers that are qualified to teach them - stop centralizing every little thing, if you want to tighten up the belt - then slash the gravy train cushy jobs that let people sit at their desk all day checking Facebook and YouTube when the boss isn't looking and get paid to do very little - start by reforming the workplace and make these people actually EARN their paycheck because right now - that is where you are losing not only productivity but cold hard cash - cash that could be spent in a lot better places and constructively too!!!

You do not solicit open and frank communication if you link comments to the author, and publish for view by potential employers etc. Respect the need for large School Division such as Regina and Saskatoon to be present in their community. These two cities represent a very significant ration of students in the province. Governance/control from outside of these cities cannot be as effective as the present model.

I understand the need to save money. However the cost of amalgamations is very high. There's all the restructuring, renaming etc. that have costs. Then there is the decision of which CEOs etc. to keep and in the past when amalgamations of school divisions happened there always seems to be too many administrators and not enough teachers and teacher aides on front lines. However I think the writing is on the wall and amalgamations will happen. But I feel strongly that local school board members should be kept so that there are local voices in the larger or larger divisions. Our province is too large to have appointed board members... there will be no local voice to speak for rural school division employees and children. I also think that the board members need to be elected and not appointed. That way stakeholders have a say in who is going to be their voice and the Board members are not randomly appointed by a government that might have an agenda.

I feel that it is very important for our prep time to stay. I know that all teachers work many hours outside of our school day to meet the needs of all of our students and school. The prep time given to us throughout the week is such a beneficial time to be working with colleagues and making sure we are prepared to work with each and every student in our classroom, no matter the needs. It is also very important to have itinerated teachers kept in our building. They are all specialized in areas that not all teachers are trained in. Taking these positions away with only disturb the students learning environment in our schools.

As a teacher who has taught both in rural and in urban settings within Saskatchewan, I feel like I have been able to witness firsthand the differing needs of these different school settings. For this reason I am in support of option 3B. I fear that the other options will not be able to address the differing needs of rural and urban Saskatchewan, and as a result will leave both groups needs unfulfilled. Thank you.

Of the options outlined in the report, I would prefer to see Option 3B which would take into account traffic patterns, health regions, geographic sensibility and population size. There would be more local input and greater accountability to our local stakeholders. That said, while I concur that administration costs are too high, I do not agree with further board amalgamations. Already divisions like Prairie Spirit are spread over such a large geographical area as to make PD and meeting with fellow teachers difficult. The greater the area of governance, the greater the cost of said governance - perhaps not financially, but in many other ways. LINC agreements take into account local needs and priorities and should not be discounted. I have been teaching for 32 years, and have seen many governments come and go, along with many curricula. I would argue that it is NOT in the best interest of educating our youth that we approach education as a LEAN business, with a CEO at its head. This should not be the government's priority, but renewing curricula for the Social Sciences at the 30 level should be. We are using Native Studies, History and Psychology curricula from the early 1990's. This is scandalous. You will demonstrate to First Nations, Inuit and Métis communities that you care about them and their graduation rates by renewing Native Studies and History 30 to reflect current worldviews instead of perpetuating those from a quarter century ago. The move toward formative assessment has been a good one, but was almost derailed when the current government began to reverse its direction and bring back standardized testing. If all the decision-making power rests with a government board, progress will depend on the government that is power, its priorities and beliefs. This is unacceptable, to our students and their teachers. It would be totally inefficient and ineffective to change direction with each change of governments or ministers. Of the choices given, 3B is the most palatable, but these all leave a bad taste in the mouth. People who do not have a background in education are making decisions based on money, to appease tax payers, the same tax payers who will protest vehemently when, down the road, our youth are not prepared for the workforce or higher education. I perceive incredible waste in the government's management of our province, but would never take it upon myself to restructure what I know little about. I wish our current provincial government could have the same humility, and stop interfering with teaching and education.

To Whom It May Concern: Different school divisions needs vary incredibly based on the lives of the individual students they serve. Putting all school divisions into one, giant, amalgamated division will take away the autonomy of school boards to meet the specific needs of their area. It will also greatly affect the ways in which school divisions can give their teachers preparation time and allot days for certain activities, as well as leaves. Amalgamating and putting a "one-size fits all" style of management on schools will greatly reduce the abilities of school divisions to meet the needs of students and staff alike. Please do not amalgamate the school divisions. Thank you,

I believe that Option 2 is the best model, because of the ability for increased transparency and accountability among local schools, but still allowing for the regional school divisions to cater to their own particular needs.

I believe that school boards should be locally elected. Decisions need to be made by people who understand the community and the specific needs of specific schools involved. Having recently switched between school divisions and now seeing the fantastic job that Regina Catholic is doing, I would be extremely disappointed to have that taken away from my children. Simply putting all divisions into one bucket does not benefit our children. It may not even benefit the bottom line. It is not worth the gamble.

We need to keep our school boards locally elected; and we need to keep decisions closer to our communities.

As a teacher, parent, and taxpayer, I am VERY concerned about proposed changes to school boards in Saskatchewan. Let me articulate my reasons for insisting that our government resist the foolish temptation to "try" to save money by reducing the number of school boards/divisions in the province. Such an attempt was made in Alberta. Not only has it failed to yield significant financial savings, but it has disrupted education in all parts of their province. Boards, parents, and teachers have all wasted time trying to advocate for their specific students' needs. Let us learn from their mistake, rather than repeating it! With more than twenty-five years of teaching experience, I have seen firsthand the positive effects of having decisions affecting students made by members of the local community. Having taught at all of Regina's Catholic high schools (Miller, LeBoldus, Riffel, and O'Neill), I experienced four very different educational environments and communities. One common thread was the local home and school associations' ability to identify, communicate, and address their specific concerns to the RCS board. Another common feature was that each school fostered excellence in academics and extra-curricular endeavors. Students from RCS are among the highest achievers in the province! Having grown up and been schooled in _____ and my husband and I decided to raise our _____ kids there. As parents, we were so appreciative of the wonderful teachers they had, who fostered the development of our kids' individual strengths and encouraged them to shore up their weaknesses. The teachers of _____ School also dedicated many hours to coaching/advising our _____ kids and learned of their individual interests. Thanks to their knowing what our _____ needed, all _____ of our kids are happily and productively employed. Our eldest

Clearly, our three kids have very different skills and interests; however, the school division (initially, _____ and later _____, which was locally elected, represented our best interests. It is far less feasible for people who are appointed from various locations to see each other frequently and informally and to discuss the current local needs and issues. It is also much more difficult for appointed school board members to truly get to know the stakeholders of every community they represent, let alone individuals from the community. What makes Saskatchewan communities strong are the local ties that bind! Please, do NOT sabotage community spirit, local governance, and the strength of people working together for the common good. The spirit of cooperation is alive in our province; the last thing that will improve Saskatchewan is for people to become combative, vying for "limited" resources. As a taxpayer I want all branches of government to be effective, efficient, and responsible. How can our province, which flourished economically and increased in population through the first term of Mr. Wall's government, have incurred such burdensome debt? It was certainly not through educational expenditures! It may be time for the government to trim the number of deputy and assistant ministers in each department, but it certainly NEITHER FAIR NOR RIGHT to make further cuts to education and to reduce tax dollars to support excellence in education. Regina Catholic Schools has been a leader in being fiscally responsible and students of RCS continue to demonstrate how effective RCS has been in preparing students for the future. It would be imprudent to tamper with a school division that is functioning effectively and efficiently. Thank you to the members of the Advisory Panel for your time, attention to details, and sincere concern for the people of Saskatchewan as you read, see, and hear our suggestions.

I feel that any further amalgamations of our public school divisions would in no way support improved student outcomes. I question whether any financial savings would be realized as a result of such an amalgamation. I support the model of electing school board members as they are best able to understand the needs of the school division for which they serve. I would love to see our province look towards the amalgamation of our 28 public school divisions with our 9 separate school divisions. In my mind this would represent true fiscal responsibility as I believe financial savings would be realized. With the trend to the building of shared facilities, amalgamation would be more easily facilitated.

The idea of amalgamating the school divisions into larger entities is preposterous. The quality of education is already suffering due to large classroom sizes, reduced EAs, more students with diverse needs. We cannot give up our local representation. Boards cannot make informed decisions when they don't know the communities and the needs of each school.

The government is foolish to be thing that a 1-4 region school system is in the best interest of educating of youth. It is important that the people running the schools are close to the schools they are actually in charge of. We already have divisions that are geographically too large for directors to know what is happening in the schools. When considering the reduction of The number of divisions the area the division serves needs to be closely looked at in order to students to be served. Larger does not mean better, more effective, or more efficient. It frequently means cheaper, further distant to the realities of what is happening and isolated. Students need to be the primary concern as they as they ones, we are going to need to be our nurses, doctors, medical personal, technicians, mechanics, carpentries, waitresses and small business owners. Saving money should not come at any cost or risk to their education as we need them to look after us, fix what is broken and more importantly work and contribute to society. The bigger a division gets, the easier it is to lose sight of all the components. The voices advocating for the needs of students who have learning difficulties are not as loud, when the room is filled with more voices. A Catholic Education is protected under the charter, therefore it cannot be in a single region/division with a public system that cannot and does not see the importance of it. We offer gender sport teams because we recognize that fundamentally there is a difference between girls and boys. Some girls are very success competing with and against boys, but many are not. Hence choice. If the province is to be divided into new regions, then one most consider geography and Catholic Education which is right. That right becomes in jeopardy when given to someone that does not see the value, the constitutional right and the importance of it. To be an effective director you should be able to access and visit all locations easily. That this means is that a director should be able to travel to the furthest location, spend a reasonable about of time and return all within a work day. It is unreasonable to make a division where more time is spent travelling than doing a job you are paid for, and flying is not an acceptable solution. It costs a lot of money and hotels just add to the bill. I feel the government is looking for what they think the public will easily buy into. They have deliberately created an environment, where the public dislikes and disrespects teachers and the teaching profession. This is very short sighted, because the good teachers will become short in supply. As this happens who will educate our doctors, nurses, mechanics, servers (they need to be able to count especially make change). One of the major issues in the United States is the lack of quality teachers for public schools. All students deserve a quality education no matter or culture, ethnic background, lineage, or class. How can one reduce the number of school divisions? --Reduce the number of Catholic divisions to 2-4. Saskatoon has already created the Saskatoon Greater Area. Possibilities: Estevan, Weyburn, Moose Jaw and Swift Current; Regina; Saskatoon; and PA with North Battleford and Melville. Looking at the public side, I could not image Northern lights getting bigger. Geographically it is huge. Maybe the rest of the province is divided into sections based on population and geography. The rural schools around Regina already want to participate in the high school extracurricular league, many parents already work in the city, so any school with a 20 mile radius of a city became are of the city. The problem with this is that parents will feel that the city schools are favoured and all the funds go those schools. Special courses are centralized so now you travel for services that will help your child learn. The southwest division could be created south of the number 1 to the No 2. Once again not ideal, because the area is too large. So look at the SHA map as a guideline. Create a 2-4 of Catholic divisions based of geography, then 10-12 other public divisions based on geography and population. If the government really wants to save some money, reduce the number of rural municipalities. They have more people on their payroll than all the board members on all the school divisions. It is time this government start taking responsibility for not putting education and health first. They spent years spending money, instead of saving and are now in a bit of a pickle. Reducing the number of nurse will save money, but then there is no one to look after me when I am sick. Making larger classrooms is an option, but teachers only effectively teach a finite number of students at a time. When there are too many students, less prep, more work, how are the individual needs of students meet?

Please leave the school division boundaries the way they are - the success of rural education demands it! We want to keep the decisions close to our community and feel the only way to do that is to have locally elected school boards!

I feel that the least amount of change would be most beneficial for students' best interests. What we are doing seems to be working and moving to one school division may upset that greatly. The students of our province are the future. Let's help them be the best they can be.

As a First Nation parent I am concerned regarding any talk about amalgamation and how it will affect their education It will cause bigger classes. Less teachers, less teachers aids , less resources. It will cause increasing stress on everyone and the students will be the ones who will suffer. I want my children to succeed in all they do. Education is a RIGHT a RIGHT that I will fight for my children and all first nation children.

There is an important theme that needs to be in education. What is best for kids. If you have less school districts the outlining schools will looked at as I may be better to close and the believe is due to city is better. Some smaller school district have proven to react to dollar issues.

Thank you for inviting comments. I appreciate that our voices are welcomed in the important decision making process. I credit the government with pulling back on standardized testing, following recommendations at a school level. I am hopeful that the report drafted by Mr. Perrins is carefully considered, particularly the election of trustees and against further provincial amalgamation. The chart on the report page 7 points to the fact that are numbers are not out of line, in terms of number of divisions. I do strongly believe that fat can be trimmed within our division, as more and more consultants and staff members are filling our downtown office. Redeployment of many of these qualified teachers back into the classroom would be a small step toward reducing both the budget and class sizes. I hope that cutbacks are not made for support staff (i.e. educational assistants) as they play a critical role in our classrooms. I was very disappointed with Mr. Wall's decision to back out of his funding promises. He continues to send a message that teachers are undervalued. School achievement is an important and accurate indicator for the success of future society. The money is well spent to prevent crime and illness, as countless studies point out. I am strongly in favor of reducing the gap between FNIM students within our division and province. We have set lofty goals for 2020. It seems that more and more is thrust upon teachers. I am not quite sure that we have the power to improve the numbers unless we have the support from home. It is all well and good to wish for drastically improved reading and graduation numbers, however we cannot accomplish everything at school. Basic care needs need to be met, and I feel that it is an interagency responsibility to prepare the children for success. I cannot profess to know about how to fund education, but I do know that it is vitally important. We need to attract and hold on to our best citizens in the area of teaching and education. We are in a time of much uncertainty and mistrust. It is my hope that the agencies can reach an understanding. There are so many reasons that our provincial educational system should be celebrated, but work must be done. Thank you for reading my letter and for your consideration,

As I look at the three options put forward I see that most look for less school divisions. Less regions of administration. My question then would be this: If the Saskatchewan government, coming into the previous election, were aware of the financial situation that the province was coming toward yet they added 3 electoral ridings then why would this same government now be looking to reduce in the areas of education while not, in any way, looking to reduce the number of MLAs and electoral ridings in the province? If the education system can be operated with 1 region, 4 to 6 regions or 14 regions, then surely the provincial government can do the same with far less electoral ridings. Reducing the electoral ridings would significantly reduce costs to the Saskatchewan taxpayer. Why is the provincial government not following their own policy of reducing unnecessary administration (MLAs) in a cost saving attempt? Education is a service that I pay for through taxation. If my services are reduced by this government then I also want this government to reduce my costs spent on unnecessary MLAs equally.

I am fully in support of reducing the costs associated with having too many individuals in administration and too few in direct contact with students. My greatest concern is with the risk of a "one-size-fits-all" procedure being introduced to all schools in the province. While it is important to have consistent expectations and accountability, it is also important to allow teachers and principals the flexibility to adapt their choices to the context that they work in daily. I support the idea of fewer school divisions, with the caveat that power and control should be shifted downward toward the teachers and principals and that any larger board should allow for flexibility in any policies they attempt to implement.

I am not only a concerned teacher, but more importantly a concerned parent. I believe that local representation in education is crucial in a democratic society. Locally elected boards are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. They are important advocates for ensuring excellence in education. Who better to serve the needs of students—which are unique to each division, and even each school within divisions—than those elected by our residents to govern education at the local level. Past experience with school board amalgamations in Saskatchewan is that they are disruptive and time consuming for boards, teachers, parents and school communities; and there were virtually no cost savings realized. Our existing school divisions are responsible stewards of our resources and are constantly finding ways to stretch resources and find efficiencies. I do not believe that further amalgamations of school divisions would enhance the education of our children. Would they increase reading and math proficiencies? Would they improve graduation rates? I believe not. As the panel appointed to study this change and report to cabinet, I would ask that you recommend the status quo regarding education governance in Saskatchewan. This would ensure locally elected boards of education are maintained as vital aspects of our thriving democracy and hallmarks of education in Saskatchewan.

Regardless of what option is chosen, it will cause some disruption to families. Coming from a different province to teach here, I see the benefits of the way the system is now. I would prefer option C as it could potentially cause the least disruption to students and teachers.

I believe that local representation in education is crucial in a democratic society. Locally elected boards are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. They are important advocates for ensuring excellence in education. Who better to serve the needs of students—which are unique to each division, and even each school within divisions—than those elected by our residents to govern education at the local level. Past experience with school board amalgamations in Saskatchewan is that they are disruptive and time consuming for boards, teachers, parents and school communities; and there were virtually no cost savings realized. Our existing school divisions are responsible stewards of our resources and are constantly finding ways to stretch resources and find efficiencies. I do not believe that further amalgamations of school divisions would enhance the education of our children. Would they increase reading and math proficiencies? Would they improve graduation rates? I believe not. As the panel appointed to study this change and report to cabinet, I would ask that you recommend the status quo regarding education governance in Saskatchewan. This would ensure locally elected boards of education are maintained as vital aspects of our thriving democracy and hallmarks of education in Saskatchewan. Looking to other provinces' examples, Alberta formerly amalgamated and are now back to the localized boards. How can a board centralized from Regina make decisions for students in La Ronge, or Spiritwood, or Sandy Bay? The students are different, live with different realities and resources. Our board is currently an hour and 20 minutes from our town and even that is a challenge. The challenges faced in North Battleford, and the population of the students is completely different than in rural Spiritwood. After reviewing the Report by Dan Perrins, option 3B seems the least disruptive and most beneficial to students and schools. Yes boards need to be accountable and redundancies eliminated but student learning needs to come first. We do not want students lost or success decreased for the sake of a few dollars saved. Imagine the resulting negative impact on the economy that would result in lower graduation rates and reading rates that will sure to occur during the amalgamation process! Thanks for allowing me this opportunity to share my thoughts, Sincerely,

I believe that local representation in education is crucial in a democratic society. Locally elected boards are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. They are important advocates for ensuring excellence in education. Who better to serve the needs of students—which are unique to each division, and even each school within divisions—than those elected by our residents to govern education at the local level. Past experience with school board amalgamations in Saskatchewan is that they are disruptive and time consuming for boards, teachers, parents and school communities; and there were virtually no cost savings realized. Our existing school divisions are responsible stewards of our resources and are constantly finding ways to stretch resources and find efficiencies. I do not believe that further amalgamations of school divisions would enhance the education of our children. Would they increase reading and math proficiencies? Would they improve graduation rates? I believe not.

I believe that local representation in education is crucial in a democratic society. Locally elected boards are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. They are important advocates for ensuring excellence in education. Who better to serve the needs of students—which are unique to each division, and even each school within divisions—than those elected by our residents to govern education at the local level. Past experience with school board amalgamations in Saskatchewan is that they are disruptive and time consuming for boards, teachers, parents and school communities; and there were virtually no cost savings realized. Our existing school divisions are responsible stewards of our resources and are constantly finding ways to stretch resources and find efficiencies. I do not believe that further amalgamations of school divisions would enhance the education of our children. Would they increase reading and math proficiencies? Would they improve graduation rates? I believe not. PLEASE do not make large scale amalgamations in our province. I do not think that will make our school systems stronger but will actually create weaker systems. We value knowing our school division superintendents on a personal basis and how we can work together to better education. As the panel appointed to study this change and report to cabinet, I would ask that you recommend the status quo regarding education governance in Saskatchewan. This would ensure locally elected boards of education are maintained as vital aspects of our thriving democracy and hallmarks of education in Saskatchewan. Again, knowing our board members is important to our community. Our school division is committed to looking to being as efficient as we can in multiple areas. We ask you to keep our school divisions personal by not creating large scale divisions, keeping our local school board members as elected members and continue to ask the people who work in education for feedback. Thank you for your time and in listening to what will help SK students continue to improve in all data areas by not making drastic changes. To Whom This May Concern, I am writing to you to express my deep concerns with the options presented in the Perrins report in regards to education in Saskatchewan. 1) I feel that giving someone one month to complete a report that will create a major change in our province's education system is definitely not enough time. It appears that he did consult various stakeholder groups; however, I question how many citizens of Saskatchewan were informed about the report, had an opportunity to ask questions or receive clarifications, or were

provided with clear instructions on how to provide their feedback to you. I feel that despite Mr. Perrins best intentions, this was an impossible feat to be completed effectively. 2) I cannot believe that further amalgamations are even being considered at this time. Everything I am reading indicates that amalgamations do nothing to save money and actually cost money. Our province is in a bad situation that cannot afford wasting money. Amalgamations also create turmoil for school divisions, teachers and students. In a time where the ministry has created lofty goals for 2020, this will negatively impact student achievement, as well as division day to day operations. 3) On the topic of school board members I have several thoughts. If the object is to save money for the province, then I would suggest to set a modest wage across the province for all board members and set the maximum number of board members per board. I look at the chart in the report and see that board members could be receiving up to \$25 000 a year for a position that is not their full time employment. I think that this could be reduced in half and still be aligned with the Sask Crown Tier 2 or Regional Health Authority members' salaries. I also do not feel that appointing people to boards is the correct decision. The school divisions across the province have diverse needs based on their locations and demographic populations. The board members understand the community's needs and are able to support education and students based on that need. If the decision was to have appointed boards, I would recommend instead to remove them completely, as they would be completely unnecessary. People on boards with no investment or knowledge of education serve no purpose other than to rely messages from the ministry. This could be achieved at the directors meetings who could then relay information to their central office staff and to school based administrators. 4) I question the impact on any changes to the system and the negative effect on the government's Education Sector Strategic Plan. School divisions are working hard to achieve the goals as set out in the plan. Major changes at this time will definitely negatively impact the results we have been working so hard to meet before 2020. We will not be able to efficiently work towards those provincial goals with such a major disruption. 5) Lastly, and most importantly, how will this affect the children of Saskatchewan? I read the title of the "Educational Governance Review Report" and wonder how this will affect "education". How would any of your proposed changes make students in Saskatchewan score higher on assessments? How would it support the many, many children in our classrooms who need support but there is none available due to already reduced resource allocation? How will it provide more mental health and social services resources for our education system for students who are crippled in their ability to learn by situations outside the realm of education? How will it provide resources for teachers who are using outdated curriculum and are supposed to make education relevant and meaningful for our children? How will it support teachers who are burning out from increased demands, reduced resources and increased societal issues in their students' lives? I cannot see how any positive supports for our education system are being created by any of the options in Mr. Perrins' report. For a province with a significant deficit budget, look for inefficiencies in all areas of the province - not just education and health care. Look at the number of RM's in the province, look at government officials' salaries, look at increasing the PST by 1%, etc. There are many places to look other than at a sector that is working with already reduced resources to meet the diverse needs of all the children in this province. Those of us working in school systems are happy to do that to assist you with finding inefficiencies in our school systems; however, we must stand up for what we are trained to do - to teach students to the best of our ability every day. Please do not create disruptions to what we are doing tirelessly every day to create stronger, smarter citizens of Saskatchewan. That is what education should be about as these children are our province's future. We need to support the Education Sector Strategic Plan, not work against it. In your deliberations, please do not solely discuss budget, boundary lines and authority - discuss children and their best interests. That is what education should be about. Thank you for your time in reading my concerns. Sincerely,

Principal Teacher Mother of 3 children in our province's school system Citizen of Saskatchewan

It scares to me to think of option 1 - one school division would not be beneficial to children. How can one population of board members makes decisions that affect northern communities like La Loche and urban centres like Regina. The needs in these schools divisions are so diverse that I truly feel one board would be run too thin and students' needs would not be met. I think the core of this Saskatchewan education shift should be focusing on kids and not on boards. That means working with option 3 and maintaining school boards but adding more schools to extend the boundaries would be most ideal. It allows for resources being allocated to an area and it meeting the needs of all kids. I think people Like educational psychologist, speech paths, etc. are already spread so thin. Further to that, people who live in the communities should be in charge of the decisions for those schools, as they truly know what is needed and important.

I love the idea of amalgamating school divisions! Money would be saved by: 1. Eliminating so many high paying salaries 2. Eliminating the travel, PD, food budgets for the same people 3. Going to one HR system 4. Having One transportation contract 5. Having 1 payroll/accounting system 6. Reducing/eliminating boards (this is an archaic model. We have far outgrown this current model.) Ensuring there is consistency among our teachers would be so beneficial. I see nothing but great things happening by implementing change! Thank you!

Leave as is locally voted in.
There are rumours going around of a school division amalgamation. Saskatchewan is a diverse province, which is a good thing for all of its inhabitants. This diversity extends into the classrooms and the schools, and school divisions were set up around that diversity as a means of catering to the needs of each specific region. Creating an amalgam school division that serves all of Saskatchewan (or, 3 school division to serve northern Saskatchewan, central Saskatchewan and southern Saskatchewan -- another rumour) would be too much generalizing of a vast and varied province. Students in Regina have different needs than those in Pilot Butte, or than those in Saskatoon, and those in Estevan. While it may make sense on paper to amalgamate the school divisions, especially in terms of saving money, this action will inhibit the education system's ability to meet the needs of its beneficiaries.
I am opposed to selecting Board Members by Appointment. I am not in support of Amalgamation as I feel it will not be best for student outcomes.
We have a strong education system. We have good school with capable school leaders and teachers, and facilities . The task of our school and tertiary institutions is to give our young the chance to develop the skills, character and values that will enable them to continue to do well and to take Canada forward in this future.
I am currently employed as a special education teacher in the _____ School Division. Over the course of my 20 year career I have worked in 3 school divisions, as well 2 First Nations. The _____ Division is by far the most efficient employer. When I worked in _____ and _____ there are ridiculous layers of bureaucracy that prevent work from being done. A laughable example was the 21-step referral procedure in S.D. No wonder we receive students at _____ who have never had educational psychological testing even though they are working at a grade 2-3 level when they enter high school. The forms, protocols, and procedures within large organizations, in fact, prevent efficiency. An example of efficiency recently occurred in my current school. I emailed my principal to request a new bulletin board be installed near my classroom in the hallway. My Principal approved the project and suggested I talk with the facility manager to discuss details. There were no forms to fill out. The bulletin board was salvaged from storage and re-purposed in its new location within 2 weeks. Another example of efficiency in the small but mighty _____ .D. is the way my students access special services like the Speech-Language Pathologist. All I have to do is email the SLP and I will have an appointment book for within 3 weeks. My students have received technical support and progress assessments in this manner for over 5 years. No unnecessary forms or other blockades in between the professional staff and the students impede this simple process. In comparison, the larger _____ S.D. has created administrative structures to limit the number of referrals to consultative staff. One year when I worked in an elementary school, despite having filled out 37 Record of Accommodations forms and countless Requests for Referral forms, the educational psychologist did not set foot in our school until May 4th of that school year. When I worked in the First Nations schools I also noticed the efficiencies of small scale administrative structures. I had the Principal's authority to arrange for Speech-Language Pathology assessments and Educational Psychological assessments as needed. I would meet with homeroom teachers, do some of my own assessments, and then arrange appointments probably within 4 weeks. This is so much more efficient than making people wait and wait as the years roll by. Although there is professional error in any system, I attest that smaller systems are more efficient than larger ones. Maintaining locally elected school boards is important in any democratic society. The bureaucrats who run the show at the Ministry level are fulfilling their role, but there needs to be a check point where the public has a mandate to exercise control over what is happening in our schools. The nightmare would be that a member of the public would make a telephone call to complain, inquire, etc. to Education Bureaucracy 1-800 and that call would be answered by an automated answering machine. There is no way inside the machine. Leave a phone message, send an email, mail a letter, and there is no reply. There are so many ways where I see monies are spent on unnecessary things. Principals and Central Office personnel are always traveling to conferences and meetings. From my own experience, I know that it takes time to implement any new idea. It is pointless to collect ideas at conferences if there is no budget or will to implement those ideas. Another very expensive endeavor is to try and keep up with new technology. I think elementary schools need to focus on literacy, numeracy, social skills, and fine arts. Screen time should be minimized instead of maximized.
I would strongly suggest option 3B. Coming from a small community with a small but very vital school I feel that this is the only option that gives our school a fighting chance. I believe we need to retain all of our board members as they are our voice for our community outside of our community. I don't feel that restructuring in to one province wide division would be a good thing for any of our small communities or schools.
The Elephant in the room? Combine the separate and public school divisions into ONLY a public school system. 2 provinces have already done this. Huge cost saving on administration.

As a parent, I do not agree with the proposed changes/school division amalgamations. I truly believe that school divisions should be community based. I do not want my child going to a school being run by someone who has never set foot in the building much less the community. I find it hard to believe that someone who is completely disconnected from the school can make decisions regarding its wellbeing. I like the fact that in North Battleford, it is a comfort that my daughter has actually met and spoken to some of our senior administration. That we have a small enough division that many of our board members have been my own teachers and who know our students, our families and our communities. As a teacher who teaches a program for students with intellectual disabilities. I am deeply disturbed that the decisions will be made by someone who does not/will not see or understand my students. I throw my heart and soul into making sure that they have a chance for a successful life, that they have the skills to be self-sufficient adults despite their shortcomings academically. We have already suffered so many cuts to our school's personnel and we are seeing the impacts of that directly in the achievement and success of our students. I fear that by taking the decision making process outside of our community you are putting our future in the hands of someone who doesn't care. You are continuing to take the power from the people directly involved/affected by the decisions being made. There is something to be said for being present, in the moment, in the situation to see the outcomes of your actions. One of the most challenging aspects of my job is to be able to see when something is not working and be able to adapt my approach/strategy so that I am meeting the changing needs of my diverse group of students. How will a school division ever be able to meet the needs of their schools if they are never present, never connected, never building the necessary relationships to really know how to meet those needs.

I believe locally elected boards of education are vital aspects of our system.

Our school board members are elected officials who represent the needs of our schools and communities. With the Ministry of Education's focus being improved literacy and numeracy rates, graduation rates, and FNMI students I feel that the need for local representation is just as crucial now more than ever. The needs of our schools and community are not the same as those in other parts of Saskatchewan. If there is only one governing body to represent all of Saskatchewan, how can there possibly be decisions made to represent the individual needs of all students in relation to the dynamics of their community? The focus on Education should always remain "student first", and by removing locally elected representation for communities does not have a "student first" focus. The last time amalgamation occurred, the promise for money saved did not happen. In the end it resulted in much time, travel, meetings, and money spent to have the process not save our government any money. Mistakes are not bad things, as we should take from our mistakes and learn from them. However, repeating the same mistake over again does not show any thought or progress made. I would hope that those who are making decisions for the betterment of our students, our future, are not having a knee-jerk reaction to a problem. Instead, decision making should be done with your main mission - students first - at the forefront for all decisions, as your mission is the thing for which everything is based. I ask you then, how does wasting money, time, and people serve students first? How does creating one governing body to represent the diverse needs of students and communities in our province remain students first? I hope that the people's voice is heard and considered when making the decisions necessary to remain student first as we move forward.

I do not agree that one board or amalgamated boards in the province yet again can deliver the curriculum to our students in the divisions. Yes, boards can be held accountable and make more effort to save money and cost share projects and purchasing, but the needs of students are best met closer to home. The Education Act was formed many years ago (over 100) and I believe in local accountability, elected boards, and trust in the system set forth. The strategic sector plan is the BEST plan I have ever seen that reaches student NEEDS and ensures their success. SCC's are active in the division, there are professionals teaching students and there are supports in place, if needed, to ensure extra help is delivered, the PreK program is ULTRA successful in our division where we have a HUGE number of families who are in great need, and the students who score the highest in all areas of need, come thru the PreK and intervention program and score the highest on the other end for success. The division "covers" the health care sector's portion for the interventionists, we have our own Speech Paths, Occupational Therapists, and Physical Therapists as the wait times of the past are horrendous and we have paid the money from education budget to ensure the BEST for the students here. Health amalgamation will further make these wait times longer, and until there is a marked improvement in the dollars of the province allocated to Rural Municipalities (296 to be exact versus 12 health regions and 28 boards of education) These numbers are not fair and equitable - please look at the RM's before health and education are affected further. If the province thinks that the system of amalgamation works, then the RM's need to be looked at and examined with a fine microscope to ensure accountability is being met there. Amalgamate to 30 RM's and calculate the cost savings. Education is locally elected officials, making informed decisions for the students in each division. Thank you!

I believe that local representation in education is crucial in a democratic society. Locally elected boards are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. They are important advocates for ensuring excellence in education. Who better to serve the needs of students—which are unique to each division, and even each school within divisions—than those elected by our residents to govern education at the local level? Past experience with school board amalgamations in Saskatchewan is that they are disruptive and time consuming for boards, teachers, parents and school communities; and there were virtually no cost savings realized. Our existing school divisions are responsible stewards of our resources and are constantly finding ways to stretch resources and find efficiencies. I do not believe that further amalgamations of school divisions would enhance the education of our children. Would they increase reading and math proficiencies? Would they improve graduation rates? I believe not. As the panel appointed to study this change and report to cabinet, I would ask that you recommend the status quo regarding education governance in Saskatchewan. This would ensure locally elected boards of education are maintained as vital aspects of our thriving democracy and hallmarks of education in Saskatchewan (submitted January 6th). As a taxpaying resident of Saskatchewan, I am struggling to come to terms with the idea that any of the proposed changes Mr. Perrins has noted in his governance review would in any way have a positive effect on what is the current education system in our province. Firstly, amalgamation. The previous data conducted on the idea of amalgamations as a cost savings initiative have all been greatly against the success that it was supposed to get. Since the amalgamation of 2006/7, there have been no considerable gains recognized by the province. Many school divisions are still trying to piece together the effects of that amalgamation in a variety of ways so how can one expect anything different going down that road again? Let's be realistic for a second - When compared to the other western provinces as Mr. Perrins outlines in his report we have the least amount of representative boards, the fewest number of school divisions and identical land mass to Alberta and Manitoba. One would think if amalgamations were the answer, other provinces would have made that decision. The second thing to consider is that the entire education sector is represented by only 28 school boards (as outlined in the report) but for some reason it requires 63 individual MLA's to represent the province in the cabinet. How do those representations seem to be equivalent? Secondly, government appointed boards of education. As a taxpayer, I have the right to vote for those who I feel will best lead this province in the direction I feel it should go. The same should be said of our school divisions. If the privilege of democracy is removed from the education system, it then becomes "taxation without representation". This is not fair to families who have children using the education system. This means that having a local voice in education will no longer exist. Those in power will be given even more power. The ability to put funds where they see fit, to remove board members at will if they are not fulfilling their duties and most importantly, forget about the most important stakeholder in the education system, the students. Education is for everyone, by everyone. It needs to be collaborative effort between all stakeholders in order for us to raise the future leaders of our province. The proposed changes that were outline in Mr. Perrins report, which he developed over a 3-week time period, do not take into consideration what is best for all stakeholders and most importantly, the students, in our province. As taxpaying citizens of this province, I ask that you take the time to think about what this really means for the future of education, and more importantly the future generations, our students, and the impact it could potentially have. (Submitted January 12th)

I do not believe that amalgamating and doing away with local governance is the answer in this. This province is so diverse in it's needs and challenges. I don't believe that having one authority would work to meet these needs. I do not believe that it is in the best interest of students. I also do not believe it will produce cost saving measures that will not impact the classroom. My experience has been that each "adjustment" that the Ministry of Education has put in place over the past 4 years has had a direct, negative impact on the learning needs of students.

I'm very disappointed with the quality of learning for K-8. I have 4 kids so I am qualified to make the statement that our elementary kids are not learning the basics needed to succeed. The math makes sense program is a complete waste of time. I have paid for all four of my kids to go to a math program called Kumon. My oldest 2 kids are in high school & are getting quality education. I have taken my youngest out of public school to home school. She is in grade 4. We need standardized testing & teachers need to be paid on outcomes. That means if kids pass they get paid because they actually taught the child something. That means the education department needs to get its programming together to let the teachers teach what is important. Enough with the Native studies when none of my kids know the provinces or capital cities of Canada.

Option 3a or 3b would be best to ensure local boards maintain as much control as possible. Moving to a provincial system is another step closure to socialism.

Education is a primarily a SERVICE that we extend to all residents in our province so that they can become engaged, positive, active, healthy members of society. Applying a business model to education is wrong. Given that we have two competing, overlapping, publically-funded educational options (the Public and the Catholic divisions in the province) as guaranteed in our provincial constitution, and given the noted previous amalgamations of 2006 which have resulted in any gains in sector-wide efficiencies, there is precious little more that we can do to improve efficiencies. However, were the government willing to coordinate efforts between Health Districts, Social Services and other agencies with the work done in schools, we could potentially be more effective at supporting families in our communities. It is an unacceptably colonial expectation that all students must graduate in a three year timeframe. This implies that all students, when institutionalized, will produce the same standards. While this industrial-factory model may serve us well to produce goods in a consistent and cheap way, it has no place in the development, inspiration and nurturing of our most precious resources, our children, nor does it recognize the individual capacities in each of us as humans. Would it be reasonable to insist that children continue to add single digit numbers for two months, regardless of their understanding or ability, just because a child is 6 years old? Some might need two days, others perhaps three months to master the concept. Some will have learned that skill at home by the time they were 4, and others are only introduced to it at school. In education we must meet the needs of all our students, recognizing that there are vastly different knowledge backgrounds with which they arrive. Expecting that they will all graduate in three years is equivalent to expecting that they will furthermore all marry in two more years, and each have 2.1 babies in the following five years. Perhaps this is advisable in a some distant Orwellian world, but this is not the direction that public education has ever endorsed. Moreover, according to Finnish Education Authority Pasi Sahlburg, we are already delivering one of the best educational programs in the world. The problem, he says, is not what is happening (or not happening) in the classroom, but outside of the classroom. We need to address the problem of poverty, specifically in our FNIM communities, where education, along with so many other services, has chronically been underfunded (http://www.afn.ca/uploads/files/events/fact_sheet-ccoe-8.pdf). Only then will we see success rates for our aboriginal people improve. Telling us as educators that we should "care more" in order to improve the education rates for our weakest students is absurd and shameful. Adding greater expectation and higher workload without either commensurate financial recognition and support, or a reduction of other expectation and workload duties is both irresponsible and unsustainable. Setting up these targets for improving graduation rates without providing any support is short-sighted, misguided and destined to fail. This is not to say that we, as teachers, are not human and teach perfectly every day. We all have an array of effective as well as not-as-effective lessons, days and strategies. We hopefully participate as engaged members of our learning communities and strive to improve our own instructional practices. However, the most effective improvement happens when we have the ability and capacity to direct our professional development. We need and want to be accountable for our work, but we also need to be respected and valued for our work. Your plan provides good insight into the strengths and challenges of educational delivery models in the province of Saskatchewan. You provide several options ranging from close to the status quo to significantly different changes. There are two items which are not clear enough in your comparisons: Please note that the Manitoba Schools Act of 1890 abolished all Separate (Catholic) School Divisions, so aside from the one Francophone School Division, all School Divisions in Manitoba are strictly geographical. Secondly, the scope of your observations on the various proposed options is not broad enough. You state in Option One (Provincial Model), which dismisses all existing school boards (similar to the recent choice in the Health Sector), that no precedent exists. This is incorrect, as states in the Federal Republic of Germany typically do not have school boards. The Ministry of Education is the central authority, under which all of the schools in the state fall, which is precisely what the Provincial Model proposes. If you are going to propose changes, continue to look beyond our provincial or national boundaries and you will likely see someone working under those other conditions. Sincerely,

We need our local elected board representatives who know what our school requires in order to provide the best possible education for our children. To take this away from us would be a real detriment to our school and church community.

As an employee, parent, concerned citizen and taxpayer I am in favour of amalgamation of school divisions across the province if it means fewer director positions. In my opinion, there are too many directors in the Northwest School Division, and each one has support staff. These positions are redundant and unnecessary. The money that is spent on these high salary positions would be much better spent on support staff (EA's), teachers (to reduce student/teacher ratio) and keeping rural schools open. In summary, the top-heavy nature of the Northwest School Division causes me to believe that one province-wide school division may be beneficial to the students and the staff who work directly with students. The focus needs to be on the students and in order to do that changes must happen financially. Thank you. Sincerely,

I have been an educator for over 18 years. In that time I have experienced a monumental shift in the approach to education. On the whole the shift is NOT what I would consider a positive movement. The FOCUS of education from our government leaders is falsely misleading from my perspective. Our government informs the public that the focus in education is on "students first". The direction that our government leaders are going does not show me that that truly is the focus. Amalgamating school divisions puts the focus on managing a system with dollars as the focal point rather than focusing on student centered education. Fiscal cuts could be made elsewhere. Why not consider mandating that all government officials work for a five figure salary including their expense accounts? This could save millions of dollars. Saskatchewan is too diverse a province to have a large managing system. Students will fall short in this process. Please treat the education of our students with some respect. Providing them meaningful education can start with locally elected boards who have the best interests of their students in mind. My concern is that teachers will once again be held accountable for the shortfall that will likely result from a government mandated consolidated approach. Forcing teachers to engage and inspire students under a broad managerial scope is not fair or reasonable. Consider this: when we want a child to learn to his or her greatest potential, the teacher will often give of him or herself outside of class time to give individualized instruction. This one to one instruction proves positive in learning. Why would our government broaden the scope of educational management? Keep local elected school boards. Actually make education a priority for students.

Good Afternoon, Amalgamation of school boards will have an affect on how Saskatchewan Schools go about offering Athletic programs. Presently all schools belong to the SHSAA, Saskatchewan High School Athletic Association. The governance of Provincial playoff structures of all sports is determined by this organization. The members of the SHSAA according to the SHSAA constitution are Saskatchewan School Boards. Decision making and representation is tied to this model. Also, the present playoff structures are determined by Districts that are organized geographically tied to school board boundaries. This is in part due to policies pertaining to insurance, travel and participation, to name a few. The district I represent RHSAA, Regina High School Athletic Association also has policies and guidelines that govern High School Sport on the City of Regina. Decisions on leagues are done by the representatives of Regina Schools. Our policies are different than our neighbors. For instance, we limit our teams travel to 3 tournaments to ensure time out of school is not compromised. The RHSAA does not travel outside of City Limits for league games to address safety concerns. High School Sport can restructure but should be given time to react to any change that is proposed. For example, if a decision is made to reduce our province to 1 school board the result for High School Sport could be catastrophic not given time to create new policies, bylaws and constitution. That part of education through sport would be negatively affected. Change can be managed if given appropriate timelines. I am willing to give further input if so asked.

I understand changes are being considered in our education system. I believe in the importance of local voice and listening to the community. Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support Saskatchewan school boards. We need to keep our school boards locally elected; and, We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

To whom it is of concern, Why on God's green Earth is this even being considered for change? Is this not a Democracy? Are we not allowed to choose what is right for our children to learn? This reeks of nothing more than our Government trying to shoehorn their own political agenda onto children who are supposed to trust us with what is right and wrong. By allowing a Gov. appointed board to decide what our children learn we no longer have a say in what our children learn, but the Gov. can control, manipulate, and brainwash our children with whatever they deem fit to shove in front of young vulnerable minds further corrupting societies morals and values. I am truly disgusted with this attempt to take away our rights.

I am nervous about education reform and the impact it will have on small rural K-12 schools. I am hoping that consideration will be given to small communities! The school that my children go to has gone through 3 divisions in the past 15 years-

The most services that were provided to students occurred when we were part of _____, a small division in which the students were put front and centre! As _____ I feel like we are really starting to again see strong support for students but with cuts in areas. As the School is again starting to make gains and grow I fear that more change and upheaval of divisions will set the School and community back! We have seen that when RCMP detachments were amalgamated we lost service! We also lost the relationship and knowing who we could turn to! Communication and relationship with _____ School Division has been great and continues to improve! I am hoping that all decisions made are in the best interest of the students! Children are the future of Saskatchewan!

I am responding to your document that was sent out for parents and teachers to comment on. Rather than sending out a 35 page document, it would be advisable to lay out the proposed changes to the education system and the reasoning behind these changes, instead of having to read through a 35 page document. If you expect the public to actually be informed, it is advisable to be precise and up front with proposed changes in a reader friendly format! Saskatchewan has the highest Indigenous population per capita of all the provinces, so comparing the test scores of our province to others does not take this into account. It seems as you are trying to make education into a business model and the problem with this is that it misses the human element. Also, putting the pressure on teachers to increase the Indigenous graduation rates without the social supports to address, poverty, addiction, family violence, effects of Residential schooling, and systemic racism leaves teacher fighting an uphill battle. Many Indigenous youth may not graduate at the same time as other students; often, they come back in their 20's to complete their education. This is still a success and the whole time limit window needs to be reexamined. As a teacher and a parent of three children, I see the government cutbacks and control of the profession as harmful to students, teachers and parents. We are unlike any other service and we need to start being treated as professionals of an essential service. Teachers took zero percent wage increases for years with the promise that when things improved, the government would make it up to us. That never happened and we have continually been asked to do more with less. Even after negotiating a contract the government refused to live up to its obligations, stating the boards had to come up with half the dollars to support teacher wages. I am terrified at the direction government is taking with respect to education. It is not about numbers; it is about people! Teaching is one of the most rewarding careers but it is also one of the most stressful and one that constantly requires individuals to give their time freely with little or no compensation. Teachers have to work 75 extra hours just to get one day off and anything over that does not count. What other profession are people required or pressured to give up their personal and holiday time for free? Numerous PD sessions are offered in the summer during holiday time. Other professions are not required or even expected to do this without getting financially compensated. Teachers are being taken advantage of and many are burning out. Our profession is complicated and multi-faceted. You cannot continue to compare us to other models or systems in society; we are very unique and our services are invaluable. Start treating teachers with the respect they deserve!

Hello. I am writing as a concerned parent and as an engaged

I understand and applaud the government's desire to be fiscally responsible. I know how our teachers are struggling with fewer resources because they tell me that whenever I ask for their opinions. Still, I feel the entire staff at school works overtime on a daily basis to provide these needs, as best they can. Our focus must remain on our students and more funds would be appreciated. If you decide to appoint one board for an entire province, then the diverse nature of our students' needs will be lost. We have a wide range of students and their needs vary greatly, from one community to the next. I would be willing to travel a little farther to attend school division meetings if another round of amalgamations takes place. We have some very good educators in the Northeast but we are also blessed with some great administrative staff. I can only speak from personal experience but Don Rempel and his staff work closely with our board to steer us in the right direction. Don is an honest bureaucrat with plenty of integrity. He and Wanda, our CFO, are always fiscally responsible and prudent with our funds. Our board is very efficient and will continue to manage our government funds effectively. I am writing to Minister Morgan to let him know we are doing the best job we can with support from the communities which elected us. Every single student matters because they represent the future of this province. I myself have two special needs children whom I would love to see succeed. They have learned to love school because of the hard work of many dedicated professionals in this division. They greatly benefitted from the individual attention from a variety of educational associates. I would like to see every special needs student in Saskatchewan benefit from the personalized attention that my sons have received in the past. Please respect our need to be a local voice for both parents and students alike. We are very fortunate to have a new facility here in Hudson Bay but I cannot take credit for that. Our board has many difficult and pressing issues to deal with and we are willing to work hard to find more efficiencies for the province. Every student in our division matters to me.

Thank you for your attention in this matter. Sincerely,

How will this affect the children? I do not agree with appointed school boards in big districts. How does a problem get dealt with locally if our division board is somewhere else? I live in Lloydminster and I believe we have a unique situation here. Please reconsider this. This can only hurt the kids! They are our future! How are we going to have a future when you destroy the kids?

I write today as both a concerned parent and concerned citizen of Saskatchewan. Last night I attended a meeting arranged by our school district to discuss the release of the Educational Governance Review Report prepared for you by Mr. Dan Perrins. This meeting was to help parents, like myself, understand this very complex document and to ask questions regarding the report and what a change based on these recommendations could mean for our community and our children. At the end of the meeting they encouraged us to voice our opinion on the matter. After personally reading the entire Report, I have several concerns regarding the options presented and how that will affect the Strategic Plan objectives and to a greater extent, our children's education. While I agree with Mr. Perrins' five recommendations for Shifts in Governance, I do not agree with any of the options he presented. I was fortunate to sit next to Mr. Cory Rideout, Director of Education and Mr. Glen Gantefoer, our Board Chairman, last night and ask them questions regarding the report, which brings me to my first concern with all three options. If any of these were to be implemented very few parents, teachers, support staff, etc. would have that opportunity to sit down face to face with these people to voice their concerns. I like to know that Mr. Rideout visits all the classrooms in our district on a regular basis and makes sure the staff is both competent and engaging while also making sure they are safe and happy. Restructuring to a larger boundary, larger divisions or one large provincial division would take away or greatly reduce that face to face accountability. There just isn't enough time in a day/month/year to do it. This also goes for the board members. It is comforting knowing that these people are part of our community, understand the struggles some of our students may be facing, and support our staff to help these children. Secondly, I'd like to remind you of a change that was made a few years ago when the Government said "School cannot start until after the September Long Weekend, as it hurts our tourism dollars." About 3 years later, they had to change that, because the long weekend landed almost a full week into September and no one at the provincial level had thought to look that far ahead. We need to look at the long term (more than 2 years out) impact these changes will have on our children and their education. A report thrown together in less than 1 month does not contain sufficient evidence to make a change of this magnitude. Third, Saskatchewan is a vast province with a diverse culture and socio-economic standing. As made apparent with the tragic shooting in La Loche and the suicide deaths in the Northern Communities this past year, the goals for a school in a Northern community cannot be the same for a school in an affluent part of Regina. While every child deserves the same education, some communities require a different method to achieve that. A larger district will only cast a larger shadow on these children who obviously need to be shown light, love, and compassion. Finally, by spending the time to combine districts (renegotiate contracts, lay off staff, teach remaining staff their new positions, rehire staff because the workload is too much for the remaining staff, teach the new staff... you get the idea) you are taking away from time and money that should be dedicated to achieving the goals set out in the strategic plan. I understand the government is faced with a serious deficit and needs to make some changes, but snap decisions with the goal of saving money will cost more in the long run. I urge you to think past a current billion dollar deficit, and consider what will happen to this province over the next 10 years if our children's education becomes secondary to the government looking to save a few bucks.

I do not feel we need to change the governance of the School Divisions across the province; however I feel we need to evaluate the way in which divisions are funded. There are a number of expense items which I believe would be very draining to the budgets within the school divisions that we could offset with Revenues. Bussing: I believe that families who use busses to transport their children to school should have to pay a subsidy each year. This service allows many families to not have the added expense of transporting their child in their vehicles. You can choose to use the bus; however charging each student \$100.00 each would generate a lot of revenue to offset the expense. For example we have 7 buses with approximately 40 children on each bus. This would be potential revenue of \$280,000.00 which would not fully cover these costs, but create a cost share effect. Administration: When I attended school as a child my parents paid school fees to the division. They ranged from \$25-\$40 per student and again created a source of revenue. Our school holds roughly 750 kids, which would generate roughly \$25,000.00 for our school alone. I analyzed the Appendix "A" Overview of the School Divisions from 2014-2015 School Year. When you break down these numbers, there is a huge variance in funding per student and Teacher/ED Staff to Student Ratios. For Example Here are some of my findings: Sask. Public \$7,071,467.00 (Admin + Govern) Enrollment 22,819.00 Student to Staff Ratio- 11.779 \$ Funded per Student: \$309.89 Sun West \$3,169,159.00 (Admin + Govern) Enrollment 4718 Student to Staff Ratio- 8.986 \$ Funded per Student: \$671.72 Funding must be constantly re-evaluated. I analyzed 16 divisions. If we base the funding on an average of the Expense Totals: \$55,492,616.00 and enrollment totals of 116,235.00 there are many divisions being grossly overfunded, and underfunded. How do we make things fair for all the divisions? I know there are a lot of social factors and land coverage for the rural divisions, but unsure of how government decides how each division gets money.

My biggest worry is how we will get local representation. It's already hard for the rural areas to be heard how is this going to be dealt with?

I have entirely read the Educational Governance Review Report and I feel that Option 1: Provincial Model and Option 2: Regional Model would not serve the children in Grades K to 12 or the communities of Saskatchewan. Decreasing the amount of school divisions to what they presently are would completely diminish the voice of the local communities and/or SCC's and the local level access to a board member is completely gone. Please when making your decision on the new level of governance for Education, do not consider Options 1 or 2 of the review report. Thank you.

By amalgamation of all school divisions in Saskatchewan you are taking the personalized care out of our schools. It would be a mistake to lose our local representative at the school board level to voice our concerns as parents on the education our children are receiving. As the world is getting bigger and bigger, it is reassuring when my children come from a small school of 100 students and still can have their voices heard on what is the best resources and education for them. Bigger and more centralized does not mean more streamlined. Perhaps this move is to save money for the province but at what cost? Less teachers, less support staff. More automated services with a less personal touch. Not everything has to be one.

Thank you for requesting input from all of us directly involved! I am a _____ School Division teacher who has worked in the Alberta and Saskatchewan systems as well as abroad. I am also the parent of 2 students within the School Division. I believe that it is not in the best interest of students to create one large province wide School Division. Our community of _____ is one of the highest risk communities in Saskatchewan and yet our students are succeeding at rates measurable by the standardized testing we've implemented at the request of the Ministry. Our schools are leading the way in the areas of early childhood environments, Kindergarten Readiness, Cross-curricular First Nations content and family engagement! It would diminish our ability to meet our communities' needs if one School Division was created. Thank you.

The Catholic School Divisions need to remain separate from the Public School, for sure. Amalgamation of divisions has never worked successfully in the past as the voices of the small communities are silenced by the bigger centers. I have had personal experience where our school division was amalgamated with other divisions and the larger centers had all the power and eventually our school, and others from small centers, were left neglected while the larger ones were being propped up with all the latest programs and funding for building improvements. The schools were eventually closed and kids bused, riding for nearly an hour as opposed to a 15 - 20 trip. It eventually leads to people leaving these smaller communities and eventually the community dies. This is all a result of poor government management - nothing more.

I believe elected school boards are important. Government appointments will be far too partisan to represent schools and needs at a local level. Having representatives for, local areas is important. I like the idea of individuals running in areas rather than a big list...i.e. I prefer the pic lock boards system over the catholic in Saskatoon.

I am very concerned with all the cuts to teachers and EA's and the size of both my daughter's grade 8 and grade 4 classes. This is the first year that my daughter's grade 4 class was cut to 1 leaving 29 students in 1 room. There are very high needs students also. I was so disheartened to see how this affected my daughter and to witness the transitioning period. This is not fair to our children or the teachers that are trying to teach. I have similar concerns with my daughter's grade 8 class. Thankfully she is a strong student but others are getting left behind. As a parent I am extremely concerned and upset and would like to see change.

DO NOT move to one school board/division... our divisions motto of "Students Come First" is true... they plan for the best outcomes for our students... based on what is needed in each of our very diverse communities!! I'm certain while changes need to be made changing the structure of boards is not the solution!!

From my experience the further away from the individual student the administration gets, the less administration can acknowledge the needs of that student... this was evident to me when the first round of amalgamation occurred. The administration operates as if it is a corporate business making decisions from a purely administrative perspective rather than considering the needs of individual students and situations.

To Whom it may concern; I truly feel that our education system needs some revamping but not have the divisions amalgamated into one. Having them stay how they are would be beneficial to the people especially our students. If the government wants to save money then they need to reduce the cost of wages to the hierarchy in the department of education and not to the lower end of the divisions For example; Teachers and students. As a parent of two girls who both have attended prairie south school division here in Moose Jaw I strongly feel that because they have learning disabilities and to have them tested for certain needs it will take longer as the division staff will have further to travel and more responsibility. Thank You for your time _____

In any situation no matter the circumstances you need to look at work load that is being placed on our educators! In our situation in our little school we have 5 grades in one class room with one teach whom is also the principle of the school! I understand that it is a teacher to student ratio is how staffing is figured out but in situations like this there has to be a better way to determine how many staff members are required! You also need to take into consideration the schools of necessity and how to make funding more readily available to the school districts again in our situation our population is sparse but for students to be transported elsewhere is crazy! For our boundary Lines for our school to drive in a car to the nearest "big" centre is over an hour never mind a 5 year old on a bus stopping along the way to pick up other students and switch busses! I guess hence why we are still open! But I guess what I am saying is that the government needs to make funding available to the school boards for these types of places! I cannot fathom putting my 5 year old in the bus at 7 am to arrive at school at 850 and had to transfer busses on a busy highway to get there! And after school get on the bus at 330 to switch busses twice (unsupervised) and not get home until 5!! Most of you don't put that many hours in at your job in one day!!! So when talking about combining divisions consider the students as they need to be the priority as they're the future of our province and with our decent education how is that going to work out! Thank you for your time!

I support changes that will improve student learning and provide opportunities to our youth. As a teacher and coach I have the opportunity to talk to educators from across the province and see a diversity in how school divisions address their own situations. I think this is a strength of our current system and would not care to see local boards lose their right to do what is best in their region.

I'm a parent in the northeast school division. I was unable to submit a comment with this email address online and so am emailing this email address. I'm not sure how the government's goals of raising the graduation rate to 80%, and improving of the grade level achievements in science, writing, reading, and math, will be accomplished by restructuring the governance structure of the school divisions. These academic goals are laudable and we should be working hard to achieve them. However curriculum changes, parent education, as well as changes to the university education programs are needed to really make significant differences in these areas. For example, in order to teacher elementary school prospective teachers only have to take one science class and one math class, both at a low academic level. If you really want to improve student success in math and science you need to have teachers that thoroughly understand and enjoy these subjects. Unless, the restructuring plan frees up money to be reallocated to resources such as EAs or classroom sets of appropriate books and materials, restructuring does not seem to be a worthwhile endeavour.

I know technology is important, but learning to use a phone book, reading an atlas or looking on a paper map to find a location is something these children are needing to know (In my opinion). Thank you.

I did not realize there was such a large disconnect between the school boards and the minister of education. Every large organization whether it is a corporation, a church, or a department of education must delegate administration in tiers as it is not possible for one small group to understand the complexities of the diverse situations that may be encountered. I am all for restructuring the boundaries, I may be even OK with reevaluating the role of the boards somewhat. When I read the proposals I seem to have gotten an understanding that the focus we wish to achieve is that of a specific standard. This is all fine, but we must understand the differences in our regions. They cannot all be administrated in the same way, the demographics of culture, religion, language, and population density make this goal a road to disaster. There must be strong administration at regional levels. But like I said earlier, I am not opposed to the reestablishment of what those regions are. So I guess to sum this up, I would be happier with 3a or 3b. We also should be sensitive to the role of the parent, the education system is simply a mechanism of which to deliver an education. It is up to the parent to help the children accept their duties to learn. This will be much easier if they agree with the manner in which their children are taught. This may be a bit extreme in thought, but do you think this ideology was in play when we thought about residential schools.

I don't want this amalgamation. It is not fair to the students, teachers or families!!!

I personally think that GSCS is a great school division just as it is. Citizens want and need the option to send their children to a Catholic school if they wish. Any one is welcome in the schools and treated with dignity and respect. The offerings in this unique division include excellent academics, sport and social opportunities. Students whether they are Christian or not also come away with skills and values not offered anywhere else. Also I would like to mention that we need to keep the ability to elect our board members. The people that are elected are community members that have a stake in Catholic education. They are visible in our schools, churches and the community. They have our children's best interests at heart.

I as a teacher and parent of 4 young children I want to continue to have locally elected boards.

As a recent student, and current taxpayer, I cannot support any less than a fully provincial system. Most weaknesses of geography can be easily addressed by modern technology, especially with a population barely over 1 million. There are always challenges in the transition, but countless global education initiatives have proven the benefits of serving larger cohorts of students. We can tailor education to each and every student, but through better educational tools, not fragmented management.

I'm sorry bigger is not always better. Each part of the province is unique and needs representation. Maybe have a North, Central and South School Divisions, NOT ONE . I also feel the Rural Schools will get short changed or closed down ! Things are working quite well now, so why mess it up. You already cut funding to the schools. Quit that crap. Sorry had to add this: one big Health Region is NOT GOOD either. Didn't work in Alberta. I also work in Health care. Only good thing make sure you get rid of all the extras at the top and quit inventing jobs for them. There are so many bullcrap jobs already in this Health Region!!

I worked in the education system for a few years as an educational assistant, my thoughts are...there are too many management positions, superintendents, head office employees, consultants and not enough teachers, educational assistants, speech pathologists, learning assistant teachers and qualified substitutes. I think amalgamating the divisions into one would be beneficial for many and save the tax payers millions of dollars. Yes this may mean some job loss for the head offices but perhaps some of those employees could go back to teaching or some could retire. Also allowing retired teachers to sub is taking away jobs from the younger people who need them to make an income to pay off student debt and gain experience to get a contract position. This needs to stop. A faith based education could still be offered to those who want it. Unnecessary spending on reports and studies also needs to stop. Get out there and talk to the teachers, listen to what they need. So many great teachers are being pushed to stress leave because so much is being asked of them. All the testing that is required is ridiculous, let them teach!! Go back to the basics, the reporting that is required is crazy and what do you do with the results?? Class sizes have got out of hand. I have friends with 28-30 kids in grade 2 and 3 classes and 24-26 kids in kindergarten classes with little EA support. How do you expect them to teach having to handle that many and some have 3-5 special needs kids mixed in. Ridiculous!! Much work needs to be done to improve the education system we have, stop the spending cuts to education and spend the money wisely PLEASE!!

I do not support any more amalgamation of school boards. Our province has very diverse needs and this can only be met through keeping local representation. Education and educators are continually feeling the brunt of this government's lack of respect through cutbacks, lack of appropriate funding and the continued effort to discredit teachers. Education is a cost that is vital to the success of our citizens. It is time to treat it as the asset that it is!! Make your cutbacks in upper level government salaries and not front line education or health.

To amalgamate again is to shift divisions' focus from the ESSP agenda (educational) and a student first agenda to an amalgamation agenda. Our students deserve attention to the learning goals upon which we have all agreed. If there are inefficiencies, target those. Expect divisions to be accountable for tax dollars, yet keep the purpose in mind - a quality education for our students. Further amalgamation will not be efficient and will not lead to stronger educational results. If there are provincial pieces to restructure (e.g., adjusting numbers of board members based on population or defining teacher time or agreements), identify the rationale (e.g., equal population representation by boards) and proceed. I believe we have over 700 municipalities, yet we have 28 school divisions. Amalgamation will not improve educational excellence, address student needs, or provide funding efficiency. Instead, years of focus will be on restructure, comparison of policies and applications, and other managerial tasks. Our students' education, not amalgamation, must continue as our priority.

I believe school boards need to remain an elected position from community votes. Parents and their children deserve to have a say in who sits on their boards to help ensure accountability and that their voices are heard. I am against changing these boards to be government appointed.

I work in the I was working
at the Thunder Creek School Division which was one of the legacy divisions which amalgamated into the Prairie South School Division in 2006. That amalgamation was very stressful and difficult to go through. Now with the threat of further amalgamations, I am scared that my job is going to disappear and if it does, then I will probably have no alternative but to leave the province to find other employment. Is this the ultimate goal of the government? To take away more Saskatchewan jobs? I have been a full-time employed tax payer in this province for 30+ years and I hope that the repayment for that loyalty is not that I will lose my employment that I need to survive. Please prove to us what you say in your political ads when you are running for office; that you want to create jobs - not eliminate jobs!

I'm 100% onboard with amalgamation of the schools divisions. CEOs seem to be out of the division, province and country more than they are in the office. Amalgamation would ensure consistency among schools - in current divisions and throughout the province. There are goals in ESSP and each CEO interprets and puts into action quite different goals /actions throughout province. Assessment practices would be aligned. Interpreting and teaching curriculum would be aligned and consistent. There would be a sharing of resources - distance learning courses, locally developed, functionally integrated, dual credit. One licence for online resources. This would be a benefit to students and to teachers. Software systems would be common - reporting, hr, transportation, and payroll. Great savings to be had there. The Minister has asked for reductions in the high paying, central office jobs. I see too many divisions adding these positions (prairie spirit, northern lights) or not reducing the Parisians when retirements happen (GSSD, prairie south). Supports should be at the classroom level. Reduce school division numbers to ensure efficiencies, accountability, and transparency.

I am not sure of what this is about but school in Saskatchewan are teaching kids things that are not useful for life and some of the classes being taught are useless for life and I know as I use only some of the math that I was taught and the cooking and sewing that I learned, as I already knew how to speak English when I entered school. So here are my thoughts: Teach these kids life skills, things that are useful in life. Also I was told by my 71 yr. old dad that all school workers are to be working 8 hr. days, but doesn't happen at any school. And why are public high schools starting at 8 to 2:20 and public elementary schools starting at 8:30 until 3PM and catholic schools would have to start later or much earlier. Thank you

I strongly believe that local representation in education is crucial in a democratic society. I want locally elected boards that are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. Students, religious affiliation and socioeconomics of the families are unique to each school division and are best represented by locally elected members of our community. I support education in public and catholic school divisions as locally elected boards of education. School board amalgamation will not suit the best interest of the students nor improve graduation rates.

Please, I implore you to keep Catholic schools and their separate boards, represented locally. The relationship these schools have with their boards and their parish priests is of utmost importance. It is a vital piece of our community and provides great environment for learning and life lessons.

I am writing to support the continuation of locally elected boards for school divisions in Saskatchewan. I believe this better serves the needs of students and represents a higher level of accountability to a local electorate. In addition, it also provides an important arm's length relationship to government thereby avoiding potential conflicts of interest from a government appointed board.

Honorable Don Morgan, Q.C. Honorable Brad Wall Dear members of Governance Review: As you are well aware, it is winter in Saskatchewan and in our grade ½ split, we are 20 some odd days away from celebrating such occasions as Valentine's Day, and the 100th day of School! The 100th day is a big deal in grade one! Then as we continue to accomplish so much excellence, each day, we will eventually embrace spring, with all its wonder and progress; growth and celebration. This particular season of a teacher's life is one of duality. The complexity has always existed for me: that delicate balance between remaining focused on finishing the year well with my existing crop of kids, while at the same time, at least in my mind and heart, beginning to prepare, plan and ponder my up and coming teaching assignment. The season of spring always brings with it a multitude of emotions, and a great deal of pride in being a part of something so magical! The teaching and learning that takes place in the span of ten months of time is always rewarding, often challenging, and each and every year, memorable in some way. As we conclude May and move into June, it is typically then that our next year's teaching assignment is confirmed, and it is also then that my team of colleagues and I, administration, and student services teacher begins the dynamic process of student placement. It is not ever a black and white procedure, and it typically evolves and adjusts many many times between that first draft of names, and that first day the following Fall, when finally that new batch of fresh faces walk through our classroom doors. There are a multitude of reasons why student placement is not a simplistic endeavor and one of the many roles and responsibilities we as educators are a part of; and I would like to take the time to share some of them with you. The foundational aspect as to why this process is never taken lightly in our school, is that it is always about students first. Sure, I remember my heart rate increasing with a surge that year I was asked to teach a class of 17 bug catching grade one boys! I wondered internally as to my ability to be what they might need, and to send them off in June, being able to read, demonstrate mathematic ability, and so much more! I wondered if I could model the right mix of what these sweet sons of someone would demand of me. I recall that on the supply list I drafted that Spring, inscribed right beside 15 sharp pencils, was 1 hot wheels car! Yup! When things got wiggly and we were losing stamina, we took our cars out of our desks (fondly known as the garage) and we made a few laps round our desk tops; we then re focused and resumed our dynamic year

of learning! I kept a jar on my desk for all the grasshopper and ladybug gifts they brought to me daily, at recesses end, all throughout that Fall! I turned 40 that Spring, and I can still see them all lined up at the front of my classroom, their special gift thought up all on their own: serenading me with "Party Rockers in The House Tonight!" I also remember the first time I was able to welcome an EAL student into my classroom, mid-year. I recall crying at my desk wondering how on earth I was going to swing this; this meeting of needs and building relationship. And it all turned out; because I learned firsthand that the human spirit can be spoken to with a universality of gestures, such as the warmth of a smile, as well as a commonality of language. Placement, you see, is never about just us as teachers. In our setting of public education, we don't choose who walks into our schools. We do, however, commit fully to teaching each and every class we are gifted with. We do everything we can to ensure that there will be a balance of friendships, some leaders and positive models, both academically as well as socially, an equitable amount of students who may require more time to obtain concepts, or who may need differentiated outcomes, adaptations, and other types of supports. We strive for there to be gender equity, whenever possible. We recognize that it is always about the greater good and not just what might 'feel' least challenging to ourselves as the teacher. We pour over these lists and we think about the children represented by these names on a paper over and over again as we turn the scenario of our potential future class list in our mind to strive to predict if the grouping will be the best fit for all. We share conversations at the coffee maker with our colleagues and we adjust and re-adjust many times throughout the season of Spring. For me, as I contemplate the diverse and satisfying roles that I have in connection with the realm of education; teacher, SCC member, CTA member, STF councilor, and parent, that of placement season is the most tangible process I can possibly summon up, in order to compare this season of transformational change we are about to collectively embark upon. As my placement team does so each spring, so too will your committee engage in diverse, dynamic dialogue with many stakeholders as you contemplate changes to educational governance in Saskatchewan. I liken it to a placement meeting of sorts; whereby in order to arrive at a conclusion which will be merited and effective and purposeful for ALL, one must sift the many factors, each important and relevant; each contingent upon all kinds of complexities with pros and cons, and even ramifications. In a placement meeting there is much dialogue, much consultation, much inspection of learning needs, data, etc. In a placement meeting there cannot be a sense of frenzy or hurry, and there cannot be a decision simply for the sake of convenience, because we are making decisions which will affect the lives of our learners in a multitude of ways, some of which will be measurable, but many which will not be ever captured by any data driven instrument or assessment tool. And as you seek to create positive modifications to how we 'do business' in schools, I am cautiously optimistic and I am choosing to offer you my trust, that you are taking your task, albeit, monumental, as seriously and with as much intention, as we do with our students during not only placement each and every spring, but each and every day that they are part of our life. Every child placed is done so with their very best interests in mind, and we seek to provide them with every tool possible for them to reach their fullest potential and be as prepared as possible to embrace a future whereby they can be successful, contributing members of society. I am imploring each and every one of you that has a part to play in this restructuring, that every decision made as a result of this comprehensive Governance review, will warrant the same outcomes: that of the very best interests of our students in mind, where you are seeking to provide each and every one of them, regardless of where they reside, with every tool possible for them to reach their fullest potential and be as prepared as possible to embrace a future whereby they can be successful. I wish to thank you for inviting the public and stake holders to be a part of the conversation that impacts each and every one of us to some degree or another. I am pleased to hear Minister Morgan confirm that the front line work that we as educators do, should not be negatively impacted, as this in turn would impact our learners. It is difficult, as Mr. Perrins, conveyed in his report released on December 10th, 2016, to sift and sort through all the layers and potential consequences, whether positive or not, and come out with a distinctive certainty that one model will be a best for all scenario. I do, however, have some questions, regardless of what model is eventually adopted for our province: 1. Does bigger mean better? Will students be provided with timely services such as Speech and Language, Educational Psychologists, Occupational Therapy, to name just a few, if the windshield time of these individuals is expanded in direct proportion to the geographic increase of division boundaries? 2. Will teachers have the same access to Professional Development, in order to best meet the diverse needs of our diverse students, in a vastly increased geographic division? Will we still have access to what we currently possess in terms of human resources, such as Math and Literacy coaches, in a timely fashion? How far will it be reasonable to expect of my colleagues who are residing in a more rural setting, to drive in order to attend in-services or meetings; especially new teachers, who already have so many aspects to adjust to in their initial years of teaching? Will there still be funds for any or all of the above, as I understand that cost savings is a key element of this initiative? 3. Who will decide the nuances that affect the dailiness of my job, because as you are well aware, we as a collective are still awaiting a reasonable conclusion to the Teacher Workload Intensification Recommendations and in that spirit, these aspects of

my work load give me cause to wonder what it will all look like as we are asked to undergo even more amalgamation: • reporting student progress • assessment • Student Services model • class size and composition • staffing formulas • supports for students with exceptional and diverse learning needs • EAL supports 4. Will our LINC agreements be honoured, and when decisions are made as far as how many divisions will exist henceforth, how will the government address the blending of existing LINC agreements representing legacy divisional entities into a scenario which meets the needs of the new division in a respectful, fair and equitable manner, for all educators in the province? I don't have any answers to this myriad of questions, but as my students and I enjoy our days together and begin to plan for our 100th Day of School, these contemplations matter greatly to myself, my family, and my colleagues. I spend more time, after all, at my job with my students than I do with my own three children. I won't, however, allow these uncertainties to distract me from diligently demonstrating and consistently giving my best to my students and their families, each day. I will read each memo and each news report and each communication from our Federation and School Division, to stay abreast of the transitions, as they become available. I will recall with intention, that the butterflies I experienced, as I was given the assignment of that dynamic class of boys, eventually diminished and we had a challenging and excellent year, and I will adhere to that same hope in this circumstance; that the questions will diminish as clarity is provided by yourselves, at the helm of this vast undertaking. I value a great deal, that Mr. Perrins and Mr. Morgan have conveyed the importance of a sound, effective education system as an indicator of a balanced and productive society. I would love for Premier Wall to speak as passionately about this aspect of governance, as he does about the Prime Minister's carbon tax. After all, without properly educated children, the very fundamentals of our society become just as fragile as our current economic climate, and the threat that an imposed carbon tax would sustain to us as Saskatchewanians. Please keep front and center, the intrinsic truth that children, regardless of which part of our province they call home, are truly our most valuable resource. Those bug catching boys are exactly half way through their public school career. Let us improve their opportunities through the forthcoming decisions soon to be made. Let us gift them the gift of a well-supported and well-funded public education system that will be enduring and sustainable for generations to come. In closing, I cannot help but take note that the deadline of January 23rd and the opportunity to share our voice comes one day after the first anniversary of that terrible tragedy in La Loche, Saskatchewan, where forever etched upon our province's history, we wear the horrific badge, like Sandy Hook, Columbine, Taber, and others. In the midst of such terrible tragedy, I have never felt such pride and resolve as I witnessed the pouring out of support for those whose lives were lost in that horrific event. Candles were lit in communities and cities alike, and the human spirit of teachers, Federation staff, and communities throughout the country saw it as a tremendous opportunity to buoy us as a collective people, a profession, and a province; to carve and cradle and recalibrate to seek to find solutions for our vulnerable neighbors to the north. We are teachers, and our greatest calling is to stand in the gap for the vulnerable and the struggling; whether that be a newly arriving Syrian family, or a northern town in a place I will only ever see and read about, in the news. I am both humbled and proud to be a part of this compelling profession. I implore you to continue to provide whatever is necessary for every part of our land of the living skies, so that we can continue to serve as the conduits for what our learners are ripe and ready for. When the proper pre-existing conditions exist, it doesn't take nearly as much effort to grow something beautiful than when something, or someone, has been starved of the most crucial components that enable growth and progress. We need now, more than ever before, to make education at every level and in every place, from north to south and each small corner and bustling city, a priority so that we can do our part to prepare our greatest resource – our kids – for all that they are destined to be. I pray for wisdom for each and every one of you, and I thank you in advance for leading with integrity and for remembering who and what this is truly about. Sincerely,

At present, I have a child attending a rural Light of Christ School here in Saskatchewan. Personally, I have worked in the education system for 20 years and I must say that locally elected school board members need to remain intact. Dissolving the majority of them will leave rural school divisions in crisis. These appointed individuals represent the schools in its best interest when taking ideas and suggestions to the government. We need these highly qualified individuals to speak for us when our education system today has many flaws . Why add to that? Why create more controversy? Why leave each school division with little or no say about anything by demolishing locally elected professional members that serve on these boards? Trying to save money? Where will that money go? It's time to listen to the public, parents, community members, school personnel, and board members. WE MUST KEEP WHAT'S ALREADY WORKING INTACT!!! Sincerely,

Hello. Making one division is not what this province needs. There are so many children min included that need that extra help every day. If they don't get what they need they will struggle in school and in life. There r other things in the province that needs more attention. Leave the school boards alone

I am opposed to appointed school boards and further amalgamation of Saskatchewan school divisions. Local voice is diminished when government authority is increased. Local voice ensures that the individual needs, unique to a specific school and its community are reflected in the management and operation of a school division. Local boards work collaboratively and cooperatively with all its stakeholders to ensure students receive the best education possible. I believe a school board must be fiscally responsible, it must determine financial priorities and ensure accountability for expenditures but it cannot forget that education is more than a business. Education is about relationships. The larger the division, as past experience has proven, the more difficult it is to maintain effective relationships.

Given the wide range in geographic regions and local needs, shifting to a uniform management or distribution model would be a challenge, and not necessarily meet the needs of the students. That being said, if further amalgamation is completed, I would hope that present employees of current administrative central offices are not simply given new job titles within the new jurisdictions. In BC we had three districts amalgamate into one (Kimberley, Invermere and Golden - Rocky Mountain) and they maintained three offices and simply called two of the superintendents assistant superintendents. The amount of administrative manpower did not reduce at all. If there is to be a change in structure, I hope the changes are fiscally responsible and accountable to student / community needs.

I am concerned about the push to graduate First Nations' students. I believe it is very important for First Nations' students to graduate, but the push to see them graduate in 3 years is resulting in a lowering of expectations from teachers (a result caused by the push from higher up). I believe that a different route is needed to ensure graduation rates gain momentum. Since the "Tell them from me" initiative, teachers have begun implementing relational strategies to engage First Nations' students. I wonder if a higher success rate would be applied if students went through high school similar to elementary schools - with the same teacher, rather than moving from class to class (It is more difficult to develop those relational bonds when always changing teachers).

As a parent, teacher, and leader in the Saskatoon Public system, I am gravely concerned about the direction of public education in Saskatchewan. In the past ten years I have witnessed the erosion of the quality of education we are able to offer our students. Our locally chosen board has worked tirelessly to develop a deep understanding of the unique needs of our city's children. They have also listened faithfully to our community members and helped determine a direction for spending our dwindling dollars. When local boards lost the ability to control education taxation, the board adapted and continued to use the resources allocated to offer flexible, adapted programming to meet our city's changing needs - increased enrollment, high numbers of EAL students and a dramatically rising special needs population. Saskatoon's children need flexible, responsive programming and direction - not a one size fits all business model designed to cut spending. We need local voices who know our community and students to determine how best to utilize our current funding shortfalls. Because of declining support from our provincial government, our board has consulted with staff and community members to make numerous cuts and find savings across the board. We can no longer say these cuts are not directly impacting classrooms. The continued shortfall of funding and the government's refusal to honor their contractual obligations for teachers has ensured that our boards do not have the funds they legally should receive to meet the needs of students. They need to make additional cuts to an already lean system to pay salaries. These cuts are evident every day in our school - in our classrooms - in our programming - and our ability to meet the needs of our students. They are also evident in the increased workload and resulting stress for my staff. I have lost faith in the commitment of our government to public education. I am dismayed to hear how little they value the input of our local boards to respond to the needs of our citizens. Education is not a business - schools and school divisions are filled with complex human beings who need flexible support. A one size fits all model will not meet the needs of our youngest citizens. Please demonstrate you are committed to public education.

Instead of going larger there needs to be a return to the smaller, more localized school boards where members of communities truly have a say in what kind of education is happening in their community. Class sizes are growing and students are seeking more support at school from stressors in their home lives. Smaller class sizes and more supports in schools will help children at an early age instead of trying to fix things when they are adults. Too many children that need just a bit of extra support but do not have a diagnosis are slipping through the cracks.

I don't think it's a good idea to put all eggs in one basket. Sure, the system is smaller and less expensive but I like having a voice. I like have the option to see my trustee. If I have a problem in a big school division... What then?! I'd have to submit a complaint online and wait for some low level clerk to compile a monthly report for the people in charge?! No. I want to talk to someone face-to-face about my child. To me, they are precious. To you, they are a student number and dollar signs. That's not what Saskatchewan is, guys. Please do the right thing and don't go saving some money when it comes to our kids. Invest in them.

Good day, I certainly agree that fewer people administering school boards will offer some (emphasis on "some") savings. I will not argue against that. This is the LEAN model that the government spent a lot of money on consultants. The Lean model has served many Japanese companies very well over the years. An example is Toyota. They are an efficient company, however, their corporate thinking has yet to yield them a championship in Formula 1 racing. Despite the fact that they have the most funding. If Saskatchewan is to produce the brightest minds, further amalgamations in the education system will create a system that is too large to and too slow to combat the issues that are unique to the regions (School Divisions). I think that academic achievement of the students will be negatively impacted when their needs are not met by a mega system -that simply cannot meet them all. Education is very different from business or health. If we look at the United States, Australia, Ireland, and Nova Scotia we see that the mega systems that govern education are struggling to make overall, lasting, improvements in the academic areas. Researchers such as Dr. Barrie Bennett, Hattie and Fullan should be consulted before any amalgamation takes place to define how the relationship will look to give our students the best chance at success. I should note that Dr. Barrie Bennett has worked with districts in Saskatchewan before. His work has turned around some of the worst performing districts in the world and transformed them to be the top performing districts. I worry that in one, or a few, mega school divisions will simply focus on measuring academic gains and success and ignore the voices on the ground. I'd venture and guess that the input of communities will be silenced, or ignored. Or worse, the opposite will happen - where the squeaky wheel gets the grease. I think the province will lose a lot of enrollment in First Nations students if there continue to be further amalgamations. Those students and their families will likely opt to attend On-Reserve, Federally Funded, schools because the voices of the parents and students will be heard. In short, yes the province will save money, but will likely have to invest a lot more in the long run into bringing up student performance, like so many of the other mega districts that at facing a losing battle. Please don't add more pressure on an already struggling system just to win voted for reelection. Do the right thing and take this opportunity to rebuild the best system in Canada, not just the cheapest/fiscally most efficient. As an example, please look at the Department of National Defence. It's one mega system - and they are very efficient for being as structured as they are! However, they delegate command and control to smaller divisions. The Navy, Army, Air Force, Disaster Relief, Communications, Medical Branch, Special Operations Command, Arctic Response, etc all have the the autonomy to pursue and shape their craft in a way that makes the most sense. And when you think about what that might look like...Imagine you are a hostage. Who would you want to come rescue you? JTF2 - Our highly specialized Hostage Rescue unit or Air Force Mechanics? Now, if your plane needed to be fixed - would you want the JTF2 Assaulters of the Air Craft Mechanics to fix the plane? Schools divisions are given the flexibility to specialized in raising and educating children to thrive in their environment and beyond.

I submit this feedback as a concerned parent, tax payer and School Community Council member. Upon reading Mr. Perrins Educational Governance Review Report it is very difficult to understand how changing governance or amalgamating school divisions is the answer to the financial challenges that we face, to ensuring our children's quality education, or to ensuring our local voices will matter. Locally elected boards matter in the education of our children. Local voices matter!!!! Our province went through a forced amalgamation in 2006. Most of the school divisions that were created are large enough to achieve all significant economies of scale. How will additional, large scale amalgamation further improve student outcomes and benefit our children? School division amalgamations are highly disruptive, time consuming and represent a significant financial cost, plus a very large cost to our students. With respect to our particular school division, Prairie Valley: it has an optimal number of Board Members to adequately serve the needs and best interests of our rural communities. It is also an optimal size, offering a wide range of programs and services with excellent results. In reviewing Mr. Perrin's report, I am happy to note that our Board does an excellent job of adhering to the Principals of Good Governance as outlined on Pages 18/19. It also does an excellent job of meeting the unique challenges that are involved in providing education in rural areas. Rather than 'transformational' change in the direction suggested by the 3 options in the report, please consider an Option 4 - maintain the status quo with implementation of system of (a) sharing best practices among school divisions and (b) look for sector-wide efficiencies to be gained by the school divisions working together.

I have read Mr. Perrin's report, and I agree that the current structure needs to change. Given a choice, I like the 3A option. Creating new boundaries and fewer administrative teams, but still maintaining elected boards. I believe there is a need for stronger education for the purpose and role of the School Community Council - in my experience, I spent 4 years on the council at our school and was never really sure why we were there other than to fundraise and rubberstamp strategic learning plans. I also think the Administrative teams may have lost view of their intended purpose, and instead have created silos of power and authority. More emphasis needs to go back onto providing quality education for students, and giving them the services and tools to learn. Respectfully,

Transformational change should come not out of budget restraint but rather from an educational paradigm shift that causes us in the education community to rethink how we best deliver programming to benefit our students in a changing world (politically, economically and socially). As seen from other provinces that have gone to a single board system, like Newfoundland/Labrador, cost savings from the reductions are negligible compared to the overall provincial budget. What has happened is a reduction in services outside the major urban centres (more school closures, longer busing for students, lack of services and activities for students - especially Educational Assistants, School Counselors, Special Education, Speech, and OT supports). How is this putting students first, as has been stated as the government's position in many instances during this process? The idea that one size fits all doesn't fit well with current educational research. As teachers, we are regularly asked to differentiate our instruction to best suit the needs of our students, while being asked to do more with less (changes to the school day, fewer in class supports, provincial hoshin's, unnecessary provincial data collection that does not lead to better in class results; we all know that statistics are dubious at the best of times). Each division's demographic is different and has different needs. By capping the mill rate, you effectively handicapped our boards and put them in the positions where they are now (lack of funds to run quality programming for all students leading to your transformational change, paying for previously agreed upon pay increases that your government passed down to the boards, etc.). Instead of looking to score some political support (which you already have) by reducing boards in a tough economy, why doesn't the government look at real transformational change based on current research and best practices? You weren't responsible for the price of oil when it was \$100 a barrel and you're not responsible for the low prices now. In a resource based economy, there are ups and downs. The education sector should not be punished for the government's lack of foresight that a downturn would eventually occur and that money should have been put away to cover such a downturn (Norway anyone?). Please don't cut our students' chances off at the knees. Your cuts will not improve test scores, parent involvement, student engagement, graduation rates, literacy rates or math scores. So if your transformational change really isn't transforming education why are you calling it anything other than a cutback? Please reconsider your proposed changes to our system and rather be politically courageous in tough times and put more resources into the most important demographic of our province; our youth. Their minds are our province's future, not the resources in the ground. Thank you for the opportunity to voice my concerns.

As a lifelong member of Balgonie, and a parent of 2 children currently in the prairie valley school district I have some concerns regarding the proposed changes to the school districts. Some of my thoughts... -Locally elected boards matter in the education of our children. Local voices matter!!!! -Our province went through a forced amalgamation in 2006. Most of the school divisions that were created are large enough to achieve all significant economies of scale. How will additional, large scale amalgamation further improve student outcomes and benefit our children? -School division amalgamations are highly disruptive, time consuming and represent a significant financial cost, plus a very large cost to our students. -With respect to our particular school division, Prairie Valley: we feel it has an optimal number of Board Members to adequately serve the needs and best interests of our rural communities. It is also an optimal size, offering a wide range of programs and services with excellent results. In reviewing Mr. Perrin's report, we are happy to note that our Board does an excellent job of adhering to the Principals of Good Governance as outlined on Pages 18/19. It also does an excellent job of meeting the unique challenges that are involved in providing education in rural areas. Rather than 'transformational' change in the direction suggested by the 3 options in the report, please consider an Option 4 - maintain the status quo with implementation of system of (a) sharing best practices among school divisions and (b) look for sector-wide efficiencies to be gained by the school divisions in working together. Your time and consideration is much appreciated.

I believe that all students should have access to exceptional education. These children will one day be our future. It is disappointing to see some schools get so much and other schools get so little. In my opinion education resources shouldn't be based on tax brackets. I would like to see the Catholic school system remain separate. Parents should have the option of a religious-based education. Teachers are struggling in the public school system. They lack resources. They lack training on how to deal with so many children with diverse needs. I would sincerely hope that parents and teachers will be given detailed info on the options being considered, including the projected impact these changes will have on our teachers and our children. I also hope parent and teacher input will be requested and considered prior to making decisions. After all, we are investing in our future.

Please do not create one single division. School in rural areas in Saskatchewan has different needs than that of an urban center!! The changes happening in our school divisions, sports teams, and life in general are setting our children UP TO FAIL. Please do not start assuming every division should be the same. This is getting ridiculous, and I worry for my children!

As I see more and more of these reorganizations/amalgamations/restructures, in other areas of life, I really question, how does one put a real cost on what is actually lost, especially when there is no monetary value on the item(s) actually being affected most. And ultimately, who is actually benefitting from these “combinations”, and is it really worth it? Living in small town Saskatchewan most of my life, over the last 15 years in the small communities I’ve lived, I’ve seen our local Co-op merge with the Co-op from surrounding communities; I’ve seen our local multi-location Credit Union merge with a larger center based Credit Union; and I’ve seen some of the effects of the previously combining of Health regions and what it has done specifically to the people at the bottom of the pyramid. Before the big change takes place, we all heard the buzz words of increased efficiency, increased buying power, huge savings, increased access to programs and it was painted as a great deal, essentially giving a smaller community access to the benefits of a larger community. I’ll admit that there was some of that, but the unfortunate down side was as the centralization of the organization occurred, it appeared that the outer extremities of our rural province ended up losing far more than they gained, particularly from the perspective of those being served. Certain services and/or issues/difficulties that previously could be dealt with quickly and easily right at “home” were now moved out of the community. Those now having the authority to make the decisions were not actually close to the affected community, didn’t have the same personal pulse on the situations, and didn’t understand the small and sometimes very unique difference and nature of the situation in the distant rural locations. The personal and caring service at the local level had been removed. Access to certain services would now require a drive to neighbouring communities, or even the city to get the same services that used to be available locally. In some cases, as in that of doctors, rules were created to force them to adhere to narrower territory guidelines and not provide services to a community that already had a doctor, even though that community preferred, and or had better success and services from another individual/office that was willing to operate in their community, and had operated there previously. The ones who suffer from this type of process, seem to be the ones who reside in the smaller communities, the smaller divisions, or those places where the large company model could possibly realize better efficiencies by going with an out-of-the-box idea, or non-standard process, instead of a “one size fits all” type implementation that tends to come with removing local structure and authority. The feeling “out here” is we have become “lesser citizens” and are praised for the overall success of the larger organization, but in the big scheme of things, are treated like a statistic, often feeling unheard, un-cared for, and unappreciated.

As a parent of a student in the Prince Albert Catholic School division, I would like the Ministry of Education to consider the following as feedback to the Dan Perrins report: 1) Catholic education is important. The Minister has made a commitment to continued Catholic education in the province. My household is pleased with this response and we would like to affirm this with the Minister and Ministry of Education. I applaud the Minister of Education on valuing the Constitutional Right to have publicly funded Catholic Education in this province. 2) Student achievement is a priority. Our school division is in the midst of completing the next three-year strategic plan and has had statistically meaningful academic improvement for our students in the last three-year plan (2014-2017). I encourage our Ministry to support our next three-year plan (2017-2020) that staff, parents, community stakeholders, School Community Councils, Catholic constituents, trustees and children are developing that will help our children meet the 2020 provincial growth plan. 3) Relationships are important. As a parent of a child participating in Catholic education, (and one that has already graduated), I would like to have the Minister of Education consider local relationships and partnerships in administering and managing the educational affairs of the school division. These are important as our school division operates efficiently and has one of the highest graduation rates of success in the province for all students especially First Nation, Metis graduation rates. I believe in developing long term, positive relationships with staff, parents, community stakeholders, School Community Councils, Catholic constituents, trustees and children to respond locally to our children in Prince Albert with the goal of supporting students to be engaged citizens who have a strong sense of self and community. In conclusion, I thank the Ministry of Education for the opportunity to provide feedback at this critical time. Yours in Catholic education,

I am a firm believer of clear, open dialogue. I feel that school boards should not be amalgamated as this would prevent the rural voices and concerns from being heard. As a Chair of an SCC, I have worked with my Board Trustee to convey clear communication back and forth. Please do not take this from us. Respectfully,

Do not consolidate the current 18 public school divisions into between eight and 14. Not in favour of the large changes to make one large board without having voices from our local divisions.

Here are my thoughts... Most importantly, please limit each class size to 20 students. How about hiring a volunteer coordinator, someone who works with teachers to determine their volunteer needs and then recruit and match volunteers with those needs. Thank you,

Dear Education Governance Advisory Panel, I represent one of two media outlets that consistently covers the North East School Division. There is a real possibility that whatever reforms you recommend would move the governing body of our local school division away from Melfort and to a place that would be difficult for a reporter based out of Tisdale to attend school division board meetings. I ask that you add recommendations to the report that will allow local newspapers to continue to cover the public portions of the board meetings and ask questions to the board chair, the director of education and any other pertinent official as soon as the meeting is complete. Such recommendations might include requiring divisions to broadcast their public meetings online and making a conference call after the meeting available to local media. I feel that school divisions can do their best work if the public they serve is informed about their actions through their local media outlets. Thank you for considering my request and for the work you are doing to consult with stakeholders and the public. Sincerely,

I am an Administer of a school with 90 % Aboriginal students I feel strongly about sharing the following information. Our staff, not unlike other schools, works very hard to provide everything that our students need in order to be successful. This encompasses many things including; breakfast, adaptations for lessons and assignments, counselling, help with life issues, assistance in reaching their goals, encouragement, genuine care and concern, coaching, extra- curricular activities like dance classes, and of course this list could go on and on, and I haven't even mentioned unit or lesson plans yet. I am proud of the work we do in this school and all the schools in Prairie Spirit School Division. I feel that we have little support from our government to reach the goals outlined in the Education Sector Plan. We have had to deal with more and more cut backs without any consultation from teachers. The change to the calendar and school hours, the reduction in Educational Associates and teachers and Prairie Spirit's inequitable funding makes an already difficult job increasingly stressful and difficult. I feel that the Government simply looks at numbers; however it is us in the schools day to day that see and feel the effects of these decisions so acutely. These decisions affect families in a way that is life changing. When jobs are lost everyone suffers. Children in the classroom are supported less, resulting in stress on the family. Teachers are becoming more and more stressed, which affects the climate in the school. It is very difficult to ask teachers to supervise or work in any extra-curricular activity because they are simply too busy and need to balance their work life with their home life. If the government truly sees the importance in Education they will work to support all schools and school divisions by supporting them with the funds they need. Prairie Spirit School Division has worked very hard to cut back on Administrative positions, teachers and EAs. We cannot afford to cut back any more. We need support through equitable funding and we need a stable governance to continue to work effectively. The PISA scores indicate that we are in need of stability and support not further restructuring and stress on an already tapped out system. Clearly the challenges to the provincial and the regional models outweigh the benefits. The education of our children should not be sacrificed in order to save money. Our students are depending on us to provide for them the best that we can offer. I am especially concerned with these models because I believe that the voices of the First Nation people will be diminished. How can the government be sure that our Indigenous people are being heard if there is only one board or 4 regional ones? I strongly believe that the only model that is best suited for supporting our teachers and schools is the restructuring or realigning boundaries of the school divisions this will cause the least disruption to our students and provide the support that is needed for our students. It is with great uncertainty that I send this letter. Will anyone truly consider the teachers' voices? Is our government asking for feedback only just to say that they heard our voice but they will still proceed without any care or concern for Saskatchewan teachers and students? Will they respond to the people's voice with honesty and compassion for our needs? The precedence in years past has my hopes diminished.

Since the removal/reduction of EA'S early on in 2010, and my son's struggle in High School, as to what wasn't taught to him at Confederation School, and its focus on immigrants, First Nations students etc, I place a large percentage of his struggles and failings in High School entirely on a poor educational system from our current and too long in power government! The teachers are overworked, underpaid, and to a degree, teach a curriculum that is failing my son amongst other kids of today's and past generations and focusing on a minority that has become home to a majority in some schools within the system. I completely shake my head at an educational system where today's kids don't know how to handwrite, write sentences, know sentence structure etc etc etc. I'm completely angry with our current government and they should as our representatives be completely ashamed of themselves for everything today's kids don't understand or were ever taught on simplistics of school. Because at the end of the day, my child is in need of a tutor at my cost!! I thought my tax dollars, in every way its collected by the government is to be paying for my child's education? I guess i was wrong.

I like that this is such a free-form approach to surveys. School is good. God Rarely interferes. I like that.

I am in my 10th year of teaching with Regina Catholic Schools and have felt the increase in roles and responsibilities of teaching over the past years. I have children of my own as well and am apprehensive about the choices being made for our school divisions in Saskatchewan for a number of reasons. I feel that already programs and resources are limited and our School Board works hard to make the learning and teaching environment favourable for it's students and staff members alike. I do not see how combining the school boards will increase learning or student success in the assessments mentioned in the report. I understand that our ministry is looking for ways of cutting spending and being efficient, however I wonder how these cuts might affect our students and teachers? Will the link agreements be cut? If so, I do not know how a teacher could continue give the same quality of education without the benefits of the link agreement that they rely on. The technology that Regina Catholic teachers are able to use might be cut and students would be affected again. I hope that the ministry is taking their decision very seriously as all of the options have a direct impact on teachers and students lives. I hope that this decision is not all about money as I believe that we should be investing in our children who are our future. Devoted teachers are working long hours above and beyond the call of duty to create a better future for our diverse students. How will their spirit be crushed if they are unable to give any more than they are already, if more resources, supports and programs are removed?

You ever hear the quote, "It takes a village to raise a child?" Well, I think an initiative as large as the one proposed may be losing sight of this. I support change when it is cost effective and delivers a superior result. However, I am not a proponent of any system that assumes equality of the base demographic. Unfortunately the differentiation in Aboriginal Schools vs. Non Aboriginal Schools is too far apart to thrust either or in to the same system and expecting a consistency in results, one to another. The Aboriginal School System has shown excellent improvements in their education levels over the past 10 years or so, but it would be insulting to think they could assimilate in to a Strong Armed Government directed initiative with the rest of the province. Community understands community. I fear that if the Government tries to force the hand of the local communities that the classroom will end up suffering. Not just those in the Aboriginal communities - but also in smaller rural communities. These smaller communities may be reluctant to let go of the control they worked so hard to establish. Especially those in the Aboriginal sector where a new system could destroy the year over year growth and graduate improvements they have witnessed over the last decade. Change has to be welcomed - not forced. I think it would be foolish to implement an idea without having I community to support it. Personally I think the Option 3A would be most appropriate for change - should any be required. The classroom needs to be the focus of this initiative. Not the budget and not a core curriculum that paints every community with the same brush. The report was keen to consider that there are different value systems held by each current school division - it's necessary to maintain this. Perhaps the core curriculum - if any should be imposed - should be concentrated on the key fundamental subjects that are universally accepted: 1. Science 2. Math 3. English and Literature 4. Canadian and World History 5. Physical Fitness The other subjects should be open to value and belief systems: 1. The Arts (Poetry/Canvas/Sculpting/Drama/Music/etc.) 2. Social Studies 3. Native Studies 4. Religious Studies 5. French Studies 6. Electives The saying may sound archaic, but it holds a lot of truth, "It takes a village to raise a child." By removing the community from the equation - the end result is going to impact the classroom as a whole, right down to the last child. The current system isn't broken - perhaps the goal of any initiative should be to find a way to improve each existing school division rather than disrupt what's already working. Whatever happens, I will make the best of it. I have children currently in the school system and I will find a way to work with any new system - for the sake of my kids - not my government.

Locally elected school boards are accountable to the electorate and are important advocates for ensuring excellence in education. Who better to serve the unique needs of students and schools in a division than those elected by the community to serve each division! Replacing locally elected boards with government appointed boards would have dire, long lasting consequences.

Locally elected school boards are accountable to the electorate and are important advocates for ensuring excellence in education. Who better to serve the unique needs of students and schools in a division than those elected by the community to serve each division! Replacing locally elected boards with government appointed boards would have dire, long lasting consequences.

As a parent and tax-payer I was appalled at the expense of maintaining local school boards! In the LOCCSD #16 the cost of over \$227,000 for seven Board members seems excessive to say the least. Further, as was mentioned in Perrins Report, the experience and expertise of some of these Board members hardly lends itself to guiding and directing of a school division. How is that \$227,000 (plus) spent? Now there is a question that deserves answering. Despite the effort combing over the LOCCSD web site there is no budget information available. Thus I applaud the Sask Party government in your critical examination of this public expenditure.

I support program adjustments that can cut out repetition of policies and procedures and create standardization of expectations within the educational system. I support initiatives that allow families to raise suggestions or concerns directly to the school system and reasonably expect a response or to work together towards a solution. I DO NOT support administrative or Board set-ups that decrease my ability to speak directly to Board members about concerns nor takes away from the very unique aspects that exist in rural education. We consciously chose to move from an urban center to a rural town with the main reason being the school system. We like the small town feel, attitudes and atmosphere created by the teachers, support staff and administration. I love that I can bring my concerns directly to our Board members via our SCC should there not be satisfactory resolution via the school staff. The mentality and atmosphere of a rural school is quite different from an urban center and it would be a very big loss to our province to have that affected by amalgamation into a single stream.

Parent of future student. I feel that often the school is the heart of the communities and that's particularly so in a small town. Local people should have a decision making role to play in their school and their children's future. Amalgamation may work for certain structures but not education. It will create bureaucrats who are even further removed from the communities and school boards who cannot possibly be representative of the people they are serving. Education is vital to the future. We need to start looking at children and humanity as assets and quit dwelling on the bottom line. Already schools have too few support people and funding. Healthy education that does not consist of standardized testing is imperative to our future! Thank you!

As a parent I think we should have a chance to provide feedback on all the teachers in our children's schools every year, similar to a peer review which would be part of their performance appraisals. I think the math program needs to be reevaluated - it is sad that you cannot work with your child anymore to help them understand it due to the fact that a parent can't even understand it unless you take the training in the class! I think failing kids should be reintroduced into our school division if they aren't at the level they need to be. It is sad that everyone is passed through the system even if they are not ready. Kids all know they can't be failed so many don't even put the effort into assignments knowing there is nothing the teachers can do if they don't do the work. All it does is sets them up for failure in real life later down the road - they can't handle reality in real life.

Thank you for asking for the input from Saskatchewan Parents. I was slightly disappointed to read that the report did not seek any consultation, or report any information from Homeschoolers. Saskatchewan does have an association, SHBE, Saskatchewan Home Based Educators, that possibly could have added some information to the report. From a Homeschooling perspective, I liked the first option of the Provincial Model. I would like to see the homeschool funding, reporting, access to programs, and information consistent for all homeschoolers across the province. I feel that a provincial model, with only one homeschooling department would simplify the paperwork for homeschoolers, and provide a level playing field. As it stands now each school division provides different (or no) funding for each homeschooler. Then each division also is slightly more or less difficult about reporting and accessing resources. It would be enjoyable as a parent for all homeschoolers in Saskatchewan to have one department with consistent information and ideas. Good Luck in your decision and thank you for taking the time to read my comments. Thanks,

Do not form one "super" division in education like you have done with Health. In education you are affecting every family that has children and having one large division will not address the needs of all the remote/rural areas of this great province. If you need to reduce the number of school divisions then get rid of the two or three small ones like Creighton and combine them with their neighbours. A second recommendation would be to combine the public AND separate school divisions. It is time to change the rules that were established years ago in this province and not have TWO different systems when one will still achieve the goals/outcomes of education in this province.

We do not agree on amalgamation of the school systems and want decisions made locally as they have been. Leave things as is please.

We do not want an amalgamation and are happy to leave things as they are please. Thank you.

I agree with a provincial appointed board, I believe this will save money and a appointed board will also make decisions based on what is best for the students. I agree with Mr. Morgan that this is to save money and still do what is best for the students, and teachers and also question whether a board of trustees should function like a policy board , made up of Representatives with special skill sets like accounting, finance, administration and education background, this should be an asset. Provincial appointed board is very capable of making the best decisions for the students.

We need to keep our Catholic schools distinct. We need to keep our school board locally elected. We need to keep our focus on student achievement and student success. We DO NOT want amalgamation. It will be very detrimental to our students, especially for our students with special needs.

The idea that community elected boards should be replaced by government appointed boards, is beyond ridiculous. The day that the Government begins replacing the need for taxpayers to contribute to education, is the day it will make sense to entrench policy design, implementation, oversight and advisory functions inside of the government. The absolute mess that "modern education" is in today is a direct function of the Department of (?) 'Education', pandering to educational fads and shiny objects, instead of using quantifiable standards of measurement to assess if tactics and methods are achieving educational goals. As a result, our students are already severely disadvantaged academically. Removing the direct channel to the community being served will only introduce yet another unaccountable level of apathetic bureaucracy that is concerned not with the end result, but instead with career opportunities and "positioning" within the immediate organization's social hierarchy. What we need, is active assessment using quantifiable testing, and reporting of performance back to the community representatives. The current lack of accountability, unwillingness to test using replicable methods, and refusal to use a 'pass / fail' system for advancement, is a symptom of the dysfunctional guidance being forced on the educational system from within its public sector management. And, replacing more of the public sector "oversight" with community positions is closer to what is needed, instead of more "make work" positions for government appointees. In summary, we need MORE elected positions within the Department of Education, not less, and certainly not 'more government workers'... that's what got us in this mess to start with!

It would sure support teachers and students to move towards one provincial school division. Our local board members have too many individual agendas. Our division needs more accountability so there aren't so many "have and have not" schools. The costs for one provincial board would be less as there would be endless efficiencies through the province. Our board doesn't represent the whole division - only their area (and some not even the whole area). Cut Superintendents. We have way too many. This isn't adding value to improve student learning. One central division would ensure consistency with administration people. Less costs for running the division would mean more costs go directly to students.

I believe that an amalgamation is a bad idea!

My family thinks that amalgamation would be a great idea for the province. Our children have friends and relatives across Sask and the consistency among schools would be beneficial for their learning. Right now, schools in different parts of Sask focus on such very different things - hard to believe they are in the same grade sometimes. The cost savings would be a huge benefit to our children. The money that could be saved on the high paying central office jobs that have zero impact on the daily lives of my children would be incredible. The money saved to be more efficient across the province in technology and transportation etc. would again mean more funds for our children. Fewer board members would be another asset. We pay so much money for board members to show up at Christmas concerts and photo ops. This is a huge waste of taxpayers' money. One school division is a great idea.

The sask party is trying to avoid being held accountable for very bad decisions. By appointing government officials there will be no opposition to what the government does. Classic Brad Wall tactic, eliminate any who oppose your thoughts. Stop "transformational change" you can't even explain it! Stop "lean" kaizen program...45M in cost and health region is \$35M in debt. Hmmm.

As a teacher I feel we need more than one provincial division and think there should be 6-8 school divisions in the province. As a catholic I also feel strongly that my children receive a faith-based education as well. I think we as a province could operate with the following: South Saskatchewan Public School Division - Davidson South Central Saskatchewan Public School Division - Davidson North to Prince Albert including Meadow Lake, Nipawin, etc. North Saskatchewan Public School Division - north of meadow lake, north of Prince Albert etc. South Saskatchewan Catholic School Division Central Saskatchewan Catholic School Division North Saskatchewan Catholic School Division (if there aren't enough schools up north then just create two Division for the Catholic School).

I'd like to have bus service for all student not only for the French speaking students. And I like to have kitchen or canteen for the kids in school to have fresh and good food at lunch.

Having locally elected boards of governance brings choice of representation, accountability for performance, and ability to influence change when needed to the community level. It is empowering the parents and it is functioning well. Please do not remove these from parents.

I think a move to a central school board is a bad one. School boards need to be maintained at the local level to ensure that officials, especially elected officials, are accessible to all and have the interests of the community in their best interest. This would be a bold move and a tad hypocritical I think, considering that both Education ministers are former Trustees and should understand the value of their former roles. Please keep the interests of the families that you serve at the forefront when making this decision. Local voices are important and this change could be likened to the removal of a local MLA, and just having random assignments for MLA's. I'll be speaking with my MLA as well.

I am opposed 100% to the Dan Perrins Report on education. In my opinion it's not transformational; it's administrative and bureaucratic. "Transformational" should speak to changed outcomes as related to improved delivery of educational services, producing better students. The Perrins report is entirely inadequate. It was not given the mandate to assess the entire education system as a 360 degree review. By the mandate of the Minister of Education, the report could not and did not assess the most significant player in Saskatchewan Education: the Ministry of Education. How can effective changes occur without a total review of the education system? How can a report produced in less than a month possibly have credibility? How can a public consultation system by invitation be regarded as transparent? I am personally offended by this Government process. In my view it is ethically challenged. I fear, ultimately, it will produce very negative outcomes for our students, communities, and Province. I call upon the Panel to recommend that School Division Governance remain the same, and that the Government fully fund education - rather than seeking financial cut-backs.

Regards,

I strongly support locally appointed board of educators in the Catholic School system and being a parent of 3 children who will soon attend school full time I Do Not Wish to see the schools integrate and see government appointed board educators! I wish to see things left exactly the way they have been for 35 years of my life the way they are today! If changes are made I may strongly consider home schooling my children a road I would rather not go down!

I've been going through the Educational Governance Review Report that was published to see the options considered as well as the perceived benefits and challenges. The areas of responsibilities that currently lie with the school boards can and probably should be looked at; such as procurement, payroll, determining out of scope salaries, benefits, contracted services, fleet services. Efficiencies should be realized with centralizing functions that are not key "educational" functions, with little to no impact on students, classrooms or schools. As existing agreement expire in these areas they can be renegotiated for the entire system; or a cost/benefit analysis should be completed to determine if beneficial to re-negotiate agreements for entire system in current year. Option 1 presents huge challenges, not only on the length of time to transition, but the potential compromise on the focus on student outcomes and reduced accountability and influence at the local level. If option 1 is implemented - what is even the purpose of the provincial school board, all decisions may as well come from the ministry of education as that is where basically all decisions will be made and driven from? I think it is big mistake to remove the influence at the local level to determine staffing levels/needs, programming and other student impacting decisions. Accountability with moving to this model definitely rests on the minister of education, with public seeking redress from their MLA and the government; even those these persons would be accountable, they are the farthest from knowing what is actually going on in our schools. The changes outlined on page 20 should be completed and rolled out to the existing school boards, with clear governance guidelines and reporting requirements defined. Once these changes have been fully implemented and reported on, it then makes sense to see the progress made against expectations. At that point only would the government be in a position to determine which options makes the most logical and beneficial sense. The governance issues identified here should have already been in place and highlight serious concerns with existing legislation, regulations and ministry policies.

An amalgamation of any sort is only going to cost gross amounts of money re-constructing a "new" type of school division. There is proof in other provinces that this DOES NOT work as well so why is it being considered? LEAVE the education system the way it is! Enough amalgamating! Saskatchewan isn't one "big city"! Every region has very different challenges and needs, and to expect one board to keep up with it is ridiculous!

I was on a local school board when Prince Albert Rural amalgamated with Prince Albert Public Schools. At the start, the people that supported it talked of all the money it would save. As amalgamation got closer, saving money was no longer mentioned even though the Provincial Government gave the School Divisions money when they amalgamated. Now the difference seems to be that the rural schools are the last to get improvements of any kind.

I feel this is so wrong. Why would I want my money going to another location, rather than leaving it where I live, benefiting my area. Taking out a main school division, how do I get answers if I need when I have to email or call and wait weeks? We're on the border, and this will be very unfortunate for Lloydminster school division!

I find it unfortunate that there is no consideration in the review of the elimination of the Separate school system. This is an important consideration for 2 reasons. First, given the complete geographic overlap between the separate and public schools such an amalgamation would likely achieve very large efficiencies with little impact on the provision of educational services. Second, as a immigrant from a province (BC) without a separate school system, I find it troubling that one faith group has preferential access to public tax funds to provide faith-based learning opportunities. I would encourage the government to fully and explicitly consider the costs and benefits of the elimination of the separate school system in this report.

This is my concern.

I do not see any representative on your Advisory Panel that is connected to Francophone Education, or French Immersion Education. I have seen young teachers go to in-services given by their school divisions that offer all the information for new programming in English and were asked to implement this in their class. Immersion teachers are asked to do in French. Please note they have to translate the information before implementing it. There is not extra money for Bilingual Teacher? So what do you get? Well, you get what you give. Great teacher will do the preparation and find the French Vocabulary that their students will need to work. Most teachers will use the vocabulary in English. But then who cares, the division can't afford the resources to give the in-service in French or it is not important because their teacher can just translate the information. I see this as a big problem. We sure can't brag about resources for in-services for the immersion programs in Sask. Teachers can't complain they want to keep their jobs and no one else gives a damn. This is what is going on right now in Sask. On the other hand, the Conseil Scolaire Fransaskois gives the information in French but of course, it costs money and they are constantly asking the government for more money. Now that the government has cut the Francophone Sector in the Department of Ed., they have even fewer resources (Having worked for both I can definitely tell you there is a difference between a Francophone Education and a French Immersion Education). So what does the Conseil Scolaire do!!!! They ask for more money. The government agencies do not understand their concerns. But you can't understand what you don't know. Does this new panel truly understand what is going on? I don't think so because there is no one on your panel who has a great concern for French Education. My daughter is looking for a school for her son and is thinking of a Francophone Education. The only elementary school for Francophone Education in Saskatoon is "L'école Canadienne Française" It is an old school, that needs repairs and is bursting at the seams. I was in the gym at Christmas and I was embarrassed. I have worked for the Francophone School Division and wonder why we don't have another school in Saskatoon, or in Regina. Cost yep cost. There is also no land subdivided for Francophone School so they get the old schools and redo them. If you were a parent how impressed would you be to send your child to an old school that is bursting at the seams. NOT IMPRESSED! How can the Conseil Scolaire compete with other schools in the city? How much money will the government truly save? Will the one school Board be able to honestly represent all the schools in Sask. ??? We have Rural Municipalities Boards in the Province of Sask that have a difficulty finding members to fill all the seats. Maybe it is time to amalgamate this to save some money.

I agree that there needs to be improvement in our public school system in this province. After reading the report, I am more confused than ever. I believe that for the most part, parents will not even begin to read this report as it is far too long and contains many numbers from other provinces, school boards in those provinces, etc. that a great deal of us will not even begin to understand. This needs to be presented to parents and others in the community in a way that we can understand and take part in decision-making for our school divisions. This report was not written with a parent's view in mind. It is for those already involved in the school divisions (administration, teachers, board members, etc.) and government officials. I encourage you to make this easier for all the people of our province to be involved. Sending a "report" to parents via email does not promote inclusiveness or transparency for parents. I believe passing along information that is this important to our children's education, needs to be presented more clearly. I also believe that posting these comments publicly will deter people from actually voicing their opinions and getting involved in this whole process.

I think that examining the way we deliver public services is a worthwhile exercise to undertake now and again. Ensuring that services, in this instance Education, are being delivered efficiently and effectively is an excellent objective. The idea of replacing locally elected school boards, however, is alarming. A locally elected school board is accountable to the electorate and understands the needs of the district on a personal level. An appointed board would essentially be a government panel, subject to the whims of the politics of the day. Our children deserve to be put above the interests of any particular political party's agenda. For our children's sake I sincerely hope that locally elected boards of education remain firmly in place. Furthermore, I would like to see a broadening of the democratic process involved in selecting these boards. Currently, a non-Catholic cannot run or vote for school board representatives in that system. I understand, even agree with, the logic of restricting representatives to practicing Catholics. I do, however, disagree with the practice of restricting a parent's ability to vote for the representatives that will be responsible for shaping the school system in which their child attends. I would like to see this process opened up so that you are permitted to vote for the representative of whichever school division your child attends.

I am not in support of an amalgamation. Lloydminster is a very unique city as we are a border city and receive funding from both provinces for our students. I do not want to lose our local board or division employees. I can't imagine having to call someone from Saskatoon or North Battleford when I have an issue in my child's school.

After skimming through Mr. Perrin's report, I noted that the stakeholders who contacted him as he was preparing this report, unanimously supported the continuation of elected school boards and did not want to have additional amalgamation of school boards in Saskatchewan. School boards were (relatively) recently amalgamated. When one compares the number of boards across Canada, Saskatchewan (for size of geographic area and size of student population) actually has a small number of school boards. Although I did notice that one public school board includes only one school and another has only two schools. The stated purpose for the report by Mr. Perrin's was to determine what system of governance and administration is needed in our province's K-12 education sector to achieve the desired educational outcomes. There is no mention there of saving money. To my way of thinking, that is the underlying reason for amalgamating school boards. From what I can understand from the comments of school board members in the media, they have already taken steps to decrease expenditures while still moving towards success in educational outcomes. So why are we still considering amalgamation? I am opposed to school board amalgamation. Please give Saskatchewan people choice and voice and do not impose decisions from above.

Keep our local school boards. Rural Saskatchewan is currently struggling, a poor harvest, low oil prices. Is this the last nail in our coffin? Please restore hope in our rural town, by allowing us to have a voice. Without a voice, our numbers are overlooked. Rural Saskatchewan has developed strong people, we have many government members who come from rural Saskatchewan. Please realize that it is important that you have members on school boards that can advocate for us. Without the voice the flame will flicker and die. Is it not more cost efficient in good quality education, then to deal with the aftermath of students who have left the school system, due to distance of travel, or unreasonable expectations of students to travel to larger centers. Please listen to our voice and keep our (boards?) so it can be heard

I don't agree at all with having a provincial school board. It takes away from the individualism of each school division. To have a provincial board will cause havoc. If I want answers to a problem in my school I want to deal with people from my own community, not someone sitting in Saskatoon or Regina. This is a ridiculous idea.

I think changing larger centres especially is a bad idea. I don't want someone hundreds of miles away making decisions on the education of my children. Smaller rural divisions could be amalgamated, but they shouldn't have someone far away making decisions for them either. School divisions should be local! We have a fantastic school division in Lloydminster and I'd like it to stay that way.

Are You Serious?? Have you really considered what this could look like in a province the size of ours? Please explain to me how a parent in a more remote part of Saskatchewan will get a school related problem solved when he/she could possibly be talking to someone hundreds of kilometres away. The option to meet and discuss the matter will most likely be impossible given the distance between said parent/school and board administrator. What are the reasons for considering something other than what we currently have? Why was the advisory panel announcement quietly made on December 21? (in case you are not aware...most schools are closed for an extended period of time over the Christmas break and are in some locations in Saskatchewan just getting back in full swing this week). Why is the time frame to bring together public opinion so hurried? We only have until January 23 to make our opinions public...it seems rather dishonest and extremely conniving on behalf of the Deputy Premier and Education Minister to expect that a decision this big can be made with so little time for review and public opinion. It's my prayer that you will seriously consider the consequences of the proposed options on the students of today and those of the future of our province and ultimately of our country....education is where we need to spend more money, more time, and more energy.....not less!!!! I am proud to have been born and raised in Saskatchewan. It is where I live and I would like to continue to call it a province that is led by a group of wise leaders!!! Step up you guys!!!

It is unacceptable for Government appointees to replace locally elected school boards and it is especially unacceptable for a Government appointee or a non-Catholic person to have their hands meddling in Catholic education. This will be fought tooth and nail and rally the people of Saskatchewan in ways you surely don't want. It took me a long time to move from NDP, most of my voting years in fact, but that will never happen again. I will not stay loyal to a party that crosses the line.

We have made many cuts already and the system is working the way it is!! Education is NOT where the cuts need to be! the province needs to rethink this and when NOBODY in the system approves this, then it needs to be abolished! We as parents need to know someone locally is going to help us deal with my child's education who knows my child! These are children not just a number in an area that's gonna get visited once in a while! If it's not broken, don't fix it!

Please follow the health district and create one province wide school board saving millions and millions. Allow the small decisions to be made at the local level and use cost savings to provide more buses for our kids. 1 hour bus trip should be the max!!!!

This makes no sense. How does the money we all spend stay in our community? How can our community ensure that our kids are getting enriched programs if it's one big school division with no lines? How quick of a response will I be able to get if an office is in Regina, and my child has a problem in school? How much money will we exactly save? Bad idea, seems more bureaucratic than in interest of our future! I Motion to stop this immediately.

To whom it may concern, I strongly feel that amalgamations (if any) should be minimal. The main stated reason for amalgamating school divisions is to save money, yet past amalgamations here and in other provinces have shown that that cost savings are minimal. Upper level administration would be faced with heavier workloads, requiring higher salaries, while administration would lose touch with the teachers and staff in the schools. If any cost savings are to be achieved, I fear it would come at the price of hundreds of layoffs. Many of which would affect good young teachers and educational assistants. As having previously been employed in a larger school division, I can attest to the fact that smaller school divisions are better for teachers and students alike. In a small school division administrators know the teachers; they know their strengths and their passions, and can ensure that the teachers are being used effectively. Teachers feel comfortable approaching upper administration with requests, complaints or feedback about division policy. In my experiences in a larger school division, sometimes policies are put into place that make little to no sense in the schools and classrooms, but because the administration has little connection with the teachers, things stay the same for far too long. I have seen tech policies that block content to the point of students not being able to research breast cancer for a health presentation, how does this benefit our learners? Amalgamation would result in large poorly functioning divisions where policies like this can thrive. Of greater concern is the risk to rural schools. Even in my small school division the voice of the rural student can sometimes get lost. Large, centralized school divisions would focus primarily on Urban students who have wholly different needs. And if, as the government suggests, we lose our local school boards, we would not only enter into a state of taxation without representation, but what little voice our rural schools have would be silenced. How are we to improve graduation rates among First Nations students in rural Saskatchewan if all decisions being made are being made for students in our cities? Furthermore, making decisions that affect the whole province solely on the basis of budget is irresponsible. If we are to have a strong future in Saskatchewan, we need to invest in our future by investing in Education. Put money towards areas that research has shown have a strong impact on learning and achievement (such as RTI with adequately funded support personnel) and not towards "fundamental change" that will change the structure of things but do nothing to increase learning. We do need transformational change, but not through amalgamations. We need teachers to be trusted and respected, not just by students and parents, but by administration and government. We dedicate our lives to our students, trying to make their learning experience memorable, joyous and valuable. Please don't make our jobs even harder by taking away our voices.

With Lloydminster being a unique situation due to it's dual provincial status, how can we ensure our funding for our students stays in our community? How are larger school divisions going to BENEFIT our students, who are currently experiencing large classroom numbers and limited resources? Please remember that our students are our future, these changes need to address the current learning conditions and challenges that students, staff, and administrators are experiencing today, not add more stress. Education is important, changes need to be made to improve our current learning conditions and I'm having difficulty visualizing how larger divisions will accomplish this. Please do not rush into decisions regarding our precious youth without understanding how valuable our teachers, staff and administrators currently are and how they are already stretched thin trying to do the work expected of them, with our students often paying the price...

I do not feel that by making the school divisions larger it will be of benefit to our students. We need a local voice through our local elected board members. Our school divisions need to know what is important to our students at local level. We need decisions to be made that will benefit our local, rural community, not made in urban offices without thought of small town Saskatchewan. We already have a very large school division that from north to south spans approximately 400 kilometers. I cannot imagine trying to take into account 1/4 of the province when decisions are made. I am afraid we will lose our rural roots, our rural input, and our rural voice.

Hello, I am very concerned that such major changes may be taking place in my children's (4) education without any real information as to how this would benefit or increase learning potential whatsoever. Instead it seems to be a focus solely on money. Especially in Lloydminster where we have a unique situation, regarding funding, we need to be able to be better informed as to decisions we are making in our children's education. Money is not the end goal in raising or children, creating well educated, kind, compassionate adults is, that is what will help our province. Stop focusing on cutting corners in areas that are vital!!! Provide time for parents to get informed and make real decisions by giving real input without the time crunch!!!

I find it very hard to understand how it is that our elected government is prepared to destroy our education system. Our system as it stands currently struggles to properly meet the needs of all our individual students and their needs. How can anyone in good conscience decide that large divisions or one all-encompassing board can properly meet the needs of our schools and children's education. How have we come to a point when education which is our province's and country's future not come first. The almighty dollar and bottom line comes ahead. If we destroy our education please explain to me how we can expect our children to learn and grow into well-educated trained adults that will continue to help our province to survive and thrive. Shame on you and your stupid budget. It really angers me to watch a government destroy my children's future.

I am very against amalgamation when there are already a low number of school boards in this province compared to other similar sized population and province. Amalgamation has so many expensive costs, from payroll staff and software changes, capital losses in one place and purchase of new capital in another place, contract reviews, and the waste of staff hours on creating something new. Instead of focusing on the EDUCATION of STUDENTS and delivering specialty services to better the students. I can see the need to perhaps review the current school boards (like mentioned on page 20) to review the number of board members, number of meetings and to align the goals and expectations of the province too. Work with the structure that is already set up, don't demo and start over. This isn't Las Vegas. There are so many things that school boards are currently doing right and well, why not expand on that? Our locally elected board members each know their area's needs and can better serve the students in their areas because of that. Each board member brings a different perspective to create a group that can provide unique solutions to meet the education goals and initiatives set up by the province and the board. Of all of the options, Option 3B will cost the province less, will keep the MLA's in good standing with their constituents and will maintain the great foundation that the current School Boards already supply which will get the Education Goals met much quicker (because there will be little disruption and the focus on Education Goals can be almost instant, without the years of chaos that an amalgamation would ensue). Plus if you are worried about money, why not increase the mill rate slightly, perhaps you reduced it too much?

Please, please do not do anything to change the administration of the LPSD in our completely unique border city. I was a board member of LPSD for several years, we continually had to fight to get a satisfactory working arrangement for our division to be sure that our AB and SK students were treated equally and that adequate funding from both provinces would be available. Those who followed me finally got a fair and satisfactory intergovernmental agreement for our bi-provincial division. Please do not do anything to jeopardize this agreement that took so long to work out. Remember the old adage, "If it works, don't fix it."

Saskatchewan has one of the best public school systems in North America and has had for generations of students. It is wrong to try to fix something that is not broken. Our future, the children's education in this province, will be in jeopardy if this goes forward. There has been absolutely not enough dialogue with the people of this province or enough time given to gather information. Something this important must be given a second sober thought, and the people of this province must be given a chance to thoroughly review the consequences of this intention. I have been a supporter of the current government, but this angers me and I question their intentions. Do not sacrifice the great education system of Saskatchewan in hopes of saving money today. It is NOT worth the risk.

As a parent, I wish to have the locally elected boards of education remain. This is why I send my children to the Catholic Schools. I do not see how having the government appointed boards would support our Catholic faith schools? We already have public schools as an option for parents to send their children.

I have been a board member for over 10 years. I strongly feel I give voice to my community, my neighbours, and the students I represent. I feel responsible to the stakeholders and to government to do what is in the best interests of the students in a responsible way. I have taken the governance training to better my abilities to perform the tasks as a board member and best serve the students and taxpayers of sk. Please value us as elected members. Please value and respect the already amalgamated sizes of the boards in this province. Any further amalgamations will set back the work we have done as a province to improve outcomes. I will continue to strive to be more efficient, to be knowledgeable, and to support this govt the ESSP and the students of Saskatchewan.

I am totally and utterly angry that these kinds of changes are underway to be made so swiftly and basically behind our (taxpayers) residents backs!! The changes - going regional, etc. to save money is an awful idea! Our educational system we have worked so hard for and is functioning beautifully will most definitely be destroyed!!!! I cannot believe that anybody thinks this plan is OK and that it will be forced upon our community like this!! I am shocked!! Whoever dreamt this up to begin with and then whomever let it go this far alongside them blindly? Know this it would be a grossly negligent step backwards for our children's education!! Shame on you guys!!

Hello, I know you will be receiving a vast amount of emails and that I am just one voice. But I have a very big voice when it comes to my child's education. You see I moved from Alberta to come back to Fox Valley, Saskatchewan only a few years ago. We decided that our two children would not only be able to live the "farming good life" but also grow up in a smaller community where everyone literally knows your name. The schooling here is just that. It's not a school where they clock in from 9-3 everyday go home and you don't hear anything regarding their education other than the quarterly interviews or sheets sent home in their backpacks that are crumpled. These small town schools are packed full of teachers who raise your children like their own. They keep you informed daily on their progress, they come up to you on the sidewalk or in church to see how the kids are doing today and tell you what they have been working on. Now you see I have friends in the bigger schools where their school is bottom of the totem pole even for their larger centre and their children are lost in the sea of the district. Their school does not get heard because by the time they go to the head office down to their itty bitty school to get 2 more textbooks the year has either been completed or it's lost in translation. And who suffers? The children of course! As an active member in our school not only as a parent but a member of the SCC we have already heard of this happening NOW in our school, children are sharing text books because our voice gets lost to the "bigger " schools. Well you know what I will not let that happen anymore. Students should not have to let their education fail them because of people like you who think the divisions will increase their money if they amalgamate. You know where that money will go? To the bigger centres not to us not to our children who deserve to get the same and best education just like a bigger city school. Just because we are from a small town doesn't mean our education should fail us and we should be forgotten. Shame on you for taking their community school away from them! To make them sit on a bus for over an hour round trip just so YOU can save your precious money that our RM actually gives you (3 Million) for it to run and yet our school Does not see any of that so what do you think will happen when we amalgamate? Not only will you taking away a community education you will also be killing our town if you amalgamate. But why would you care, right? I bet you don't have children or if you do they are in the bigger school centres and this will not even affect you...

I support the present number of school divisions and I DO NOT WANT TO LOSE our grassroots voice - our elected school trustees! We are a homeschooling family and would ask that SHBE (Saskatchewan Home Based Educators) be counted as a stakeholder in these discussions, to make sure students who are being educated at home have a say in how the Ministry makes its decisions. We would hope that the province would appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students, and we ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators. Home educated students are often overlooked for both services and funding so our hope is that we would be included in these discussions to minimize exclusion of these students. Thank you.

To Whom It May Concern: Education belongs in the hands of our LOCAL education boards. I am NOT in support of these changes. It is my hope you see that this is not in the best interest of the children, and many parents are upset and gathering to stop this. Please show you care as much as us.

To Whom it May Concern: Let's not amalgamate our school divisions any further than what has already been done! We already live in school divisions that are too large. Finding the 'right' person in the 'right' department at a school division office to even get an answer from has become impossible as it is. This is what going 'bigger' does – eliminates the opportunity and the incentive to be a part of the education system. The minute the government did away with local school boards and took away any voice that could have been given to school community councils, we saw a direct loss of interest in our local school by our community members. When/if you take away the grassroots voice in favour of government-appointed board members, what is the end result? It is the continued loss of the voice of those who care very deeply for their community and in particular for the students and schools in those communities. I implore you to maintain the school division system and elected trustee system that we have now. Allow us to have, at the very least, a voice via our area trustee. I cannot believe this government would even consider taking away the voice of the grassroots people. What ever happened to the idea of parents, communities and governments working together for the good of our children? What makes you consider removing two integral groups from that partnership and leaving just the government in the equation? I am shocked, appalled and saddened to think that these options are being considered. Sincerely,

There is no reason to get rid of the public boards that ensure that the parents and the communities needs are being met and heard for our school divisions. This would be an educational monopoly which isn't legal in business and should be in no way legal here. Do not remove the voice of parents. Do not do away with elected boards. This will only be a detriment to our already failing systems. Saskatchewan is so far behind everything other province for educational standards. Don't further impede our children's ability to learn and get rid of the elected boards.

I have been employed by the School Division (first Moosomin School Division) through one amalgamation (South East Cornerstone) and it was a slow, frustrating process. The division used to be small and the superintendents used to be "in the know" as to what was going on at each school. Since amalgamation, the division office is 2 hours away (I've seen it once in 10+ years) and the superintendents are not readily available (see them about once a month maybe). I do agree that Saskatchewan needs to have their data the same across the board (we should all be using one database for student records etc.); however, I'm not convinced that amalgamation is the answer. After the first amalgamation, our students became numbers in a student to teacher ratio. With another amalgamation, this will only become worse. The larger the division, the more it is ran like a business and not focusing on individual student needs. I see "consultants" and other division employees all the time visiting our school and being paid for transportation plus a wage when a lot of the time they sit on their laptop not communicating with the people they supposedly came to see. We need more teaching staff and less consultants telling the teachers what they should be doing. Teachers don't have time to implement all of the things the consultants from behind their laptops are telling them to do. Our education in Saskatchewan needs to be standardized across the board and where our students are compared to the rest of Canada, only proves that what we are currently doing is not working. Enough with the 50,000 outcomes on each report card that teachers are supposed to plan for and meet. And enough with the schools constantly buying ever changing support materials with their miniscule budgets. If the province of Saskatchewan wants to do something across the board, start with supplying the recommended learning materials that their curriculum demands and create an even playing field for all students. Stop stretching the teaching staff so thin and continuing to push out more and more demands. Our children are not held accountable anymore with the refusing to fail anyone and the fact we have students at a grade one level but being in grade 5 and receiving next to no support. It's time for some major changes in Saskatchewan's Education System but I'm not sure amalgamation is the answer.

Dear Minister Morgan, I am a parent of four young children ranging in age from 5 years old to 10.

I understand you and your advisory panel are working to provide the best education environment for our families, teachers and schools. Thank-you for making this a priority. However, I struggle to see how further amalgamating school divisions and eliminating locally elected school boards will help to achieve this outcome. There is no doubt in my mind that bigger is not always better and sometimes things do not need to change. I know the parents that are on the school community council and trust that they have the children's best interest in mind when making decisions for our school. Also, my mom was an active school board and division board member while my siblings and I were in school. There is no better advocate for our children than their own parents and community members who have a stake in the education and future of our schools. As far as amalgamation goes, I have yet to see an amalgamation that makes an organization more personal and caring towards the members involved, rather I believe quite the opposite. Education, I believe needs to stay in the hands of those who will put the most heart, work and accountability into it.

I feel great concern over the proposed elimination of elected boards of education. Allowing government to appoint school boards would not serve the community. Members of each community deserve to have a voice. Governments need to be accountable to their communities and in touch with the specific needs of each community. Amalgamating school divisions and eliminating elected boards of education means taking the voice away from the parents of the students. If we don't like the way our children are being educated, we have the opportunity to nominate a candidate, run ourselves or support a candidate whose philosophy of Catholic education we support. If you take that voice away from parents we no longer have the opportunity to play a role in how our child is educated. The seriousness of this disempowerment of parents and all community members cannot be minimized. My husband and I would actively fight this "transformational change" as it has been called. We will not sit back and watch our education system lose accountability to its community members. If in the future we find that our Catholic schools cannot offer the education and faith formation that our children need, we fully intend to educate them ourselves in the home. While I firmly believe that the best place for my children to be educated is in a good Catholic school, I will not allow them to be educated in a school system that does not take great care to consult the actual parents and community members. I sincerely hope that the many other parents that I know will also take the time to write of their concern. I am currently a board member of a large Catholic parents group here in Saskatoon involving over 60 mothers (with an average of over 3 children each, many who already homeschool) and this new initiative has already caused great alarm. If you want children with concerned, involved parents to attend your schools, then they will have to be allowed to participate in their child's education. Thank you.

Our school division has demonstrated significant savings and efficiencies by using the model outlined by the government. This is a great example of a school division working at its optimal size. My family and I support the current model. Further amalgamations at any level of government will only address the immediate debt situation and not the long-term needs of students in Saskatchewan. These students are our future leaders of this province.

As Chair of our school's SCC for the last three years, I have been involved with the school beyond solely being a concerned parent. I have been impressed with the strides and accomplishments _____ has had within their district and believe amalgamation and appointing trustees will derail their progress. _____ Division underwent major restructuring just ten years ago. As a result of that major change we have less elected local voice for our communities. Any further change in local voice or our school division boundaries would not be in the best interests of our children and our communities. Time focused on addressing changes would be time taken away from focusing on students. We need to keep our school boards locally elected to keep the voice of the people heard. We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. We do not support further amalgamations. We do not support changes to our subdivision boundaries. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community. Education belongs to community and I support _____ School Division and Saskatchewan's school boards as they have been operating currently.

Sincerely, _____
School Community Council

I am against the idea of government appointed school boards! We elect our boards based on what they can do to make sure our kids get the best education/opportunities possible! If we have problems, there's a local board to turn to, that is familiar with how this are run here! Very disappointed to hear this coming from a government I have supported from day 1...our kids are our future! I can't support a government that doesn't put our future 1st and our kids and are our future!
Signed A Very disappointed parent & resident of Saskatchewan,

I am concerned how these decisions will affect the Lloydminster area. I believe that it will not improve the quality of education in this area.

Will this benefit the quality of education for the Lloydminster area? How does this affect the students? This is not a good route for Lloydminster. Please evaluate your decisions.

I believe that we need to keep our school boards locally elected and we need to keep decisions closer to our communities. I think that students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community. Sincerely,

We at Prairie Valley School have undergone many changes over the last ten years, such as closing schools and amalgamating them to save money. We seemed to have finally obtained some normality and consistency. My children attend Vibank School and I feel very strongly that our local boards serve a very important part in the system. If we do not have a local board which is made up of parents and local people who actually have an interest in our school and children, we will have lost our right to have an opinion or say in what happens at our schools. Vibank school has undergone teacher cuts consistently for the last few years with having to combine classes as early as Grade 1 and 2 splits. Studies have proven this is too young of an age to have grades split and does not provide the amount of teaching required for such vital age of learning. Our children have the right to the best education possible and the continued cuts to staff are not allowing our teachers to do the best they can as they are UNDERSTAFFED. We have put up with enough and by taking away our local voice you will just be making a very bad decision for our schools. **KEEP OUR LOCAL BOARDS AS THEY SERVE A VERY IMPORTANT ROLE.**

To whom it may concern: I just learned that all of the school boards will be amalgamated! This is RIDICULOUS!!!!!! I was born and raised in/near _____ I went to public school in the city from K-12 and worked as an Educational Assistant in the _____ Public School Division for over 10 years! We moved to _____ for a few years and the school there was TERRIBLE! I ended up pulling my kids from school and started homeschooling them. We are in the process of moving back to _____ ut if this amalgamation happens there is NO WAY I will even consider putting my kids in the public schools. I have been home with my kids for 6.5 years so I don't know how _____ education has changed since I went on my last maternity leave but I do know how community minded this city is and how the school staff, parents, and the board work together for the best of the students. We would have board members visit our school on a weekly basis, they would often join us in the staff room at recess and build relationships with us. It would make communication much easier and more effective so any issues we had could be resolved as soon as possible. If all of the school divisions are amalgamated will we still have board members visiting schools on a regular basis? Will there be that sense of community and relationship? Will the board be able to make the best decisions possible for an individual student that they have never met in a city they know nothing about? Much more consideration needs to be put into this decision.

What will this mean for homeschooling families? Our school divisions are already very busy with their students in the public school, so for those students who learn from home, but still need or want some support or services, how will these students receive what they need with a much bigger division to work with?

First off, I'd like to know why? Why change something that has worked for how many years? To cut costs? Was your education neglected to cut costs? Were you deprived of learning with the courses offered just to better a province? How is this bettering anything? You're ripping out our futures education to save money. I get it - schooling costs a lot, but where are we going to be if we do this to our children and future generations? School is already detrimental to a lot of children, between being bullied (which is zero policy, my butt, I've seen the bullies themselves never be punished while the victim is punished cause they finally stood up for themselves cause the schools have done nothing but brushed it off.) Children are being labeled and having this tossed into their faces, some are slower learners than others so they are already struggling in school, why as the government would you make it worse? Why as a government are you trying to destroy our future in this province? Please explain to me how this is going to better our children in any ways. Or is this all just cause people are so incredibly lazy and feel like they are entitled to more pay and this is your way of doing it? Let's think about this for a moment, you change everything to better accommodate you, but now our children graduate they want to go to university or college. How far behind are they in comparison to every other province? How many more won't make it through the first semester of their courses? How do you think they accommodate (?) going to feel? Are they going to turn into our now government, self-entitled brats, cause they think the world ripped away what they should have had as children? Now here's my next question and probably the one that you may get but you also probably won't cause you're too busy thinking about your pay cheque. How do you sleep at night? How do you sleep knowing that you're hurting this generation of kids and the following generations? How much more work do you really want to overwhelm yourself with cause you want to cut costs? How many people are going to be unemployed because of your greedy actions? Are you yourself looking at the bigger picture or the right-now picture? This is the only time I've ever been ashamed to say I'm from Saskatchewan, I've always held my head high knowing that my children are learning something to get somewhere in life, that as a Saskatchewan resident we know what is more important and that ripping things away from those who are going to be running things in the future will understand hard work and not greed. However, right now I'm hanging my head being ashamed that such a strong province is willing to break down a crucial part of us.

TO whom it may concern: Good morning, Sir/Mm. (1) After reviewing the three options outlined in the report, I cannot see how any of them will benefit education for students in the unique and complex bi-provincial nature of Lloydminster. As a citizen of Lloydminster and Alberta resident, I have grave concerns that my tax dollars supporting education, will not be used to exclusively to support the children in the City of Lloydminster and the Lloydminster Public School Division. Under the current structure of locally elected boards, our trustees are able to provide the necessary resources to "determine program and service levels to respond to community needs and interests" for the students of Lloydminster. (2) The Lloydminster Charter clearly establishes a funding structure that has served the educational sector very well for the past 84 years. Within this formal structure, students are funded based on their province of residency and each Board of Education then harmonizes that funding to provide a seamless service to students of Lloydminster Public and Catholic school division. The restrictions within the charter that ensure Alberta funding remains within the City of Lloydminster would make it difficult, if not impossible to provide equitable service across an expanded division that would not be bound by a seamless delivery philosophy. (3) Equity for all Lloydminster students is a challenge that arises from differential funding by the two provinces. The equity principle has always been important to the residents of Lloydminster, indeed, so important that the City established a municipal levy (imbedded in the Lloydminster Charter) to ensure equity of opportunity and seamless delivery of services to students across the City. This allows the school division to ensure services such as Pre-Kindergarten, Drivers Education and Transportation are delivered equitably regardless of province of residence or school attended within the City of Lloydminster. (4) It is my belief that the five challenges identified on pages 20 and 21 of the Educational Governance Review Report can all be met effectively through amendments to legislation, regulations and policy. It would be considerably less disruptive to continue with elected boards working under new mandates, regulations and expectations. Respectfully,

Well to make this school better, get a better principal that knows what he/she is doing and interacting with parents more. Also, some teachers should not be teaching anymore. Some of them don't care about the students and are just there for the pay cheque. And there are a lot of other things that need to change in this school - if it doesn't change this school will be closed within 2 yrs. I know a lot of kids that want to leave this school because teachers don't care and don't take the time for the students.

I feel that it would be a grave error to amalgamate school divisions and eliminate elected boards of education by replacing them with government appointed boards. The elected boards ensure excellence in education along with serving the needs of the students uniquely in each division.

The change to having government manage and implement our children's education instills in me a sense of George Orwell's 1982. A province of the superstate in a world of perpetual war, omnipresent government surveillance, and public manipulation, dictated by a political system euphemistically named English Socialism under the control of a privileged elite of the Inner Party, that persecutes individualism and independent thinking as "thoughtcrime." A resounding NO!!! I do not want to see public liberties be undermined by a government department that is understaffed and totally indifferent and ill-informed about my community.

This is a bad idea to take the blanket approach to schooling in Canada as far as the school boards. Every regions school board is working to best serve their own region because they are there every day and understand first of all the people, their needs, and how to best achieve those needs from an educational standpoint. Consolidating Saskatchewan's 28 school boards will create even more holes when addressing issues like students with exceptionalities, the importance of rebuilding FNMI relationships and creating funding for better learning opportunities in rural areas, and the lack of teachers and teacher assistants in the classroom. We are gambling too much in a world where education is becoming less and less valued, where in fact we need to allocate more funding than ever. Leave the regional school boards intact otherwise we will see drops in academic achievement across the country, as this is already a trend happening in North America. We cannot afford to play around with issues like this.

Locally elected School Boards matter. Trustees live and work in the communities they serve; and are the voice of parents and stakeholders for the education and learning opportunities for their children. School boards should not be removed from the communities they represent. Appointed Board members are an extension of the government that is at arms-length to serving the local needs of the education of our children. With appointed boards, the local voice is lost in bureaucracy. Locally elected or acclaimed Trustees represent the voice of parents for the education of their children in the communities they serve. Changing governance or creating amalgamations are not the answer to addressing financial challenges. Amalgamations are disruptive, time-consuming and have no research base for being financially efficient. School Divisions are successfully working to find efficiencies that do not hinder the education and outcomes of our children. We need to keep the focus on the education of our children and the things that matter to students and parents. Locally elected or acclaimed Trustees make that happen.

When school divisions hire more central office staff right after provincial budget announcements , then the CEO proceeds to cut EAs - there needs to be more accountability in a division. We believe our students would be better served if we had fewer divisions in Saskatchewan. We need fewer fat salaries and more student support.

Honestly I think things should be left alone the way it is. Why screw with something that is already in place and waste some more tax dollars that is unnecessary. A locally elected board is way more in tune with what is happening in their area than a provincial one. What happens in the cities is totally different than what goes on in a small town. As a school in a small community, I feel locally elected officials give a better voice than when you lump them together with everyone else. I hope you reconsider this proposal and leave the locally elected members. Thank you,

A request to provide feedback on this topic is welcomed, but I must admit to concern that whatever comments are provided they will have little impact on a government determined to introduce changes to major organizational governance structures in our province. I cherish the role of community members in helping school teachers, administrators and trustees understand the uniqueness of their area. Over my long career I was fortunate to work with parents, trustees, colleagues, departmental officials and thousands of students. I recall on several occasions hearing from a community person insights that were helpful in our organization of the schools and the divisions where I worked. It was an "our" kind of feeling, not a "you" and "they". Establishing one master board of education makes no sense to me. I implore the people who will make this decision to listen to what the community members are saying.

Enough amalgamations already. Bigger is not better, nor does it ever save money. Changes need to be made but not at the expense of our children. Education and Healthcare is NOT where changes need to be made!

In the bi-provincial city of Lloydminster, a greater number of our students reside on the Alberta side of the city, yet we are a Saskatchewan school division. A move to one provincial school board would leave Lloydminsterites on the Alberta side of our city without a say or any recourse for action due to their inability to vote in the Saskatchewan provincial election or for local school board representatives within the city. An amalgamation could potentially lead to an inequity of funding for our students given the money that is provided to us by the Alberta provincial government. The Lloydminster charter (provincial legislation approved by both Alberta and Saskatchewan) has protected our unique situation as a bi-provincial community for over eighty years, and it is essential that both provincial governments recognize our unique situation and work with us to ensure that our community remains seamless regardless of which side of the border we reside.

I think they should keep the school boards the way they are and not try to make the schools one big division. The needs of kids in the city and out in the rural areas can be very different. Also it is nice to have the residents vote people on the school boards because those people know more about the needs of the students in their own communities than a bunch of random people appointed by the government. Education for our children is so important and I don't want that messed up because of some agenda people are trying to fill. Our kids are the future and good education matters.

After reading the governance review and attending a meeting with my local Lloydminster Public School Division, I have to express my deep concerns regarding these proposed changes. Firstly Lloydminster is a special circumstance in which the division receives funding from both the Alberta and Saskatchewan government. Most of which coming from Alberta. How would these changes assure Lloydminster residents, and Lloydminster residents ONLY, are using this funding? I have absolutely no faith that the "one board fits all" will responsibly allocate this funding directly to the tax payers in Lloydminster that it is intended for but instead will funnel it into a collective whole. Secondly my tax dollars go to support this community, schools and students not the general population of Saskatchewan. Third, how can one board speak for all the individual communities with their unique needs? One board will not understand the special circumstances or desires of a community and therefore will not represent or benefit the children in our schools. Finally I truly feel taking away my ability to vote for my school board should be a violation of my constitutional right to vote. This right is protected within the Catholic system and makes absolutely no sense that it is not included in the public system. Religion should have absolutely no bearing on this right and I feel the Saskatchewan government is taking advantage of this loop-hole to appoint members of their choosing who will only serve to meet the wants of the government NOT the people. Schools are not the same as health care. These are not viable options and will negatively impact every student, which is supposed to be the focus of education. Thank-you.

I don't feel an elimination of elected school boards is something that is necessary. How would government appointed boards know what our school systems and our children need? I believe someone local who is elected by the members of the community is better to serve the needs of the students.

I was recently told that Don Morgan has stated that there may be an amalgamation of school divisions. I strongly oppose this move by the government. Locally elected boards are in place to be accountable to the electorate they serve and help hold the provincial government to account. Each school division is unique and locally elected boards serve the needs of the students. Education truly belongs to the community...please don't take that away from us!!! Sincerely,

I believe it is important to keep Locally elected boards. They are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government accountable. They are important advocates for ensuring excellence in education. Under the current structure of locally elected boards, LPSD's trustees are able to provide the necessary resources to determine program and service levels to respond to community needs and interests for the students of Lloydminster. It is concerning with Lloydminster being a bi-provincial city that Alberta funding will not stay within the city. Every community has their own unique characteristics; it would be a shame for them to lose their local voice.

The trustees of the school divisions should be elected by the people and not appointed by the government. This will make the trustees accountable to the public that elected them and not to the government of the day that had appointed them. By having the trustees elected it leaves the door open to anyone who wishes to let their name stand for election. It also gives the public a sense of involvement in the education system and in which direction it is headed. If you are satisfied with the direction of the education system, you just keep tabs on it. If you are not happy, then you can voice your opinion to the elected trustee, vote for someone else or let your name stand for the elected position. People need to have a more hands on approach to the education of the children, be more involved and not less involved. These children and young people are our future and it is in our best interest is to have them educated to the fullest and by the best possible means. "LESS IS NOT ALWAYS BEST" I also say that failure is not always bad, it is how you deal with failure that is the problem. If you show a person, when they are young or old, how to deal with failure and not to give up on trying or themselves, then you are setting them on the right path to success. If they fail, they must be told and shown that success does not always come with the first try. Somethings are successful on the first attempt but most successes are attained from not giving up and multiple attempts. But you must learn from your failures and not repeat them. You have to want to achieve, it is then that you will find success. Everyone is different and may learn at a different pace, but all can become successful if they are given the right learning tools. If you have never known failure, how can you truly enjoy the feelings that success brings.

I believe that things should remain as they are currently. Board members should continue to remain elected and school divisions should also remain the same as changes could be detrimental to the education our students receive.

My name is _____ and I am from Lloydminster. After being told of what changes are in the table that may affect Lloydminster's school board, I felt the need to let my opinion be known. I have a _____ who attends _____ in Lloydminster. _____ and follows an IEP program. Before starting school this past fall, _____ was receiving therapy they the city of Lloydminster at _____. Well let me just say, that program was laughable at best for our sweet _____. The program did not give _____ what _____ needs, whether thru time, programs offers, nor did the staff actually have the training necessary to help out _____. Now moving forward, we knew _____ needed more and we were put in contact with Mary Fraser at our LOCAL School Board. She knew the issues we were facing with _____ with therapy failing _____ and our apprehension of us starting _____ in school. Mary was and is amazing. She would call from time to time to keep up in _____ progress as well. With the proposed changes, how would Mary have been able to do this for us? She would have had so very much more in her plate and no time to keep tabs. _____ enrolled in school this past fall, and is beginning to flourish. Due to the planning made to help _____ due to the staff and school board working together. It is amazing to have something not fail _____ for a change. It is because of Mary being local that she really understands the program's here, knows and works with the staff that deliver these programs, and knows what the schools here can deliver. She was so kind as to even visit us in our home in the evening to give us more information, to keep up on _____ progress, much before we had decided to start _____ in school this past fall. I am worried for people who may have a child due to start school who may have a disability, not have the relationship we had with Mary Fraser. We needed someone to take our hands, in a sense, to guide us, as we were at a loss of what to expect. Having a child with severe disabilities really makes the simple things like a child starting school to be a huge issue as you are worried about the child's transition, worried about any signs of regression due to the change. Little things are a big thing i _____ life and in ours. With not having someone local to help us, I am not sure what we would have done, how the transition would have happened, how we would have had the knowledge we had given to us. Having someone not being local trying to help out parents with a child that requires more planning, would be an epic mistake. That goes for Lloydminster and any other communities that would lose their local voice. It has been said that these changes will not affect the students. It absolutely would! We absolutely cannot lose our voice here in Lloydminster. We need to have our local school board office to remain. You can contact me thru replying to this email or by phone at _____ if there are any questions.

I currently have 2 children in elementary school one of which has disabilities. As a parent of a child with disabilities and constant interaction with the school and the board I cannot imagine the negative impact amalgamating the divisions into one will cause. I feel like Saskatchewan school divisions being kept small allows for proper rapport to be built between the parents, staff, and board members. Creating a province wide board would only increase frustration in communication and cause a ripple effect in the quality of education. Keep the divisions small and allow those locals to keep their jobs and the schools to operate with their boards as is.

I am an Alberta resident. Some children With special needs receive funding for aids, speech therapy, occupational therapy, etc. It is my understanding that this Alberta funding is pooled together and used throughout that particular school. What will happen with our special needs funds that come from Alberta? Will the special needs dollars that Alberta provides end up in other SK communities? Saskatchewan provides very little funding to special needs education! There are a lot of people who leave SK for Alberta because there is much more help for kids with challenges.

Hi there. As a parent of three children in the city of Lloydminster, I am uncomfortable with the idea of fewer governing bodies close to our schools. I like the idea of getting help for our children should we ever need it the same day I ask for it. And I dislike the idea of having to jump through way too many hoops to get questions answered. I feel like things are fine the way they are. I am concerned our children won't have access to the many programs they have come to love and enjoy. And concerned that funding will be ceased for those programs as well. I say things should be kept saying as they are. Respectfully yours _____

I am against the proposal of changes to our education system! Education belongs to the community. My children currently are thriving in their schools in Lloydminster AB/SK and absolutely love attending their school. It is because of the quality of education and programs they currently have in place. This would all change with changes that are being proposed. Our children would suffer greatly. Not only would it not be fair that our extremely high tax paying dollars (in both Alberta and Saskatchewan) are not kept within our community, being applied to our own children's education, but we would lose the personal relations that we all enjoy the privilege of having with our locally elected board members. These local board members are educated and aware of our unique Community that borders the province of AB/SK and are able to provide stable feedback and decision making that affects us as a community, but most importantly affects our children and their future!

If the importance is to "...present governance options that will focus on student success while ensuring accountability and efficient operational structures within the education system" I would be deeply be disappointed to see the elimination of locally elected school boards to be a result of that. Eliminating locally elected school boards would not only be detrimental to our education system as a whole but ultimately to each individual student. Taking away locally elected boards removes everyone's voice and opinion on their local education including parents, students and the community as a whole. When community members represent our schools, we are closer knit as well as more likely to resolve problems each individual school faces since we have a direct link to the school board. Local community board members stand for their community and honour what's important, while doing so without an annual salary. On the contrary, with government elected board members our children's education is ultimately put into the hands of individuals who are "hired" by the government with no direct link to each individual school. This raises some concerns: Who do we address with our issues? How do we ensure these concerns are brought to the table and considered with dignity, when someone is simply being paid to be there? We need local members who consider our children important and contributing members of our future rather than people who will only see our students and children as numbers and statistics on paper. Our children are more than just numbers on a paper but rather smart and dedicated students who deserve proper education with a LOCAL support group behind them and looking out for their individual success! Education is looked at from too much of a business perspective rather than the true reason why it's there - to provide children with the tools to lead a successful life, equality, self-dependence, confidence, and to be contributing members of society. Please consider all communities small and large and the absolute importance of having a local voice representing our divisions and students.

Good Afternoon, In reading the lengthy report that you have prepared I know there are going to be changes. The concerns I have with the first two options are I live in a Rural Community and each time you amalgamate our boards we lose our rural voice. I understand why we amalgamated 10 years ago it was to help with funding and that was great! But I feel this rushed report and Holiday deadlines are a way for you to do what you want and not hear the people's concerns. I hope you hear mine and I'm sure many of the others that should be flowing into you. I do not believe that merging our school divisions will help and I feel like I am being punished for choosing to live in a Rural Town you take our local voices away. If you merge we would be lucky in a four year term to even meet our school board rep let alone know that our concerns are being heard. There are so many questions that need to be answered before you make your decision and I hope you have our Children's education at interest. Thank you
SCC Chair

The reason our students are doing so poorly at math is due to the way it is being taught. Bring back the accountability for rote memorization of the basics and encourage and allow kids to 'compete' by seeing how many equations they can solve in a minute (e.g., $4 \times 5 =$). The garbage that my daughters bring home as instructional material for math is ridiculous. Often this watered-down math instruction endeavours to interlink concepts from other subject areas which ultimately results in convoluted ways of asking a question or solving for an answer. With students doing so poorly in math, it is no wonder that they are also lacking in the sciences: It's difficult to understand science if you cannot do math! While I did not have time to read the full 34-page report, the fact that SK kids are doing so poorly jumped out at me. With regard to math, it is not a surprise given the way the subject is taught! Fix this now, please! My kid's and our society's future is going to be diminished if we do not.

School Divisions are already large enough with past amalgamations. Only local boards have the understanding of what local school need a provincially control school board and division spells disaster for our childrens education and for the educators of the system.

I am wondering why this was put forth with such a limited time line. My thought is, when you destroy the very best in order to give credence to the underperforming areas, success does not always follow. Lloydminster, with its special status, and continued success in delivering education, should be studied, not dismantled. This rush for change bothers me. People will come up with many reasons why the Government is making these changes, but it would be more beneficial to have the truth.

(1) I am in strong support of publicly elected school board officials and think government appointees would be a travesty to student education in SK. (2) I do not believe there will be any cost savings via school board amalgamations that would offset the loss of local influences on their education. Thank you.

I am a parent whose child attends a school with the Light of Christ School Division. I do not think that the divisions should be amalgamated. We elect our trustees because we trust that they will voice our opinions. I have never had an issue with a board member and I find that our small voices will be lost if this gets approved. Why change something that is obviously working? In my opinion, spend time reviewing other issues.

To Whom it may concern, Advocacy Points: (1) After reviewing the three options outlined in the report, I cannot see how any of them will benefit education for students in the unique and complex bi-provincial nature of Lloydminster. As a citizen of Lloydminster and Alberta resident, I have grave concerns that my tax dollars supporting education, will not be used to exclusively to support the children in the City of Lloydminster and the Lloydminster Public School Division. Under the current structure of locally elected boards, our trustees are able to provide the necessary resources to “determine program and service levels to respond to community needs and interests” for the students of Lloydminster. (2) The Lloydminster Charter clearly establishes a funding structure that has served the educational sector very well for the past 84 years. Within this formal structure, students are funded based on their province of residency and each Board of Education then harmonizes that funding to provide a seamless service to students of Lloydminster Public and Catholic school division. The restrictions within the charter that ensure Alberta funding remains within the City of Lloydminster would make it difficult, if not impossible to provide equitable service across an expanded division that would not be bound by a seamless delivery philosophy. (3) Equity for all Lloydminster students is a challenge that arises from differential funding by the two provinces. The equity principle has always been important to the residents of Lloydminster, indeed, so important that the City established a municipal levy (imbedded in the Lloydminster Charter) to ensure equity of opportunity and seamless delivery of services to students across the City. This allows the school division to ensure services such as Pre-Kindergarten, Drivers Education and Transportation are delivered equitably regardless of province of residence or school attended within the City of Lloydminster. (4) It is my belief that the five challenges identified on pages 20 and 21 of the Educational Governance Review Report can all be met effectively through amendments to legislation, regulations and policy. It would be considerably less disruptive to continue with elected boards working under new mandates, regulations and expectations. Sincerely,

To Whom it May Concern, I strongly disagree with the changes that are being proposed by the government in regards to the amalgamation to school boards. I think the way that you have released the information and the short timeline you have put on this to gather information from constituents is unacceptable. I think the proposed changes hurt the education our students & children are receiving which will be a detriment to the future of our province & to our communities. I don't think there is enough transparency or information in the report proposing the changes & no where does it explain how much money centralized school boards will save. I think are just a few of the things that should be addressed by our government before you move forward on this. Thank you, P.S. I tried submitting this on the government webpage, but continued to receive the message "The message field contains content that may present a security risk. Please enter appropriate information." It did not explain what I could do to change my message to avoid the security risk. I hope this is not happening to others, because you could be missing a lot of comments coming from the concerned citizens.

If there is an issue at my kids school like hell I want to phone and talk to someone in a different city and play phone tag with a ton of people to find out what a solution is going to be. I also would like a guarantee that any money fundraising or off my property taxes is kept in the schools my children will be attending not something that might go to a different city! If this is going to be something where I can't talk to a physical human face to face with concerns or anything I would seriously look into home schooling because nobody hours away looking after how many different schools is going to be able to tell me right then what is going on with my children and their future without them phoning someone to get the “he said, she said”. Nobody is going to sit there and want to wait 3 weeks for an answer. The whole thing is a bad idea and nobody seems to know exactly what you would be saving and no time to research and find out what the hell is going on. Something seems very fishy here, like someone's trying to cover something up. My biggest concern would be who would be looking ater making the bus routes. I worked for a school where head office was in Regina and they made the routes but had no idea how the city is set up or how traffic is set up, and it was a huge pain getting bus routes set up with someone who didn't understand anything about Lloyd. Also how would we stay aware in Lloydminster of any changes and express the concerns if there is nobody here to inform us of changes? I understand it would be cheaper but it makes school life here a lot harder. How would we know the money we pay stays in our community and would everything be calculated for Lloydminster properly for everyone on the AB side that attends our schools since we are a unique in that. Since I don't know how funding works but is that still going to be something that someone straight from SK is going to be trained on. And if we have a concern we run on a different time zone in the winter, will there be an office open for us to contact or do we have to wait to talk to someone the next day. Sorry about my last email but it's frustrating thinking that I can't go talk to someone here about my concerns face-to-face and it's going to be a game of playing phone tag with someone who will probably have to play phone tag with someone else! Seems like it would cause a lot of middle people for no reason, causing a lot of headaches.

One division seems like a money saving idea, which would benefit our kids.

As parents of a student in Fox Valley School, we are completely against a revision of the School Boards into 1 or 4 Divisions. As a rural family in Golden Prairie, our child rides the bus well over an hour and a half each day. Our school offers the bare basics in an education. As students progress into high school, they have no choice but to take Distance Education classes in order to graduate and obtain any sort of choices in different classes. Add all this on top of larger school divisions will result in even less funding coming our way. Less ability to access school psychologist, career guidance counselors and all other resources. When you share all these professional individuals within a division, it's a waiting game. Sometimes it takes months to get action and enlarging the areas will not help the issue. Unless you're going to increase the number of professionals, our division has already overloaded these services. Our small schools will get lost in the shuffle and our funding will decline even though our rural tax base supports the urban schools. Urban schools couldn't survive on the taxes they generate; they rely on the rural tax base to top them up. There is no fairness or equality in the rural vs urban education system. All you have to do is compare what Maple Creek offers in the line of classes, services, building ect. to a school like Fox Valley - it's pitiful. So we are 100% against any changes to the existing school divisions. It will only be a detriment to small schools.

We do not want the proposed changes in our school systems. We want to keep everything the way it is.

I do not want anything changed with our school division. We want to keep our voice!!

The restructuring of boards and school divisions will be detrimental to our students. Every community is unique geographically along with the diverse students who attend each school. The changes proposed will give little voice to each community. Local governance (those in touch with students and staff) are always more effective. Additionally, if they choose to amalgamate Saskatchewan into one large division, the allocation of resources will change. The only reason why the government wants to make the changes is because of money. It is never in the best interest of our students. If it was, they would find a different way to fund education instead of cutting jobs that are supporting education for our students. I expected more of the Saskatchewan Party.

I want to personally know the leaders of my child's education. I want them to be a visible and approachable member of OUR community. Our upper level administrators know their families by name and work very long hours. I do not believe restructure would benefit our children or the strength of our community. I do not believe restructure will save money as no other province in Canada has been successful in the process. Local education process is vital in creating a sustainable culture of community belonging.

Every community is diverse and unique and restructuring of the school boards and divisions will be destructive to our students and their education. Each school has their own unique concerns and needs that need to be addressed locally by those close to the community, who understand the needs and conditions of the surrounding and community that attends the schools within the division. Our school board should continue to be an elected board chaired by those in touch and available to students, staff and family locally. This form of governance is far more affective and productive. This is why we have city councils govern our cities and counsels govern our rural municipalities. It's far more effective than simply one governing body for all issues of the province. This is overwhelming and will prove detrimental throughout the education system.

As a Caretaker for Prairie Valley School Division, I have an opportunity to interact with students in a small school and also to see the interaction between them and the school staff (Teachers, EA's and Administration). The personal attention these students receive is, I believe, invaluable. They are very fortunate to attend a rural school where student numbers are low and staff has time to focus on individuals when necessary. Cutting any of these resources would be a shame and the students will be the one to "suffer" in the long run.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my thoughts and comments. After reading the Perrins report, I am convinced that amalgamating our province's school boards into a provincial body is not a wise move for our province. In lean times, efficiency is an understandable direction. However, it is not worth compromising the accountability we have through our current system of smaller school boards. Being able to elect the school board members in our area is important to me and my families, as these individuals understand our community best. I am also very concerned for how an amalgamated division would affect our Indigenous students, particularly those in the North, where lower student numbers could equal lower funding in such a province-wide school division. As a government, I am sure you are well aware that this is a crucial time to be adding resources to the North and our children there, while maintaining the voices of those in the community in leading their own divisions. I ask that you leave the current school divisions as they are, with our communities possessing the choice in how our school boards are comprised. Respectfully,

Our board spent \$1,000,000 on Yorkton minor football clubhouse. These decisions don't benefit all students. We need to move away from boards being able to make decisions that do not benefit all students. Fewer divisions would ensure these decisions do not happen

This teacher hating/education dumbing government has already taken away so much from our children it time to stand up and say no more! For those who don't know 10 years ago kindergarten curriculum was 0-100, today it is 0-10. All this to try and make themselves look like what they are doing in improving in the areas we are failing in, unfortunately it is all a facade! Sask education bumps up failing marks, even though the teachers who actually teaches the students and know if they passed or failed a class have entered in a failing mark! Those are a couple small examples of how this government has dumbed the system down. They are responsible for curriculum not teachers, they have to teach what the government says. For those of you with students in high school, the universities are now talking about having math entrance exams because the high school curriculum is not adequate, unheard of 10 years ago, thank you Sask Party! This government needs to realize that without a decent education the future is bleak, education is important! Each division has different needs and all students deserve a local voice, something that the government wants to take away from us! I should not have to phone another city when I have an issue or concern that I would like to discuss at my child's school, how long would it take to get a response? The higher ups there would have no idea what is going on in my local school! Then you think, would the government then be dishing out money for superintendent to be traveling around the province to ensure the schools are running efficiently? How many times a year would schools actually see a superintendent? What if a major issue comes up in a school and needs immediate attention, sorry you have to wait for however long it takes our superintendent to get here before we can deal with it! Instead of taking our local voices away, get rid of the waste at the top of each division. We don't need all the consultants! 10 years ago they were almost unheard of and my two older children both got better education without them, now they have one for everything and some don't even know what their roles really are! Now there is a waste of money! This government did not spend or save their money wisely when the province was in a boom and now that the boom has slowed they want to take more money from a system that is educating our future generations! Again every student, parent, teacher, educational assistant, etc. have a right to voice the concerns to their local boards. The needs in Saskatoon are very different then the needs up north and if we are all blanketed with one board, it is not going to matter! How will it look for our tax dollars? If I am paying my education taxes, I expect them to be staying in the community I live and that my children go to school in! My tax dollars should be put to better use Brad Wall! Time to give your head a shake, I think you and your government have done enough damage to our education system during your time in power! Education should be more important than your big business buddies because once they retire, there are going to be far less capable people to take their place because you and your government have dumbed down the curriculum so much to make yourselves look better! Enjoy your last not quite 3 years in power, I have a feeling your cockiness is catching up and you will be out next time round. Hopefully you and your government will not have completely destroyed everything good this province had to offer!

100% against these proposals.

As a home educator, I have found our school division to be intrusive and overly demanding. I have had little to no opportunity to influence home education policy. There is no transparency or accountability in how the school division uses the funding provided by the province for home educated students.

I feel that changing the Lloydminster division will cause a huge problem for us. It is difficult enough maneuvering through a border city. A change in the division will direct our resources and attention away from students. As a Saskatchewanian, I feel this may be one more step in changing the rural way of life that has been honoured and respected in this province. Wait and see how the health district makes out.

I don't believe that amalgamation of the school boards will have the desired results. I understand that the intent is to improve education and to lower governance cost, unfortunately due to the vast area that the Province covers and the diversity of lifestyles that we enjoy it would be very difficult to create a "one size fits all" scenario. Community councils will help take care of this diversity, however I believe that we will find that we will begin to cater to special interests that are a very small percentage of the student population, but consume a large percentage of resources. The current school boards are better suited to balance this equation. Our family moved from Alberta to Saskatchewan 13 years ago, we have found our schooling and education here superior to Alberta. Friends of ours moved from here to B.C., they have also stated that they have found our education here superior to what they are experiencing in B.C. Now I understand that this may not be the experience of all school boards or even schools in Saskatchewan, but I would certainly caution using the data alone. Children excel in a school system when they are cared about and they receive good support in their homes. Data may be suggesting that the school system lacks, but I would suggest that for the most part the school system is just fine, but the support at home is what lacks. Survey your teachers they will tell you.

I would like things left the way they are. We are a small school that would likely get lost in any amalgamation

Why do we support a public and Catholic school system? A publicly funded school should not cater to one religion in our multicultural society; it is ridiculous and wasteful to run two school boards next to each other!

I am writing to you to express my concern over the proposed changes to the governance of the provincial education system. I am not in favour of appointed school board trustees. Local board members work and live in the communities they serve are in the best position to make decisions for students. Local board members are connected to and invested in the success of the students in their area. Prairie Valley School Division (PVSD) has made tremendous strides in the last 10 years since its creation in many areas of student achievements. I do not want to see a larger division meaning decision making would be more decentralized which could negatively impact student outcomes. School division amalgamations are disruptive, costly and time consuming for staff and administrators. I want the maximum amount of time, energy and funds focused on students and not amalgamations. I fear that amalgamations would mean that the issues that face our rural schools would be lost among competing priorities of urban and rural areas. It is very unclear to me how the proposed options for new governance structures would benefit our children. I feel that efforts to save administrative costs via amalgamations may in fact lead to poorer student outcomes in the future and limited cost savings along the way.

White City, SK

According to the information provided by the Government of Saskatchewan the total number of days from Mr. Perrins' appointment to the Educational Governance Review (EGR) to his submission of Educational Governance options was less than 25 working days. Furthermore, the number of days from the appointment of a six person Advisory Board to the last day in which all stakeholders may "share their thoughts" is 23 working days. This includes the six days between Christmas Eve and New Year's day that are traditionally family or holiday time. Effectively, students, parents, teachers, administrators and all stakeholders have approximately two and half weeks to voice their concerns. Another fact regarding the Educational Governance Review is that Government of Saskatchewan through the Deputy Premier and Minister of Education, Don Morgan appointed the EGR Chair, Dan Perrins, who in turn, appointed the six-person Advisory Panel. In other words, the Government of Saskatchewan arbitrarily selected a like-minded individual who in turn arbitrarily selected six more like-minded advisors to examine which of the EGR options to implement. How, in this process, could students, parents and educators believe that their concerns will truly be heard and considered. Why is such a fundamental change to the administration of our education system being pushed upon us without an appropriate timeline? The proposed changes to our education system require understanding and discussion.

Having taught in rural Saskatchewan for over thirty years it is an undeniable truth that a community's school is the heart of the community and as such the locally elected school board and the schools' community councils are the life blood. Removing locally elected school boards from communities in favour of larger, distant, appointed boards will only prove to disenfranchise all stakeholders. Decisions that will have a profound effect on our education system need to be fully understood and discussed. The current timeline for discussion does not provide this opportunity.

It is no secret parents have become disillusioned with the current state of the education system. We only have to look at the recent PISA score to see what parents have been saying for a while. The current system does not work and as a parent I want significant change. The question to me is if our education is so badly broken that only significant change is necessary? I believe this is the case and support structural change to our education system.

We believe that you should leave the school divisions the way they are. Sending our children to a school that is on the outskirts of our current school division, we see the results of what happened when the last amalgamation went ahead. Large is not better. The local community of parents and teachers has less input into their children's education. Yes, the larger boards can afford to hire a variety of and more consultants/professionals but these people also need to serve more schools and students so is there really a benefit when their time is spread so thin. We believe in elected school division boards. The people that put their names forward have an interest as well as a desire to see that the schools and therefore the school division is run economically and successfully. The local school board member is involved with the School Community Councils and is there to listen and give the school and local community a voice.

I sure hope you folks rethink this whole plan of action. We know you are in trouble with money in our province. You spend like during good times and now the pot is empty and you are about to make bad decisions to recover. This move would be a disaster for the Catholic Schools. We are going to fight it with all our power and might. Catholic is faith based education and we cannot allow some government to appoint, God knows who to run our schools. If you are out to destroy our schools, find another place to govern. We will not stand by idle. We had so much trust in this government until this move. Please rethink this plan of action.

As a mother of a 7 year old, 5 year old and 2 year old and a proud resident of SK, the status of the education system is very important to my family. Therefore, after reading over Mr. Perrins report I feel the need to voice my opinion regarding the Saskatchewan Party's review of the current Governance structure for Education in Saskatchewan. On page 9 of Mr. Perrins report he mentioned that "Saskatchewan has sought to improve equity and quality through a number of policy changes. The focus in Saskatchewan has traditionally been on achieving equity in taxation and equity in distribution of funding with a view to providing equitable access to education wherever a student may be". That statement resonated with me. In performing your review of the current state of governance, I plead that you remember that statement. Wanting to provide equality in educational tax rates across the province, is commendable, but how can you consider equality across the province by then making a decision to remove the structures that allow for local voices to be heard. The entire rural community of Saskatchewan CANNOT be heard by one voice alone. As stated, currently our provincial school divisions represent an average size of 36,200km2 which is double the size of our neighbouring provinces. I don't feel that larger structures will fully represent the communities involved. No matter where a Saskatchewan resident may decide to reside, unlike the Health Care Industry, they pay municipal education taxes. These taxes should allow for their voice to be heard at their local government level. The above being said, as a business owner myself, I value the importance of reviewing and revisiting current structures to make improvements and gain efficiencies. If cost cutting is a goal, while not reducing core educational funding for students and teachers, I believe you need to focus on the "Shifts in Governance" noted on page 20 & 21 of Mr. Perrins report. Government has a role, without a doubt, but local communities also require a voice. Nobody understands a community or their needs more than those that are living there. Nobody is connected to a community unless they are a part of that community, no matter how many promises are made that they will be represented! My recommendation to the Saskatchewan Party would be this: 1) Option 3B including Implementing the Shifts in Governance. Why I believe this is the answer: Current school divisions and SCC's have been working hard for the past 10 years to develop and implement huge amalgamation from 2006. Such a large reorganization cannot be expected to be seamless, and during this time it would be reasonable to think that some focus was removed from the core education system itself thereby playing a part in Saskatchewan's PISA & PCAP ratings faltering. But rates are increasing and there have been many successes along the way. These groups need to be rewarded for their efforts, not penalized. I am confident that if you reduce the number of school divisions, you will be met with greater resistance which will never increase efficiencies or result in cost savings. Strengthening the current structure is far less costly and will keep the focus on what we are doing well, not what the province failed at. When my husband and I made the decision, almost 5 years ago, to move home from Alberta we believed in the Saskatchewan Party and all the strides they were making to bring this province back to life. We are happy, once again, to be back to our proud Saskatchewan roots. We believe that Mr. Wall and his party understand that making a province sustainable isn't just about the urban communities, it's about keeping rural Saskatchewan active and engaged as well. Thank you for your consideration.

I think we need more teacher aid's for extra help for the kids that are little behind the rest there isn't my child is one of them and I want her to do the best and I believe they are not getting the best ... that's all I am worried about

Prior to any decisions being made - is there somewhere we can read the detailed information about each option - how it would affect smaller school divisions, and representation, as well as the cost savings estimations? The Star Phoenix article on this gives vague information, but certainly not enough for the public to be able to voice opinions. Where are the details? We homeschool in the Saskatoon Public School division, and I would also like to know how this would affect our representation? Saskatchewan is one of the best provinces to Homeschool in - will this change?

To whom it may concern, I am very concerned with the proposed consolidation of Saskatchewan school divisions. Currently, our board of trustees is community elected. These are individuals that we as a community trust and respect and who can easily communicated with and held accountable locally. They are people we have chosen ourselves to guide our school division, and they have done a wonderful job. As a former teacher with LPSD (with plans of returning in the very near future), I cannot stress enough how pleased I am with how our school division is run. Our division is set up with a framework of resources that encourages growth and supports both staff and students in all areas of their lives. As a taxpayer, I want my tax dollars going to support the children in my own community, including my own. As a city bordering on Alberta and Saskatchewan, our unique situation is often overlooked. Our city has unique complexities that sometimes need extra attention. As a parent of two little ones who are entering LPSD in the next couple of years, I am very concerned about these proposed changes to their education. I am very disappointed with the timing of this proposal and also with the limited timeline that has been given. I cannot stress enough, the importance of giving the public time to share this information and learn about how these changes may affect our children. Sincerely,

It appears that this report only recommends realignment of the 18 public school boards, and does not offer actual overall change that includes all parties. Of the options presented, only 3b maintains a local voice. I am concerned that some of the issues being considered do not actually reflect priorities for our students. Community voice may be lost if locally elected school boards are dissolved or school divisions are made substantially larger. Reductions to education funding found through efficiencies may result in losses for our students that cannot be easily rectified. Student success depends on local a community working together to support their educational journey. I am greatly concerned that further cuts and widespread changes will only negatively impact our children. Thank you

Bottom line, we need to really consider leaving this as is. I do not see any benefits to anyone including teachers, EA's, and most importantly our children! Any more cuts to our education are going to be seen negatively for years. Maybe a hard look at the budget could save some money in ways other than an amalgamation.

Bigger is not always better or more efficient. Think of David and Goliath, the bigger you are the harder you fall. Over doing it can be the downfall of a government. It is nice to have a familiar face or a person you have been in contact with when you need assistance.

We as a family new t Saskatchewan (my home town where I went to school), are extremely disappointed in the way school has been educating our children. There is a HUGE concern for the lack of education offerings and a HUGE lack of the deliverance of the courses offered. Our High school students must take their math online, with no classroom structure, no teacher (I do not consider a teacher that you have to email, and wait 2 days for a response) an actual teacher. My son has been more than disappointed with what this school lacks, and our children coming up to high school are worried about not learning as much as they should with REAL LIFE teachers instead of you tube ! Small town kids shouldn't suffer because of where they live!?! What's going to fix this!?

I feel this amalgamation is most certainly not in the best interests of our students. Children need individualized attention. Students should come first. The staff serving these students should be given the opportunities and support to best deliver a quality education to our students. I am STRONGLY AGAINST the proposed amalgamation.

Lloydminster is a special circumstance and should not be lumped in with the rest of the province. You have no idea how complicated it is already managing funding from two provinces. There are so many more consideration but that is just one example. Listen to the people. Do what is right for the students of Saskatchewan...not for what is right for Brad Wall's bottom dollar.

I personally think it is a mistake to amalgamate school divisions in Saskatchewan. People cannot get proper representation from their school board trustee who has a large geographical area. Relationships and connections will be lost in communities. Elected school boards are important and do different work than principals and teachers. They are the voice of the community, not government employees. I have two children in the Greater Catholic School Division. I do not want representation from someone who has no idea of the needs of my community. They would be further removed and we as tax payers would have reduced access to their boards. This amalgamation has nothing to do with improving the education system, and as always they are looking at our children as dollar signs and not kids. Thank you

Without having experience in the governance of education, I cannot comment on the cost effectiveness of any model. I want to encourage the decision makers to carefully consider the cost of this change and to questions whether they can guarantee improvement in our education system. Millions will be spent to implement any change. Would that money not be better spent in the hands of our current school divisions, providing the needed upgrades to a multitude of facilities? Providing more effective staffing? I do not understand the apparent urgency in making this decision. The impact is too large to be rash. Thank you for considering my thoughts.

A possible amalgamation of Public School Divisions into 1 massive division greatly concerns. It concerns me as a parent, community member and as an employee. I worry about fair and equal representation for ALL students. We have many at risk students, minority groups and students with greater needs. Who is going to be the direct voice for these students, where will the parents of these children go to have that direct voice? We are dealing with our most valuable asset and the focus of our daily work and efforts...our students. That should be kept in the forefront of all thoughts, efforts and proposed changes. We are not just dealing with numbers; we are dealing with people with futures.

I found reading the Perrin paper confusing to say the least, but I muddled through. If consolidating to one governing body would reduce costs in upper management and provide more for teaching staff and those is support positions like transportation and janitorial, as well as benefit students in extra-curricular options, I'm all for it.

We need to keep our school board locally elected We need to keep decisions closer to our communities We do not support further amalgamations We do not support changes to our subdivision boundaries We are opposed to reducing the number of trustees in Prairie Valley School Division

As a teacher and a parent I have many concerns about what the government is trying to achieve with this "plan". What is their desired outcome? Because I don't think the outcome of the massive change is going to be the outcome that teachers, parents, and students signed up for, I don't think the outcome is going to be a better Saskatchewan. .. The most important thing to me is being able to teach my children and students in a manner that serves them to the best of my abilities. Over the past few years, teacher's lives have become busier, more publicly scrutinized, and undervalued because of the government's choices and budgetary restraints, and yet WE keep keeping on - we continue to serve our students and to rise up to the increasing demands placed upon us. No one in the government can understand a day in the life of a teacher unless they have spent a day in our classrooms - they cannot understand the dedication, passion, and heart break that we go through every single day. They cannot understand the financial burdens that we struggle with because our wages have not even kept up to current standard of living. They do not understand that we work 60 + hours for a chance to earn 1 day off. They do not understand that we already put 100's of extra hours into our work without financial support. They do not understand the frustration, stress and emotional turmoil that they are placing upon us on a daily basis as it is - as it stands right now. We became teachers because we love children and we want the best for them. WE are here to touch their lives and make them ready for the " real" world. Sometimes we are the only safe people in their lives - They are not numbers or clients or statistics. They are my kids - and I give my heart to them on a daily basis. Treating the teaching profession like a business is NOT an effective way to build a better society, or a smarter society. Treating education like a business will not help more kids graduate, learn math, or learn how to study. This change that is being proposed is going to take us backwards, it's been proven in the past that this model will not work - spend MORE money - pour more into education and you will have healthier, smarter, more well-adjusted members of society for the future. We need literate kids - we cannot teach 30+ kids to read in a grade 1 classroom with no supports when there are 2 ESL students, 2 with learning disabilities, 2 that don't have a lunch every other day, and a handful with a myriad of other challenges that they face..... We need mental support for our kids too - all of the essential services, which may get cut in this process. This is not good for their health, safety and wellbeing... My kids are NOT my clients. I am in this profession to serve them. WE are facing increasing demands DAILY - ESL students, students with disabilities, huge classrooms, increasing assessments (that don't reflect a true understanding of abilities). More and more pressure is put on us, we keep smiling, we keep showing up, the government keeps on asking us to do better and better and we do - but our home lives, our financial lives, our emotional lives - it is taking its toll already . My fear is that there will be no qualified, dedicated teachers left because you have burnt us all out in the end - turning education into a business does not promote well-being. We are exhausted, our school day is long enough, our prep time is never enough..... And we are not being heard by the government - if anyone knows what kids need - it's a teacher - how can a business person sitting behind a desk make these decisions for us? How can they possibly decide what is best for your children? Bigger is not going to be better - the rural schools, and rural students will suffer first- they already are. It has already been proven that bigger is not the answer. This is not the answer. IF the changes do not affect my classroom, if I do not lose EA support, if I do not lose talented, dedicated, wonderful colleagues due to cutbacks, claw-backs and slashes -IF my workday is not undervalued, then I can and will continue to be the best teacher that I can be - but please don't continue to ask us to do more and more and then continue to give us less. Give us more - that will help improve Saskatchewan - without a doubt.

Education has been undergoing transformational change for the past twenty years along with rural Saskatchewan. Seldom has it been for the better I would hasten to add. Finally just within the last year or so with change brought on with whole push for Hoshins, after the previous round of amalgamations had the situation stabilized and was progress being made on student achievement. So now we have a suggestion to turn the whole process on its head yet again??? This will undoubtedly throw the whole system into turmoil once again and set the process back. How far back I believe to be the only question. Based on past change in education and change to other sectors in other provinces, I would consider 5 years to be an optimistic number ten years likely more realistic. One can smell a greater change afoot here as well. Truth is this is primarily about money or more precisely having education spend less of it. By Perrin's own report the most effective way is to cut payroll. Less administration at the top would accomplish some of this but more likely the move to a larger system will make it easier for the admin that remains to cut what is left of the small schools in the province with much less fuss. The report by Perrin even alludes to this as he suggests that school closure rules must be changed. The threat or reality of this move is not even veiled this time around. It seems pretty clear what is afoot here and I weep for Rural Saskatchewan and its people as you sharpen the axe. This has nothing to do with student achievement and making things better for students in any area but in particular rural areas and everything to do with money. I have often thought a society can be judged on how it treats its young and its old, after watching the provinces performance in these areas over the past ten years or so, I wonder what has happened to us.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my grave concern for some of the proposed changes to education governance in Saskatchewan. Our current system and current numbers of school boards provides opportunity to the school boards to respond to the needs of the students within their boundaries. In addition locally elected individuals are responsible to the electorate in their area rather than an appointed person serving the desires and direction of the provincial government. Locally elected school divisions are the best way to make good decisions for children. They are also the best mechanism to ensure financial and educational accountability. Also, there is no need to redraw, or reduce the number of divisions. In fact there is some evidence for the benefits of more school divisions. My understanding is that Alberta and Saskatchewan have the fewest number of divisions. It's my perception that the people proposing changes to governance don't have a sense of the real work of teachers, administrators, schools, directors and school boards. Teaching children is responding to a call to a real challenge. It's hard work. Work that draws on the cognition, emotion, integrity, and persistence of teachers and all who have contact with children. This is a challenge the teachers of Saskatchewan respond to with everything they have to give. It is children and the people who work with them that need this government's full support. Spending money to reduce school boards, or redraw boundaries is irresponsible. Those dollars need to get to the classroom. Our deficit is serious. The responsible thing for our government to do is find money in places that can withstand the changes. For example, there is much evidence that our rural population is very over-represented by our Rural Municipalities. Can we reduce the number of rural municipalities and redirect the savings to education. My humble opinion is to leave the school divisions alone, and continue with business as is. The founders of this province were brilliant people who created representative governance for the ratepayers of the province in the Education Act. This Act doesn't reflect an attitude of "we do it because that's the way it's always been done;" rather it is the way we do things around here because it's right. Again, thank you for hearing my voice and opinion. Ratepayer of Saskatchewan.

Our children are the future of this province. Their success in Education furthers the success of not only our province, but our nation and ultimately our world. How then, can we look at Education and the future of such, through a lens that is tainted with dollar signs and a budget that is showing a deficit for our province? These children did not make the Educated decision that placed our province at a loss, yet their Education is going to be one of the first to help create wealth for a province that in previous years was thriving. If it was the best solution to amalgamate school divisions now, why not when the province was at its economic peak? Living in a small, rural community, our students at our local schools are thriving thanks not only to the individual work of teachers but because of a local school board and division that is able to set realistic goals, and focus on our schools individually when setting their direction. Being a part of a smaller (although much larger than 1992) division allows for a sense of community and collaboration that is key to the success of students. The idea that Education would be able to thrive in a province the size of Saskatchewan under one umbrella of an institution is unheard of and research in all educational fields have proven time and time again that the industry of Education thrives when its constituents feel valued. How can a province value each individual school when there are thousands to manage across the province? We ask our educators to teach with differentiation, varied instruction strategies and different tasks that are able to allow all students success no matter their learning abilities or background. In that same sense, how can Education as a whole to all fit under one umbrella of leadership. Rural communities and school interests vary greatly from larger Urban communities. The needs and desires of the individual schools cannot possibly be heard and noted if we are further divided and grouped.

My concerns regarding an amalgamation of School Divisions is that the students we serve everyday will only become a number and not a face. In order to strive for services and supports for our children and our students we need to look at quality educational services and not a dollar amount that we are spending. In the school divisions that we currently work in services and supports are already stretched and we are trying to retain quality services and educational quality in our schools. The Saskatchewan government needs to properly address quality with the promise that school divisions are taking care of the needs of the students that we currently serve. Diminishing the number of school divisions would decrease the quality of services students would receive. Investing in a larger organization will see that some students needs are going to be lost or ignored. This move would be detrimental to students who need to be a face and not a number in order to receive the services and supports they need and deserve. Amalgamation of School Divisions would diminish quality with students, families and our communities.

Keep things the way they are.

I one hundred percent want to keep our schools locally elected. People in our area who know what is happening in our communities. The school system is one of many reasons we moved to a small town and I would hate to see this change! I do not support further amalgamations and I do not support changes to our subdivision boundaries.

At Horizon School Division - our board trustees, Director of Education Kevin Garinger and all of our team in the office and the schools do awesome work. I see the long hours people put in to make things better for the kids. It is all about the kids whether you are the maintenance people, superintendents or secretaries. We all do our best to give the kids the best education possible. When problems come up, our board and our team are quick to respond. I have been out to numerous schools as an admin assistant. It is heartbreaking to hear teachers talk about having to gain the trust of their kindergarten students in the first weeks of school as the school is their first safe place. Whether it is by providing a response to traumatic events, violent threats or just providing the training to deal with that. We make that happen. The way our literacy team goes to the schools to help the teachers who in turn help the kids is amazing. To improve our graduation rates, students need to love school from the start then maybe they will realize the importance of it. We understand that and are working towards achieving the goals you want to see. But we need time. Getting bigger or amalgamating isn't going to help. Please don't change our school divisions. What price do you put on educating a child? Thank you.

Attached is a letter for your consideration, after reviewing the budget it doesn't seem logical to pick on the education, it's frustrating that every-time a budget needs to be leaner Healthcare and Education are the first under the axe. Good management saves money, that's what school boards do; they're elected by the community to serve the community's best interests. I find it hard to believe that a bureaucrat in Regina or Saskatoon will really understand the challenges faced across the province. It is annoying that education is always under scrutiny, yet the crown's CEO's won't take cuts, and even the distribution of wealth among the crown's could be done better. School boards run lean enough. Don't sell the investment of education and the growth that brings with it today, it will cost so much more in the future. Thank you. To whom it may concern,

I am writing on behalf of myself, a Saskatchewan resident for 7 years and a tax payer to both the public school division and the Saskatchewan government. I am extremely concerned with what the future holds for schools in our division, the teachers and administrators that work at these schools and the children that will be affected by the outcome of the proposal of amalgamating the school divisions.

I understand that when the government of Saskatchewan published its budget for the year, it was forecasting a deficit of \$430 million, the culprit being low tax revenues and low commodity prices Also laid out in the budget were four strategies: No tax increases, controlling spending, investing in people, investing in infrastructure. The worrisome fact is these budget strategies such as the investment in people has already been compromised, other provinces may not have the most popular people in office, but at least they haven't deviated from their budgets like the Saskatchewan party has.

School boards are the furthest thing from irresponsible spenders. If you review the administrative costs of the Lloyd Public school division for example, they have kept the same administrative budget for the past 3 years (\$2.2 million) Currently the division only receives 28% of its funding from the Saskatchewan government the other two thirds is split between property taxes and the Alberta government. As far as the savings of closing the division office, it would be \$616,000 annually, average that with 28 divisions, it works out to a costs savings of around \$17 million a year. It is difficult to justify the small savings short term for what will be a huge inconvenience in the future by putting so many well educated people out of work, and taking away quality education that fits certain demographics. If the government is really that hard up for money why not cancel that \$80 million dollar grant for the new Mosaic stadium in Regina.

A school board is the grease that keeps the education wheel moving, without an effective, efficient management system the quality of the product which is education deteriorates, the business becomes inefficient creating greater costs, and society decays as education is the bedrock to society's foundation. The value of an effective management system shows long term value, without a community elected board, the community's needs will not be met, "what's good for North Battleford may not be good for Lloydminster" we have 61 MLAs for this reason, why should school boards be treated differently? With an amalgamated school division we place a dollar value on a child's education. Moving forward the quality of Saskatchewan education will be similar to that of the inner city schools of the United States, where issues are not seen and dealt with on a personal level but through email and standardized testing.

Thank you for listening.

My biggest concern with amalgamating school divisions is the top-heavy result that can happen. Too many admin personnel create redundancy and use up resources that should be directed at the actual education of our children. The University has so much administration that it is putting more strain on already tapped out students. I would hate to see this happen at the primary school level. If you must amalgamate the school divisions there should be a huge release of administrative staff, and an increase in funding at the school level. (NOT at the "presidential" level.)

Not exactly sure what the government has planned regarding the amalgamations of school divisions in the province, but, having been a part of two previous ones, I have two questions for you.... 1. How is the amalgamation of divisions going to help better educate our children? Longer bus rides? Better delivery of knowledge? I'm not sure?????? 2. How is the amalgamation of divisions going to save the government money? From what I have seen and been a part of, when divisions amalgamate, the number of teachers usually decreases while the number of people at head offices goes up. You may say that we won't have as many Directors, but we will likely just move them to "vice-superintendents" (or whatever title you choose to give them). How will the education of our kids (particularly the rural ones which this proposal will mostly affect) improve with any of your proposed changes? I hope you will reconsider your initiatives in regard to this matter.

I understand changes are being considered in our education system. As the mayor of Sedley, I understand the importance of a local voice and listening to the community. Representing our community I feel very strongly forced amalgamation would have a negative effect on the students in our local school division. I am opposed to amalgamation, appointed boards and strongly feel we currently have the right number of trustees in the Prairie Valley School Division, even minimal change in numbers would have a negative impact. We simply cannot do with any less. None of the options in Dan Perrins report are favorable for our students.

Our school division is an optimal size now, with the benefit of wide programs and services. Our elected Board members are still close enough to our community and our School Community Council to make decisions in the best interest of our rural students.

Prairie Valley School Division underwent major restructuring just ten years ago. As a result of that major change we have less elected local voice for our communities. Any further change in local voice or our school division boundaries would not be in the best interests of our children and our community. Education belongs to the community and I want you to know that I support Prairie Valley School Division and Saskatchewan's school boards and ask you to share this important message with your colleagues in the provincial legislature.

We need to keep our school boards locally elected.

We need to keep decisions closer to our communities.

We do not support further amalgamations.

We do not support changes to our subdivision boundaries.

Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community. Thank you in advance for being our voice with your government as any potential changes for our community is being considered.

Sincerely, Bryan Leier, Mayor, Village of Sedley.

We need to keep our school boards locally elected We need to keep our decisions closer to our community We do not support further amalgamations We do not support changes to our subdivision boundaries.

Good afternoon, I'd like to voice my opinion as a concerned parent and Kindergarten teacher. My opinion is this: creating even larger school division borders through the process of amalgamation is a very bad idea. My school division is currently so large that (it feels like) our administration has a precarious hold on what actually happens on a daily basis in our schools. Rural schools in particular get the short end of the stick and are the first to receive budget cuts. If the borders are made even larger, the needs of rural schools will become lost in the shuffle. Even more than they are now. Meaning that our children, the students of those rural schools, will be shafted. How is it fair that a child living in a rural community does not receive the same level of education as a child living in an urban area? My two cents: please don't do it.

As a parent of students at both École St Matthew and Holy Cross High school in Saskatoon, I believe it to be imperative to continue to elect local representations for our school board. As such, the parents and rate payers are able to play a role in the election of individuals that we see best fit our vision of education for the students.

, I have seen the active participation of these elected representatives with in the schools and the community. Their local knowledge is pivotal in the effectiveness of the board.

Every community is different and their needs are different. By having boards that are elected we are able to choose who best represents our feeling and needs. I feel that by amalgamating the school divisions, you are taking away peoples voice. I feel that here we go again with a top-heavy tiered system, where now our children will be a number and not an individual. Taking away the electoral selection of members is again taking away voices. Thank you.

Whether we are to see a savings by having one single administration remains to be seen, one thing for sure is if we have a hard time having our voice heard now, it will be much worst with one large single unit. Please don't do it.

I am expressing my concern as it is my understanding that a single provincial public division governed by a provincially appointed board has been proposed for the school system in Saskatchewan. I have been affected by amalgamations and ever-changing divisions numerous times throughout my life. First, as the student of an amalgamation in 1991 which brought two communities together in an elementary & high school split. We have come to accept that with small town populations dwindling, efficiencies are necessary. I have seen the school division expand greatly from our surrounding towns all the way to towns we have never been to, nor even heard of. With these changes come challenges. What works for south eastern SK doesn't necessarily work for us, but we are all painted with the same brush stroke. It directly affects our students, our teachers, our support staff and our communities. Now as a business owner, we have financially felt the effects of the large division as all of the transportation repairs are centrally done, we are no longer able to provide ANY repair service for the buses serving our area. I am the parent of two children in elementary school and feel a disconnect with the administration - I don't know a single member serving on the board for our area, it seems all control lies within head office, even our teachers have expressed their frustration with the lack of decision making capabilities at the school level. To go ahead with the proposed plan would further segregate the solution from the problem. We need a more hands-on approach, not less. To make our school system like a corporate conglomeration will not be the answer for more accountability, efficiencies, consistency or quality. Please take these thoughts into account as we move forward! Thank you

We understand changes are being considered in our education system and we hope you understand and value the local voice and listening to the community. We want you to understand what these proposals mean to us as the local School Community Council, to Horizon School Division and to schools, such as Humboldt Collegiate Institute. We pride ourselves in having a connection through Community School Council to local administration and a direct line of communication from the community to the school. Education belongs to community and we want you to know that we support Saskatchewan school boards and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature. We need to keep our school boards locally elected; and, We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community. We are interested to hear more details regarding the proposals being put forth for educational governance.

First of all, country/town schools are a lot different than city schools in their make-up and the way they are run. Secondly, to be properly run, a school board should be elected by the people who are the taxpayers and not appointed by the government. An appointed board would be quite restrictive and would not necessarily have the will of the educational people involved (teachers, students, parents, etc.) as their main focus but would have as their agenda what the government dictates whereas an elected board represents the people. Too much government interference would not make boards efficient. We have to do what is best for the students and local boards know what is best for the students in the area they oversee. A reduction in boards might work but cutting the boards down to 4 or 1 would not. This is showing me that the government is more interested in looking like they are saving money than looking out for the interests of students and education. Would the money saved go fully back into education and supporting education? Not likely. Most will go to big business or elsewhere. The money given to local school boards has decreased during the time this government has been in from what I see and from what I am told. The student's interest has to be always the center of focus and not trying to show the public how much the government saved at the expense of the students. We need to make education and educating students a priority.

You want some feedback, well here's my opinion. I think it's a terrible idea to lump all of Saskatchewan schools into one division. Our small town school has different needs and challenges than the northern school divisions. Our children will suffer if you make this decision. We want to keep our small town school as good as it can be, and I want to be able to contact someone locally and not a complete stranger across the province if I have a problem. Do not group us all together, our children will suffer.

As a 35 year employee with this division I know the last amalgamation was a total nightmare for us in the division office. As far as I can see there were no cost savings and since that time the government continues to fund school divisions unfairly. Particularly large rural school divisions. We are now left with a half empty division office because of cuts we have had to make which directly impacted students. I voted for this government and am ashamed of it. Particularly Don Morgan and his leadership in the education sector. Great support staff lost their jobs and more will be lost through amalgamation. The divisions in the province are doing what they can to cut back in all areas. People losing jobs will not help this province. Please look at other Ministries for further cutbacks. i.e. Municipalities. We used to say Students First in all decisions but that seems to not be a Government phrase I have heard through all of this. Please do not pursue further amalgamation in Education.

NO! Just NO!! This is a terrible idea!

There seems to be one option missing from all the lists to reduce costs, drastically reduce the Ministry of Education. The Ministry spends millions on curriculum reform. The educational publishing community spent much more on curriculum development. Redundant? The Ministry spends millions testing. Which seems to be the main goal of education today. And test-taking is such a valuable life skill! Time to REALLY rethink education.

I thank you in advanced for reading, contemplating, and valuing my perspective on the Educational Review. I am both a teacher at a rural school and a community member of a separate community. My perspective therefore takes on both of these roles. I agree that there should be policies, procedures, and expectations in place that ensure that each and every school board is doing their duty to the people of Saskatchewan and to the Government of Saskatchewan that funds the divisions. I also agree that improvements to our education system, such as graduation rates of First Nations and Metis students, should be a major focus. However, at my level in this system as a classroom teacher, my focus is the resources available to my students to help them succeed in school. I am also concerned with, while the long-term benefits of the provincial model are guessed (however, the document states that an amalgamation of this size has never been done before and therefore there is no precedent), the short-term drawback that are clearly laid out with affect my students negatively. It is the students that I am currently teaching, or those in Grade 1 that I will teach next year, that are my focus and concern; not the students who have yet to be born that I may teach in ten years' time. I have a great respect for my profession and the people who have dedicated their professional lives to it. We are an extremely hardworking group of people who value our professional standing. I believe that Saskatchewan has extremely competent teachers, principals, directors, etc. that value the education of all of our students and that every effort to improving the quality of education in our students is made each day in our province. In our classrooms, teachers are making every effort to see our students succeed, and no adjustment to our school divisions will increase that effort. When working with kids, nothing can push us further than seeing their success. It is well-researched that the success of our students has a percentage to do with what happens in the classroom and a greater percentage to do with the socio-economic standing of students and their families. By creating transformational change in issues such as poverty or racism, the likelihood of students achieving more success in schools is much greater than readjusting school division boundaries. For example, there is ample research suggesting that the quality of nutrition students receive deeply impacts their ability to focus and therefore succeed in the classroom. Perhaps creating change to the access of quality nutrition in northern communities or inner city communities could impact student success. I suggested this example to illustrate that what teachers do in the classroom, and what school divisions do for their schools, are not the only way to increase success in students. My second role is as a community member. In rural Saskatchewan, rural schools are central to the community's activity and involvement level. Without a school, a community fades. I live and volunteer in a community, and teach in a different community, 20 km away. It is amazing the differences in needs and supports that each community and school has. These differences are not due to the fact that each school is part of a separate school division, but simply because every community is unique and presents unique qualities and challenges. Local school boards and small school divisions that are invested in these unique challenges are crucial to the goal of improving the education of each student. The greatest impact on a student comes from decisions that are made closest to that student – by the teachers and board members from their own community. My other concern with the Educational Review is where it leaves the collective bargaining process. This is a fundamentally important process to teachers and changes to its structure have a direct and severe impact on me personally. Regardless of what happens with the readjustment of school divisions, all local agreements should be respected and honored and a meaningful consultation should occur before there are any changes to the bargaining process, This consultation should directly involve the perspectives of Saskatchewan teachers. My biggest focus is the wellbeing and success of my students. I believe that this process should not result in any school being closed, or in any student losing the resources that are helping them to succeed. This could mean their classroom teacher, their educational assistant, or the many professionals that are directly involved in the success of students such as speech-pathologists, occupational therapists, psychologists, learning resource teachers, principals, consultants, bus drivers, etc. Can it be guaranteed that my students will not lose out? Can this change be justified if my students suffer? I would like to stress page 2 of the Educational Governance Review Report. This page clearly states what the perspective of 32 stakeholders in education in Saskatchewan is. The summary of this collective perspective is a much better piece of data than anything I could write here. I urge the decision-makers to seriously consider what is written on that page. I thank you for taking the time to consider my thoughts and perspective.

Education is the most important asset we can give our children, with it they can rule the world. This Government needs to stop messing it up and look at improving this service as with a great education comes better jobs ,communities, standards of living and YES less stress on Government funds. Education serves children and shapes their lives for at least 14 years we need to invest in this resource.

Further amalgamation of school divisions will not provide cost saving benefits. Just like the last amalgamation process did not provide cost savings. The divisions are already large and therefore have many challenges due to size. Having less local say in education is not in the best interest of students. We continue to strive to meet the expectations set out by the government, while meeting the needs of the students that we serve. We do this because we have a connection with our students, families and boards. We should not lose this. This is not a process that should be rushed, there simply is too much at risk, our students who are our future.

My husband and I have chosen to NOT delegate our parental responsibility to educate our children. We have enjoyed a very respectful relationship with our registering authority (school division) and hope that it continues. We would ask that SHBE and HSLDA be involved in any and all discussions that even have the slightest chance of effecting home education in Saskatchewan. We trust those two organizations to best communicate the needs and opinions of homeschool families. Greater transparency from the government towards SHBE would greatly assist in the cooperation process. We all desire educational success for our children, so let's continue and increase our respect and understanding so the student is best served. Thank you for serving.

Please keep the boards local. Rural town's voices need to be heard. Rural town's educators, students and parents will become invisible if the ministry decides to take our voice away. Every town and city is unique and deals with unique situations, issues and demographics. We are all not the same. Education is not something you can standardize. Education is for each individual. A policy may work for a big city school but could never work in a rural school. What would PD look like if a new structure of education took place? Teachers in GSSD already have to drive between 30min to 1.5 hr. to get to PD. Driving 2.5 hours to Regina is not reasonable or practical. Keep education boards local where they understand the communities they represent. Allow parents to have an approachable figure if they have an issue. What would Saskatoon or Regina know about my small town? How are we even alike? Keep the education structure the same and all to have a voice. Allow each of our divisions to be unique and have the ability to deal with each school's population the way they see fit.

To whom it may concern: My name is _____ and I am the president of the parent committee of the _____. I'm writing on behalf of our members which consist of 15 fathers in our community. We would like to voice our concern about the proposed amalgamation of the provincial school boards. We oppose any changes to any schools boards or school divisions as they currently stand. We do not see it as a benefit to change or enlarge or restructure the school divisions in any way. We also do not agree with having government appointed trustees over publicly elected trustees. We feel if the government appoints these positions that the rural communities will lose their voice. We are also concerned about losing our rural legislated status if changes are made by government through another amalgamation process.

I strongly disagree with the government's proposed changes.

I am greatly concerned with the recent talk of further amalgamation of Saskatchewan's school divisions. I am a recently retired Saskatchewan teacher, and the previous amalgamation of Saskatchewan's boards of education is still a recent memory. To suggest further amalgamation so soon afterwards indicates that this government's understanding of educational governance is simplistic and lacking in depth. While most would agree with the need for the efficient and responsible allocation of funding, it is important to understand that amalgamation does not save money, and in fact often costs more. Common sense and experience have shown that smaller organizations -- in the business world and in the public sector -- are most often more cost efficient and productive. Bigger is not necessarily better. This plan to govern all of Saskatchewan's schools by a single board of appointed (not elected) trustees appears to be a knee-jerk reaction by this government to their current financial challenges. The extremely short timeline allowed for feedback from stakeholders would indicate that this consultation process is only being done for the sake of appearances. I would suggest that such a monumental and costly process not be undertaken without a much deeper understanding of the complexity involved. I would also suggest that the strongest consideration be given to the opinions of those people most qualified and experienced in education -- the teachers of Saskatchewan.

To whom it may concern: No way is making one provincial school division going to be a good move for smaller schools. The school divisions need to be left the way they are. We can not afford to lose schools. Busing kids hours to go to school. This is one place we can spend more money on. Education is for the kids. How can they learn getting up so early to take the bus. I live in small town Maidstone. We have a full Elementary and High school. The school divisions now are large enough. Thank you

As a teacher in a rural school and a soon to be parent (my child will enter the system next year), I am Not in favour of these amalgamations.

I DO NOT agree with any of the governments proposed changes that are currently being considered! First of all, I very strongly disagree with the government appointing school board trustees! I believe we should have the CHOICE in regards to who represents our schools and communities. The representation should be made by someone who is local (or from a surrounding area) and someone who has our children's and communities best interests in mind!!! NOT a government appointed board of trustees! I truly believe that by the government appointing representatives that we as a community will lose our voice. That all of the communities will lose their voices! If school divisions become larger will our schools services stay the same? What about extracurricular activities for the children, what about professional and educational development? What is the cost effectiveness on the division models being proposed?!? What are the benefits of these proposed changes? There are too many questions and gaps in these proposed changes that have not been explained to us, the communities, parents and teachers, and therefore I very strongly do NOT agree with any of the models being proposed!

We need to keep our school boards locally elected We need to keep our decisions closer to our community I do not support further amalgamations I do not support changes to our subdivision boundaries

As a retired teacher I feel as a cost cutting measure this is a good idea. The school division is very top heavy with too many directors and assistants. If this will save money and help put more teachers back in the classroom one province wide division will be great.

I am a parent as well as a pediatric occupational therapist. I have had the opportunity to work with children in both the health and education systems as well as privately. My private practice started because of the significant lack of services available to children with disabilities. In reading the report I read that one of the objectives was to maintain and improve quality instruction for all students regardless of where they live. This is nowhere near being achieved for children with disabilities. Children with disabilities have the right to learn and to achieve; however, without professional supports available teachers are left not knowing how to do this for children. We have educational psychologists who test children for learning disabilities (although this service varies depending on what division you live in), but we do not have consistent supports in place for children to help plan their learning and achievement after that. If a division has an occupational therapist in it there is usually over a year of a wait list, causing teachers not to bother seeking it out. And then if an OT becomes involved they are so limited as to what they can do because of their huge wait list... Children with disabilities are getting disinvited from schools as their challenges are beyond the capabilities of schools. All people have a right to education, yet we are not doing this. It becomes a basic human rights issue that stems from lack of supports to our teachers and more importantly lack of supports to our children. This decision is for our school boards to make... Our boards who take the recommendations from the administration. If our board members do not have experience with the needs of children with disabilities how do they know what supports are required? Our SCC may function differently than others but it plans events and fundraises for things like playground structures.. It does not make recommendations to the board on the needs of the most vulnerable, and frankly those parents are so busy getting through the day that they aren't lobbying the board or the SCC. They just accept that the schools do not support children with disabilities and that their child's achievement will be completely dependent on the previous experiences of the classroom teacher which can vary from year to year. The fact that there is over triple the amount of speech therapists than occupational therapists just shows the lack of understanding the boards and school divisions have of children with disabilities. Speech therapy very important but if a child also has sensory processing disorder or autism, or ADHD, or a physical disability they need other supports to be able to learn effectively and to be able to achieve at their highest potential. The fact that on page 14 of this document that Occupational therapy was not even mentioned just shows the lack of understanding that we have regarding children with disabilities and their needs. There needs to be something done to educate our boards on the minimal requirements for school divisions and the supports in place for children with disabilities. We cannot keep pulling services from the most vulnerable and we need to recognize that this is a provincial wide issue that needs to be dealt with in your reforms.

I would like to see the student teacher ratio never higher than 20 to 1. And administrators cannot part of the ratio.

Please choose option 3 b. Rural Saskatchewan needs connection to our local grass roots people. Who are connected to our kids. Sask Party was founded on grass roots. Please don't break the connection for the parents to have a voice in the education of there child. Large amalgamation may save money but our kids (the future of Saskatchewan) are worth way more than \$ & cents. Sincerely,

The most efficiencies and consistencies would be gained by having one division. Local elected or acclaimed boards have their own agenda. We definitely need to try another solution in Saskatchewan since what we have in place doesn't provide equity for students.

Let Divisions find efficiencies on their own - No dollar amount provided in the report about costs of the proposed options. - Little or no reference to students or student learning in the report - How do you meet the individuality of students/schools and divisions? - If appointed – where is local voice? - Options decrease Diversity - Reallocating efficiencies - will proposed savings be put back into education - How would these options affect student-teacher ratios, and class size ratios? - Will schools in smaller communities have closures because of options? - With change to boards/division how will feedback and communication to/from communities and families remain effective? - All our divisions have unique situations and are so different. If we don't have local decision making how will we deal with these unique situations? - Too much focus on business model (not on students) - How fast can major decisions be made if local contact is not there? (ie: fire at Meath Park School) - What are the cost savings for each option? - (3) - How can a government make such an important decision in such a short time frame? - What role would SCC's have in this new system? - Have any of these models been researched and found effective? If so, where? - What happens to professional support staff/special needs now determined by local need? - Amalgamation timeline - what is the rush? - What would the boundaries look like in the region and division downsizing options? The north has unique needs as does the south and Prince Albert! - Savings are great and efficiencies should be a goal always, but what about local businesses? How do they survive with all these changes? They are our parents, volunteers, sponsors. They are part of our community and our children's education too. - Divisions provide supports to the schools that are crucial and unique to the division. Will these consultants lose their job? They are needed. - With a diverse province and many new immigrants to our province, these needs are also reality - language barriers, teacher ratios and EA supports, etc. - How will this affect French Immersion/Immersion programs?

My thoughts on this plan are fear. Fear for my two small children who will be entering the school system in the next couple years and if they will even have a school nearby to attend. Our children currently will have a 20 minute bus ride to school which is reasonable. With your proposed plan it makes me concerned that this new board will close our school and my 5 year old child will have to bus an hour away for school. I have been informed that our school already struggles to get funding and the necessary supplies needed for our students. We are already the largest sq km area covered for our school district. Your proposed plan will only make that area larger making funding even harder to be provided. Our small town of Richmond is close to the Alberta border and the small town of Schuler who recently was provided with a brand new school. Which if this proposed plan is passed I would strongly consider moving my child to Alberta for education because they understand the importance of keeping schools in rural areas. I understand I choose to live in a small town and raise my family but I don't think my child's education should suffer because of that. I understand during this economic time and everything that is happening in our country currently means we have to make cuts to keep taxes low, but I don't want my child's and the children of that generation education suffering to provide that.

In the late 1800s, my great-grandfather was a school trustee who helped establish a one-room school that was the only source of formal education for my grandmother and her siblings, as well as many others in the area. Since then, our family has supported education in Saskatchewan as trustees and teachers through four generations. We are not casual observers -- we care deeply about education. I am very disturbed that the provincial government would lay out a plan that overrides the democratic wishes of Saskatchewan people. It was only three months ago we voted for school trustees in local elections. The candidates offered their services for a four-year term; as voters, we chose our representatives for four years. Essentially, a contract was struck. Then, merely days later, the Perrins report is released with options that all negate this democratic process. How can this be reasonable, ethical or legal? If the report or the government's approach were a review of school governance over several years, recognizing and allowing the democratic decisions made in October to be respected while planning for a new model, I could accept that. I would still want to see a detailed financial analysis to show how the new model would save money (which we don't have now) and to see a plan for how separate school divisions/boards would also contribute to any savings, but I could be convinced it was the right choice. As it stands at present, I see a government that is willing to throw aside democratic process for a new, imposed model of governance with no firm basis of cost savings or improved service to students or communities. I ask that the provincial government rethink the time line for this initiative so that the voters' wishes as expressed in the very recent local elections are respected and a thoughtful approach to future school governance, based on fact and analysis, can be created.

1. Director hires his girlfriend as literacy coach 2. director hires his dad to teach distance ed 3. Director hires foster brother as FNMI liaison 4. Boys club - Directors hires friend as principal of DE course 5. Principal who was charged with DUI (and guilty) - no consequences 6. More central office staff hires These are six reasons Directors need to be accountable for their decisions. Fewer directors needed who make decisions in their own best interest (where is the accountability). Their families best interest re taken care of. Their friends best interest are taken care of.

The increased consolidation of school divisions will present significant challenges, especially to rural schools, who already feel like they are being neglected. If education and student well-being is the ultimate goal, consolidation will not advance the cause. The farther removed the administration is from the school or the organization, the less in touch they are able to be. Can we use Justin Trudeau and the oil and gas industry as an example? Please don't make the rural and more sparsely populated areas of Saskatchewan the recipients of the fallout of a power struggle. We need local, elected representation and division administrators who actually live in the region and understand it's challenges and it's uniqueness. I'd like to see option 3B be implemented, if any changes needed to be made.

By law, since parents have the foremost right to choose how to educate their children, I think it is fitting that the Government, through the Advisory Panel, work with SHBE (Saskatchewan Home Based Educators) in this endeavour. I submit that the authorities appointed by the government to register home educated students should be accountable to the home educators for the funding given for their home education program. Moreover, I feel that governance to the home education program should be more transparent, and should include participation of home educators. Thank you for your attention to this communication. _____, Saskatoon, SK

As a parent in Regina Catholic School Division I would like to voice my concern with consolidating the local schools boards.. This seems like a move to eliminate local decision making. When this occurred last time the transition was horrid and I suspect if you asked the parents from those school systems they would indicate that they now feel they have no way of voicing their needs and concerns. Simply making it possible to go online to make comments seems futile - I did that when you surveyed about the Math program. There wasn't even a response to confirm that you received my comments. The best way to kill input from the stakeholders is to make it difficult to express one's views. There must be other ways to save money - perhaps reduce the size of the local school boards. Please confirm that you have received my comments. Thank you.

I'm going to start by telling you a little bit about myself and my family. I am a mother of 3 children (2 of which attend school in the Sunwest school division)...my youngest still has a couple more years at home and than will join his siblings! I LOVE SUNWEST! I LOVE how they are centralized for our needs, how they are close in proximately if we need them, I love how when I've had problems in the past they are usually resolved within the same day! I love how I can see our bus schedule and know which buses are running and which ones are not because as a small school division those decisions can happen quickly! (ALSO keep in mind that if our school is being regulated in Saskatoon or Regina- we don't have people that drive our roads daily to make informative decisions if they are safe for our students or not)! I often tell my close friends and family from other communities how amazing our school is, school division, and of course community, _____ And quite frankly with everything else changing around us (living expenses, job loses, food prices) I DON'T WANT my school division to change! I think everything is perfect the way it is and I think our children are flourishing and doing quite swell the way things are going. I HAVE been that parent that has had a child that was being bullied. I HAVE had to go into the classroom and deal with a situation that occurred between the teacher and my child and you know what? I don't have to wait for that third person or a phone call back before I can do so. I'm comfortable enough walking into that school knowing that this small issue is just another curve in the road and will be dealt with accordingly and than I continue on my merry way! I'm sick of hearing budget cuts, costs, etc, etc...I WILL pay more for fuel and the food we eat, BUT I am not ok with having my children's future tossed around like a frisbee all because someone somewhere thought it may be a good idea! These are MY children whom I've raised to to be the best they can be....these are MY children who are comfortable in their school division, and these kids are OUR future! We need to take careful consideration with everything we are putting out there because this WILL affect them!! And what parent wants something negative to happen in their child's lives? Who would want obstacles thrown at their innocent children? NO ONE! NO ONE should wish any child a hard life or set them up for failure! LIFE IS HARD ENOUGH.....So, from the bottom of my heart, as a hardworking momma and community member, I will ask you to please reconsider what is being thrown on the table and leave our school divisions the way they! Each school division is unique and moulded for the communities that it serves. I've considered homeschooling as an option before and may have to once again if this follows through. It just isn't fair to our children as they aren't doing anything to deserve these drastic changes! They are INNOCENT! I can only imagine how much more bullying certain communities will see, the lack of information we will be receiving in a timely manner, and how many hours will be wasted trying to find the right person to get in touch with regarding certain situations. PLEASE consider all of these ESPECIALLY the bullying aspect! Without the proper enforcement and policies each unique school division possesses, our communities will fall apart and kids will be going to school against their will and not LOVING school like they should be. Thank you for taking the time to read this, I hope you make a smart, informed decision.

Any transformational changes made should be made solely at the central office level -- amalgamating school boards, director positions, etc. and assigning regional superintendents and coordinators. One provincial public school seems to be the most streamlined and will provide consistency throughout the province. However, as Alberta's experience has cautioned, it is important that the right people are appointed for the job. No direct service to students provided in schools should be reduced. No school closures (unless school size is so small that it needs to be put "under review"), no teacher cuts, no reduction in special services (speech, therapy, counseling, etc). Students' education and personal well being should not be negatively impacted by this transformation. More resources need to be put into online education (like the old provincial correspondence school) as this is the trend for the future and many students are opting to complete high school courses online. They shouldn't have to pay huge amounts of money to do so. Teachers can be reassigned to online classes rather than there being teacher cuts throughout the province. Teachers are a valued profession being the only job that is the springboard to all other professions for all students. Their importance in society as a whole needs to be respected and equipped with all necessary supports to do their best job so that their students receive the best possible education for their future which is what ultimately becomes what is best for Saskatchewan's future.

I think that Dan Perrins report was done well. I think that nobody likes change. I think that the government is doing the right thing in looking at the school boards to save money and to create better school boards. Things change from time to time and this is why this needs to be done. The students are still the most important thing. The students are entitled to the best education they can receive, no matter where they live in the province. The schools should be maintained and upgraded where required. The students should not be on the school bus before 7:25 am and in the evening coming home no later than 4:40. The school buses should be well maintained. The school bus routes should be on the best roads possible, and certain roads should be upgraded to make sure this is possible. Students should be offered as many classes as possible. Other school services should be equal in all divisions, no matter where your school is in the division. School division numbers are not as important. You can make any number work. I don't think that 1 is right number. It is more important to have shared services, shared inventories, and amalgamations where possible. School divisions seem a little top heavy right now. Try to reduce this when you restructure this time. Also don't be too aggressive so we don't add a lot of separate school divisions to the list.

I think that consolidating the school divisions into one is a short-sighted mistake. School boards were originally created to react and reflect the needs of local citizens. There is no way a single board can effectively hear the needs of local people. The Saskatchewan government squandered tax money during the good times and now they are desperate to appear like they are fiscally responsible. This proposed move to a single board is also a thinly veiled attempt to consolidate power in the hands of the ministry, as if they didn't already rob the boards of enough power when they took over control of funding. Local boards have local needs. The needs of northern students differ from rural which differ from urban; this same principle applies to teachers. Having one board will not do anything positive aside from potentially saving a nominal amount on overhead. This solution reeks of an attempt to blow up local agreements, take all power away from local authority, and silence the concerns of locally elected school officials. Now that the province's revenues have decreased, the government is having trouble dealing with the consequences of their short sighted policies. In retrospect, maybe the government should not have cut the PST or maybe they should have not wasted money on the GTH land deal. Adding new short sighted policy is not the answer. To conclude, finding efficiency is one thing but disguising cuts as efficiency is the kind of doublespeak that reeks of desperation. Education is too important to be a political pawn. As a parent of two school aged children, I want the government to know that **SOME THINGS ARE WORTH PAYING FOR AND EDUCATION IS ONE OF THEM**. If we cannot afford to pay for proper education then we need to do what is right not what looks right. Maybe the government needs to reevaluate its priorities (for example not placing tourism ahead of education with the post-labour day start date). Maybe we need to do what is best for students and society. If that means a tax increase so be it; if that means a change in government so be it. I am highly skeptical that moving to one board is the answer - if it is, maybe we need to clarify the question.

I cannot see this being better for the students. How is one small board going to know the needs of the students in all areas of the province. Northern students needs are so different from urban. I am afraid that our first nations are going to get even less than they get now. Students with disabilities needs are helped much quicker within their local school division. All of our divisions have different needs. I want my school tax dollars going to the students needs in my division. Not one central pool. One big question for me is why is this only affecting public schools? Is this not going to make the division between separate and public schools much bigger? Of all the cuts that our provincial government should be looking at, education and health care are not the ones to be hit.

I feel that it is not in the best interest of any small town Saskatchewan school to amalgamate into one school board! I feel our voices will be lost when thrown in with more urban schools where there are a lot more students attending. People move to small towns to enable their children to attend a school with smaller class sizes, and a smaller student-teacher ratio....please consider us when you make your decisions...

Less school divisions and having school divisions that are accountable to a common entity seems like a great idea for consistency and efficiency. How can one division add 3 LEADS positions on the same day the announcements from Minister in being more efficiency at the administration level happen? Our division cut EAs and programs while hiring central office. We need to not be top heavy in the office. And our support in place for students in classrooms.

Hello: I am deeply concerned over the possibility of amalgamating the public and catholic school boards and divisions. As a catholic parent who worked in catholic schools and raised children who went to a catholic school have been deeply rewarded with the ability to share the catholic Christian faith freely and have the children be educated by generous, loving, Christ centered teachers. When this is the norm and the message of Jesus is captured throughout the day, it creates a beautiful positive learning environment for the children attending it. I DO NOT want to lose this gift and emphatically ask you not to follow this option. Education belongs to locally elected boards both--public and catholic-- NOT government appointed boards who'd be so out of touch with the children and teachers. EDUCATION BELONGS TO THE COMMUNITY.

I, personally, do not feel comfortable with discussions and decisions being made in regards to the education of our children without the representation of those who chose to educate at home. There is a large percentage of families within Saskatchewan who have chosen to remain the primary educators of their children. I feel it is necessary that we be present at all of these meetings to ensure our voices are heard and our rights be taken into account when crucial decisions are being made which could impact the future of home based education. Therefore as a member of SHBE I request the following: I ask that SHBE be counted as a stakeholder in these discussions, I ask that the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students and these persons be educated in the rights of home based educators. Finally, I ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators. Thanks you

I fully support the government's Education Governance Review. Thank you for taking action and for your efforts in producing this exceptional report Mr. Perrins. This process will hopefully bring change that supports the objectives as outlined in the report. In my opinion, two opportunities for improvements exist in our District - greater consistency in student supplied resources and accountability with capital and operating budget spending.

I am 100% supportive of fewer schools divisions. School Board members take home too much money which can be redirected towards students. CEOs are overpaid. Central office staff have gotten too large. Too many divisions have added at the central office admin level and have cut at the teacher and EA level (it's sad when student supports are cut yet central office people get paid so much money). Consistency and efficiency will be great benefits. Improve student learning and student experiences by ensuring students are at the forefront of decisions. Thanks for being a change agent and making decisions that need to be made!

I, personally, do not feel comfortable with discussions and decisions being made in regards to the education of our children without the representation of those who chose to educate at home. There is a large percentage of families within Saskatchewan who have chosen to remain the primary educators of their children. I feel it is necessary that we be present at all of these meetings to ensure our voices are heard and our rights be taken into account when crucial decisions are being made which could impact the future of home based education. Therefore as a member of SHBE I request the following: I ask that SHBE be counted as stakeholder in these discussions, I ask that the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students and these persons be educated in the rights of home based educators. Finally, I ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators. Thanks you

I believe that decision affecting education should be made as close to source as possible. I know that the government is looking at ways to reduce costs but I'm not sure that a government appointed board of highly paid bureaucrats will be as cost affective as the present system. If Government is serious about reducing expenses they should have reduce the number of MLA's instead of increasing. The salaries of senior management in both education and health also need to be reduced. Amalgamations will just increase costs as there will still need to be staffed district offices as well as added expenses for transportation. If you want to be inclusive then you must provide the same opportunities to every rural community as you provide for Regina and Saskatoon.

We celebrated our 10 year anniversary as the amalgamated school division last year. A lot of effort was put into creating a community, and that leadership is just starting to reap rewards. Changing the governance model now seems to me to be akin to the investor who is continually chasing the next great stock, and wastes much frantic energy to achieve lower results than if he had simply understood the value of what he currently possessed, and persevered with small, consistent, and incremental changes. I also do not understand why we would consider such a move right now. If a tight economy is not the time to make tax changes affecting our private industry, why is it the time to make sweeping changes to our public industry? A change in governance is an upfront expense that assumes future rewards. It will cost more money in the near term with severance packages, co-ordinating and combining existing services, training employees in new procedures and unforeseen challenges. I question whether the returns are real, especially if the governance model might be uprooted in another decade to account for the next fad. Even if the returns are sufficient to invest in a new governance model, is this investment the best use of our currently tight funds? During the BSE crisis, we went through a variety of options to reinvent our farm, and all of them looked better than our current situation superficially. However, once we stepped farther out on the learning curve, they were never as profitable as the initial assessment was. We watched a lot of neighbours jump ship in desperation, and of the resulting businesses, none are still standing. I think it is much more prudent in times of tight finances to put your head down, whittle your interests to your absolute priorities and persevere. The grass is never as green as it looks on the other side of the fence. The argument that you need more centralized control in order to maintain the integrity of the province's finances flies against your negotiations with the federal government. Surely, you can come up with a mechanism to simply collect and disburse funds to the elected boards. Demonstrating this leadership within the province might help Ottawa treat Regina with the same respect. This government has always maintained a conviction that the best innovation occurs in a decentralized environment. Why are we abandoning that principle? The leadership which collected all the school divisions together to create the ESSP's was strong because of its soft power. The province and the boards had to listen to one another because they could not simply overpower each other, and while I would imagine it was a more difficult consultation, the result was stronger. I believe this separation of powers sacrifices efficiency in order to be more effective. The local boards need the authority to agree to disagree with a provincial mandate and to face their electorate having made that decision. I cannot imagine our SCC's being an effective local voice in a regional or provincial system. We are able to persuade our school to continue the Christmas concert or ice skating outings. We do not have the capacity to do what the school boards do. I cannot agree with the findings of this review.

This is something that I normally do not do but I believe strongly that educational school boards and divisions should remain in the community. Especially in the case of Lloydminster where it is a very unique circumstance with residents from Alberta and Saskatchewan are involved. Lloydminster has always been a City where the service is the same across the board whether you live in Alberta or Saskatchewan and it should remain so. I want my tax dollars as an Alberta resident to support my children in the schools in the City they attend as well as have their needs looked after locally. My Alberta tax dollars should remain in Lloydminster to support Lloydminster not another Saskatchewan community that has very different needs than Lloydminster. I believe that every student in Lloydminster is equal and therefore should receive seamless delivery of every service regardless of which province they live in. This can only be done with an elected board and school division that is in the community as it is these representatives that know and understand what needs to be done locally in order to achieve this. There should be more concern shown in getting the contract done for the teachers so school is not interrupted that on revamping the school boards and decisions as without the teachers there is nothing. Show our young people the proper respect and leave their education the way it is for them to succeed - in the community that they live and attend school in.

My name is _____ and I have been a resource teacher for the majority of my 20 year career. I am also a mother of two school age children attending a public school in Saskatoon. I have worked in both rural and urban school divisions in the province and I understand that there are unique issues to both types of school divisions. I was a part of the first amalgamation process and I recognize that change can be a good thing. I am willing, and readily look forward to, any change that will support, enhance, innovate and stimulate the minds and education of the students that I work with and advocate for. I believe, one of the unintended outcomes of the first amalgamation was the depersonalization of education. As a staff member, I no longer felt connected to the 'whole'; many of the options for student programs changed because of the shift in division philosophy and many students and their parents felt alienated and frustrated. Because education at its roots is an inherently personal process and the transformative education we are planning to achieve the graduation rates for Saskatchewan in the near future, I would like to know what steps or plans are in place for the prevention of depersonalization following this amalgamation?

Closing down smaller rural schools in favour of bussing children to farther destinations is not the answer in my opinion. By doing this that would mean my children would be on a bus for 2 or more hours in the morning and 2 or more hours after school. This impacts their ability to keep up with homework/studying and will cause deprivation in their sleep as they would be waking up earlier and going to bed later. As we all know lack of sleep impacts one's ability to learn and perform, there are a lot of studies out there showing issues caused due to lack of sleep. It will also cause classroom issues as in overcrowding and impact a teachers ability to be able to provide any extra learning help to those students who need a bit of extra help. As the student/teacher ratio will not be sufficient. I have no problem with a Saskatchewan based Education Board overseeing the province. I however, feel that there should be elected representation from each school on the board. This way all schools have an elected voice. Not a board appointed by government officials. It is in my opinion a way for the government to try and make up the deficit that the Liberal/Truduea government has caused. Instead of giving millions away to foreign countries that money should have been put towards our children's education, our elderly, veterans, healthcare and helping to house our homeless. This is nothing more than the governments way of cutting much needed funds to cover their overspending. As someone who has worked in healthcare for 20 years I have seen many cutbacks/job losses all under the false hood of bettering patient care. They were nothing more than the government's way of saving money to make up for their overspending. It did nothing to improve patient care, as staff is over worked and unable to keep up. I have seen and worked with the lack of staffing due to "so called" improvements. Making work Safety/Patient Safety a dangerous situation. I know the last bit has nothing to do with school closures but was written to show that financial cutbacks are not always the answer.

I'm writing to express concerns with the current "transformational change" that the Saskatchewan Government is conducting as part of a governance review. I have several concerns with this review as a Lloydminster resident, some of which are indicated below: 1) Possibly losing locally elected school board officials to government appointed, (2) Possibly losing advocates for our local school educational needs, (3) Possibly having parents and educators deal with government boards several hours away, (4) Possibly losing necessary resources for local program needs, (5) Possibly losing funding from both Alberta and Saskatchewan as Lloydminster is a unique situation with the border dividing the various city schools, and (6) Possibly losing administration staff and teaching positions that may force residents to leave our city. My main concern is what is ultimately best for our local students. Decisions should not be made solely for financial purposes. It has not been made public that amalgamation would even be cost effective. I am only hearing about this review now with a very short initial feedback deadline of January 23rd, 2017. I'm writing with hopes that decisions will only be made in the best interest of our local students and staff. Thank you, _____, Lloydminster, Alberta

I have concerns regarding high needs students in our province. Cuts in health care and education have left them falling through the cracks, neither of these departments have the funding required to give these children the supports that are required to aid them in growing into independent, capable, contributing citizens of our province. Health and Education specialists have confirmed the absolute necessity for early and intense intervention required for these young citizens. However, neither health nor education have the funding and staffing to meet these needs. Staff members whom I have met in these departments are very caring, conscientious professionals who work extremely hard. They know what should be done to help high needs children. However, limited money and support people leaves them no option but to cut programming. Families with high needs children are exhausted and stressed. It's difficult to comprehend their daily struggles if we've never experienced life with a high needs child. Some of them manage to make financial sacrifices to pay for private therapy in speech and occupation. They do whatever they can to give their children opportunities that help them become happy and strong people, especially if they're facing the fear that despite their love and sacrifices, their child may not receive all that he needs to meet that end. Some families, despite the love and concern they have, cannot afford the very expensive private therapies. So the bottom line is, our provinces high needs children are getting not getting the services they deserve and need. Our government holds their futures in their hands. Are you going to own your responsibility and do what is necessary for these children to become independent contributing citizens, or are you going to deny them that? If so, they will be dependent on government services for the rest of their lives. Early intervention will prevent later and greater depletion of government funds. More importantly, it blesses all of us with strong, independent friends and neighbours who were given a chance from a government that showed they cared. I implore you to do what is right for Saskatchewan's high needs children.

We ask that SHBE (Saskatchewan Home Based Educators www.shbe.info) be counted as stakeholder in these discussions. We ask that the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students, and we ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators. These words were given to us by a SHBE but we agree with them wholeheartedly.

It was very interesting to read the report, and I especially noted the 2015 PISA ratings where Saskatchewan came in last for Science, Reading, and Math. I noted nothing pertaining to students with disabilities, and am curious what percentage these students would fall in, in comparison to mainstream students (I am guessing below the average)? I have a son with autism who was refused entrance into the French Immersion program (both Catholic and Public schools within the city of Regina) and very sadly, neither school would guarantee the 1:1 support or Occupational Therapy consult that he would have needed to excel in an English program for that matter. We briefly chose to homeschool, and he is now integrated in a mainstream Francophone classroom (the principal and school are exceptionally supportive, and I plan on nominating his teacher for a Prime Minister's award for teaching excellence), as he is doing very well with the necessary supports. Navigating the system has been exceptionally difficult, and re-structuring might make that process easier for parents; however, if the money isn't there to provide the necessary supports that students need, and parents are not respected and supported in the process, I feel that not much will likely improve for these kids (and I know that I am not the only one with these concerns, as the lack of support, and lack of dollars from the educational system comes up a lot in our parent support group meetings). If it were not for my persistence, I feel that his right to an education would have been compromised. The range of support from school to school also seems to be very inconsistent, perhaps depending on the school's administration, which can be good or bad depending on where you live. Restructuring might open up the potential for things to become better (or worse) for everyone on an even level. Also, nothing about homeschooled children was mentioned in the report, but I believe that if statistics were provided, homeschooled children would excel compared to mainstream students. I did not feel supported in accessing my right to homeschool, the process was also a bit confusing, funding seems inconsistent, and in terms of accessing extra services for my special needs son, I felt like I was the first person landing on the moon, with no process in place, nobody to turn to, and zero results. Homeschooling rights need to be respected and supported, and dare I say, even encouraged, as a lot of value to society has been (and will continue to be) added.

Please put kids ahead of profits. Keep local Boards for the sake of kids.

Hello. I am writing to voice my concerns about amalgamation of school divisions into one large division. I do not in any way support this transition. Listening to friends and community members I have not heard one person in support of it. As a small community we deeply value our elected members. It concerns me to think that this process would be replaced taking power away from our community to decide who represents us and what values, goals etc we feel are important. Locally elected boards matter in the education of our children. Local voices matter!!!! * I am not in support of appointed school boards * Our province went through a forced amalgamation in 2006. Most of the school divisions that were created are large enough to achieve all significant economies of scale. How will additional, large scale amalgamation further improve student outcomes and benefit our children? I fully believe our children will suffer under such a large system as they will become merely a number or statistic among many. * I am not in support of amalgamation of school boards. Each school division/geographical area has unique needs and demographics. How is an appointed official not familiar with an area or its students to make appropriate decisions???? * School division amalgamations are highly disruptive, time consuming and represent a significant financial cost, plus a very large cost to our students. * With respect to our particular school division, Prairie Valley: it has an optimal number of Board Members to adequately serve the needs and best interests of our rural communities. It is also an optimal size, offering a wide range of programs and services with excellent results. In a rural community the sense of community and support is part of the appeal to people. We move here to get away from large infrastructure. To know our neighbors, to know who our leaders are and to have input in things that matter to us. I can't imagine someone from outside an area, not familiar with it, making huge decisions that largely impact those living there. The needs/wants/necessities of life in rural Saskatchewan are so different from urban cities. As a parent of a special needs child I am terrified of what this amalgamation would mean for him. He will merely become a statistic juggled by the system and arbitrarily offered services based on a system looking at labels vs knowing a person and their unique needs. Our local school division has a reputation for providing outstanding support to children with special needs. We want this to be the case for years to come--not to merely be restructured by people unfamiliar with our unique community. Please reconsider. I feel that amalgamation is looked at purely as a means to rectify a financial situation with little regard for the young lives that it will impact greatly. Our kids matter!

I'm totally opposed to a provincially appointed board. Where is the accountability to students if you are not locally appointed by the families you represent? Rural schools voices are not heard not this will make it worse. There is no cost savings attached to any of these proposals. Not a good way to make a decision when u don't have all the facts... Dan Perrins' letter of transmittal states that no one is in support of his findings . He states himself that a local voice is what the province wants!! It has been 10 years since the last amalgamation and you finally feel like things are moving forward. Don't stop that progress and make us start over... Who will the disruption hurt? Our kids.

Catholic education in the province of Saskatchewan has made a huge impact on what makes Saskatchewan the great province it is. Thank you for considering to continue this service by the Ministry of Education. Considering the long term plans, I believe it is very important to involve the community (parents) in consultations as you are doing right now. The parents are the FIRST and most important step in the education process. Please continue listening to the Moms and Dads of this great province.

After reading through your report I appreciate your thoroughness. There needs to be greater accountability of people to their role if employment. When I, mere mother of children attending school, hear rumour after rumour of superintendents age management taking unreasonable liberties within their job/role I get concerned. These are people making generally high annual incomes. Quite frankly, if I ran my privately owned business the same way I would go out if business. It's time for a reality check for all employed in education that as an individual you accepted a job, you must do that job, or be replaced. No one is indispensable and there seem to be many individuals who grow complacent in their positions. In this economic down swing there is more than ever qualified and willing people to fill positions. Secondly, a real evaluation of what education is delivered to our students needs to happen. Our graduation rate in the mid 70% is embarrassing and unacceptable. How are these individuals supposed to be contributing citizens after grade 12 when they really don't possess the minimum standard of education? We are failing our children. Perhaps less classroom hours spent on "who am I or am I bullied" and more emphasis on learning basic skills (reading, writing, math.) pushing a child through the system is far more harmful and long term damaging to the child than keeping at a grade level until they understand. I also realize my next statement will be unpopular and probably considered ignorant statement, I assure you that is not my intent. I am all in favour of integrating our special needs students into our classrooms, but at what cost? Cost regarding financially but really more so at the expense of the other students. I've been witnessing since grade 1 a large classroom with 3-4 special needs children, the handful of what I call disciplinary issues (students who are disruptive, don't stay on task, etc), the majority of children who are average students, and the handful of kids who find school easy. What happens to the teacher's time? Probably 70% gets spent trying to keep order and help the special needs students. The average students do not always get help in the area of their specific weakness, and the above average students just get left because they're meeting the benchmark. This is not fair to the students nor the teacher. Our resources and teacher strengths I believe could be better utilized to create a better learning environment for our children, our future leaders! I'd be happy to elaborate further any point I've brought forward and would welcome the opportunity to learn more or be involved in this process. Thank you for your time. Regards,

Creighton, Englefeld, Il a la Crosse are great examples of why school divisions need to be amalgamated. They run full Boards to run one or two schools. Fewer divisions would ensure consistency and many more efficiencies.

I would like to see the governance and control of the school boards remain at the local level. I would see a centralized model as a major problem and a step backwards for the educational system as a whole.

Although I am a school board trustee, and speak from that perspective, my comments are also influenced by my experience as a parent, a former senior educational administrator, and as an engaged citizen. Whatever may happen in Saskatchewan with regards to "transformational change", I do not wish to see elected boards of education replaced with appointed boards. Elected boards, the voice of the community, are accountable to those who elect them and are responsible for the decisions that are made within individual school divisions. As such, school division stakeholders have direct access to their trustees who are democratically elected and are invested in the well-being of their respective school divisions. Stakeholders have come to expect that their issues/concerns are addressed in a respectful and timely manner. If there were to be appointed boards, stakeholders would have to deal with unknown, distant officials who may have no particular understanding of, or commitment to, individual situations. While an appointed board would be responsible to those who appoint it, there would be little or no appetite on behalf of those appointees to challenge and hold the government to account. Such a scenario would be an erosion of the democratic principle of responsible and responsive government. As this is a principle we hold dear in Saskatchewan, I urge the government not to impose appointed boards of education on the same citizens who elected them to office.

Is anyone even thinking of the rural kids and what will happen if you amalgamate school divisions, close schools or get rid of our board representatives? NO YOU HAVEN'T!!!!!! Maybe instead you should be looking at yourselves. Can't imagine the wages someone with 40 years of experience, Premier, MLAs or Ministers are making. Instead of punishing the kids and the rural people you should take a closer look what will happen. How long will kids need to be on buses to get to schools if you are going to close schools. The province of Saskatchewan was all built on rural people not city folks. I didn't vote for the saskparty the last time and I sure as HELL AM NOT GOING TO START!!!!!! WHATS GOING TO BE LEFT WHEN THE WHOLE PROVINCE IS SOLD. WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO???

We are writing in regards to the Saskatchewan government's plan to change how school divisions are run in the province. We have a fantastic school division (LPSD) in Lloydminster and we would like it to stay that way. Our kids get a great education here. They deserve to continue to have a great education here with LOCAL people in charge who actually care about what happens to our children. If our school division is part of one whole division in the province, or a bigger division elsewhere, where is the accountability? No one is going to care about the education our kids receive and what happens in our community and in our schools. School divisions need to stay the way they are now – LOCAL! School boards should absolutely be elected and not appointed by the government, as there is no accountability if they are appointed. Parents have the right to vote in their school board and have a say, so they can trust in who is making decisions on their children's future. Changing things is only to save money, not to make things better for the students! Our children deserve the best education they can have because they are the future of this country! What happens to all of the taxpayer dollars in this community if these ridiculous changes are made by the Saskatchewan government? Lloydminster taxes should stay in Lloydminster! Because of the unusual situation in Lloydminster where there is funding from both provinces, this is going to mean big changes and be detrimental to the school system in Lloydminster and students who live on different sides of the border. We live in Alberta, so will our kids be better or worse off than kids across town? All of the kids in this community deserve an EQUAL education where decisions are made LOCALLY. Overall, the changes the Saskatchewan government are proposing will have a negative impact on the quality of education that children in Lloydminster will receive. As our elected MLA, please stand up for the students of our community and fight these changes. Sincerely,

I believe teachers have always led change as the nature of our profession involves working with children and therefore necessitates the need to be on a perpetual continuum of flexibility and forward thinking. I do not believe bigger is better. Go back to the stakeholders to find needs and not in response to a 38 page report. Things always look good on paper. It always works on paper. Making it happen in the geography of our huge division is already stretched for the five year old on the bus, the teacher in the classroom in front of students, the admin ordering paper and janitorial supplies, the technology needs, the geography of bussing, inter professional meetings, extra curricular events, PD events, and division events for students. We absolutely do not need our divisions to be larger. We do not need less contact with those making decisions that impact our daily lives. We do not need our local SCC having less voice about their communities. We do not need less subject offerings due to someone "out there" making staffing decisions based on staffing based on number of students per square foot. It will simply stress staff already at the tipping point of time and energy they can give. You are going to lose the expert teachers who are the work horses already. This move is not what is best for students. And that should be the only reason changes are made.

I believe that Catholic education is a vital part of the education of children, this gives them a great foundation to help guide them to adulthood. Please keep Catholic education a option for people to choose for their children's education. Thanks

This decision needs to be investigated further before it is implemented. What is the reasoning behind this move? If it is strictly money than the proposed financial benefits should be made public before any drastic desicions are to be made. I would like to see how this will actually save money? We have already done this scenario of enlarging the school divisions. Has it saved money? We are not a health region where patients travel to major cities to see specialists. Will most of our specialists spend the majority of their paid time on the road while our students are rushed through? Who will look after the various needs of our diverse communities? Will a CEO be interested in how the money allocated to schools and the programming affects students and teachers or will they simply be looking at schools as numbers? Will a CEO come into all of our schools to get a sense of the needs of all students in the various communities? How with huge school divisions will this work? If all of the administrators are in one center, our tax dollars will be spent on vehicles and travel for these admin people to come to our schools. They will be paid top dollar to drive for hours to visit for minutes. How does this save money and improve schools?? I think a lot more thought and discussion with school divisions, schools and parents must happen before this is pushed through.

Being a parent of children who attend a rural school, as well as being an employee in a rural school, I understand how different our needs are from those of our urban counterparts. It is far too easy for small rural schools to get swept in with the masses. It is very important that we have representation from people who understand what our needs are. We can only be sure that we will have this voice if we maintain the right to elect the individuals who sit on our school boards. Some very great people have been educated in rural schools. We have a very high percentage of graduates who go on to receive post secondary education. If we are to continue producing great people, our needs, as small schools, need to be recognized.

To the Advisory Panel regarding governance changes to the Education System in Saskatchewan. The _____ is writing to you to express our concern over the proposed changes to the governance of the provincial education system. The members of the _____ are in favour of elected school board representatives and of maintaining school division boundaries at their current size. Locally elected boards matter. Local board representatives work and live in the communities they serve and have strong ties to the school and the community. These elected representatives are in the best position to make decisions in the best interest of students in their area. They are also in the best position to connect with parents and local community members. Our school division, Prairie Valley School Division (PVSD), has made tremendous strides in the last 10 years since its creation in the areas of programming options, facility improvements, technology upgrades, leveled literacy intervention and student achievement results. We feel our school division is at an optimal size to provide a wide range of programs and services and still have board representatives who are close enough to our school community councils to make decisions in the best interests of our rural students and communities. We do not want to see school division amalgamations which are disruptive, costly and time consuming for staff and administrators. We want focus to be maintained on students and the issues that matter to our students such as reading, writing, math, and strong student outcomes. We want the highest amount of school division resources as possible to be directed at student learning. There are unique challenges in rural areas and we fear that large scale school board amalgamations would not be in the best interest of our students. PVSD has developed creative ways to deploy services across our 27,000 square kilometer area. Amalgamation with urban centers that do not face the same challenges as rural centers is not in the best interest of students. As parents and community members we do not want to see centralized decision making. Our priority is the learning achievements and student outcomes of our children and we fail to see how larger school divisions or appointed board representatives will meet our students' needs in a better way than they are currently being met. Without further information on the reason for proposing governance changes or the intended outcomes that are expected to be achieved from governance changes we cannot support any change at this time.

School Community Council

I took the time to read the report that Mr. Perrins has submitted. There is one glaring and egregious omission. At no point has this review mentioned Home Educators as "stakeholders". It is my understanding that there are in the region of 2200 students registered as homeschooling in our province...how is it that they have been completely overlooked in this process?! I would respectfully ask three things: 1) That SHBE (Saskatchewan Home Based Educators), as representatives of the homeschooling community, be counted as a "stakeholder". 2) That the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for the use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students...at the moment there is a decided lack of transparency and accountability. 3) We would ask that any model chosen would be transparent and include the participation of home educators. Thank you for the opportunity to be involved in this process.

Preferred option in Dan Perrins' paper is option #1. Second preferred option is #2. Lower costs, greater efficiency, greater effect Needs, greater accountability.

I don't agree with amalgamation. Our rural schools and communities need a voice. Having a larger school division than we already have worries me. I do understand the fact that cutting back on division board members may need to happen, but somehow we need to keep a voice to fight to keep our small schools alive. I do think we have a great director and team at the division office right now. As it is with our large division we don't see them in the rural areas much, but with technology they do keep everyone informed with division news and make time to come out when needed. It concerns me if it was any bigger than it is how much that would change. One other thing, no matter what the decision is please don't start shutting down our small town schools so the students have to travel many miles to get to school, or start cutting teachers or EA supports! They are the most important to what really matters here and that's ultimately the students and their learning needs!

I am simply contacting you because I have some concerns regarding the direction of education in our province. I understand that these are difficult times and realize that the government needs to make cuts to keep our province economically viable. However I am concerned by the suggested restructuring and the rapid rate decisions are being made. What I am concerned about is how these changes will affect students. While I hope the changes will not affect class sizes, I'm not so optimistic for specialized services such as occupational therapists and speech and language. We have been very fortunate that in Lloydminster we have these specialists on hand. However if division sizes drastically increase will our children have to wait longer to receive these services? We have also enjoyed having a school board that is locally elected. I worry that if school boards become appointed positions they will lose touch with the community and become more accountable to their "bosses" in the government. I thank you for your time and hope that a decision is reached that lives up to the standards we have grown accustomed to in our education system!

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the excellent report on options for governance in education in Saskatchewan. I am a retired senior science teacher.

Students are the ultimate stakeholders in schools and to set ESSP goals to increase collective reading ability, math skills and graduation rates are commendable. I believe it is important to remember that education here is designed to do that through curricula which have outcomes and indicators for classes but ultimately for individual students. We have some excellent curricula in Saskatchewan. I was involved in the writing of new grade 11 science curricula and found the collaborative process inspired the development of a comprehensive new approach to teaching current science disciplines. The writing broke down school division boundaries. We considered students, the knowledge and experiences they should have and; the teachers, and how they could deliver the curricula efficiently (in the time allowed) and effectively (contributing to those graduation rates within 3 years). The difference in implementation, it seems to me, came at the division level where some directors and superintendents chose not to switch to the new curricula when others did. No doubt some teachers were anxious because the new curricula were so different but those fears were dissipated quickly in divisions with good leadership and sound implementation. It seems to me that there are a lot of layers between the Ministry of Education and the students of Saskatchewan. Perhaps fewer school divisions is a good idea. We must always remember that the task at hand is to deliver quality education to those who in the future will be contributing members of society, making informed decisions. We have very well qualified teachers. I noticed an increase in level of education and professionalism during my career. Teachers are connected to students, parents, families, and communities. They have a role to play in bringing that context to the decision-making process. They simply need to be asked. The school boards of the future in Saskatchewan must be equipped with the skills necessary to think sustainably about the next generations of our province while considering the social context of current school areas. There is value in considering that appointed board members could be selected for necessary skills however it could narrow the perspectives at the board table. Therefore, from the options presented in the report I would still think boards should be elected but there should be fewer school boards or fewer board members. I would also add that teachers should be respected for the local knowledge they have and consulted with; their participation is important. The students of today will be expected to compete globally in the future. Given the social structure, economy and development of this province we should be able to set them up to be competitive with any jurisdiction. Some of the curricula still on the books in the province are outdated. It is my opinion that the Ministry of Education should no longer support the older curricula and they should find funds to keep core curricula updated. New content areas, topics and strategies will contribute to improved success in reading and graduation rates. This is not a division by division issue. This is an example of the need for fewer divisions to contribute to a more efficient and effective delivery of education. After carefully considering the options I prefer Option 1 or 2. A high level of transparency will be required, communicating change from the Ministry, CEO and Board levels, to the teachers in the classroom who can then align with new directions. There should also be an invitation for increased communication in the other direction where teachers can provide feedback to decision makers, including school board(s).

Options 3A and B would seem to be the best answer for the students - less disruption while maintaining a system that allows for kids and staff to be people rather than numbers and scores.

Our province is vast and has many schools as well as different cultures in the different areas. It is much too vast for one or even 4 divisions. Realigning the divisions to even out areas may not be a bad idea and will least affect many schools and students.

After going through the amalgamations in 2006, it would appear that there were not any significant cost savings. That being said, the public is still able to hold our school boards accountable and provide feedback. School divisions cannot be "cookie cut". There are different challenges between the urban and rural. Within an even larger school division, these differences may not be addressed and students will lose out on the education they need and deserve. I would hope the Government of Saskatchewan would reconsider and opt for other ways to save costs.

Please be inclusive of the home education system, which is continuing to grow and increase in popularity. It is also important to thus include SHBE or Saskatchewan Home Based Educators Board of Directors in the discussions and planning related to the improvement of educational governance and administration. I would ask for complete transparency in decisions regarding home educators, as well as the appropriate authorities to be accountable to home educators in the area of provincial funding. Thank you.

I believe that we need to keep the School divisions the way they are right now. The RCSD has been financially efficient and we are experimenting success with our students. We have strong values and we cater to the needs of our students.

I have found Imperial School to provide excellent service in all aspects. It is well operated, and maintained. My son gets more than enough attention, and academic attention to improve his marks since moving here, and enrolling him into class. I feel that the administration and staff are doing an excellent job, and will agree with whatever choices and decisions they see appropriate for our school programs. My child has had a few special needs to improve his learning experience and the improvement I see in his abilities is proof that they are definitely doing their best to further this. He enjoys school, he stays healthier, he has enthusiasm; all new to his attitude since moving here and starting classes in this school. They have their priorities straight, and are good at working with parents, and as a cohesive unit to provide meaningful education. In one sentence: Keep up the direction because it works. Respectfully,

When deciding on education reform the number one factor that should be used to make decisions is "How will this affect students in the classroom?" As a teacher I think there are far too many consultant and coordinator positions. If half of those positions were gone I don't think I would see a difference in my classroom at all. I don't want to see these people out of work. However, I think through the process of getting rid of teachers who are retired and taking positions on temporary contracts (double dipping) and replacing teachers who retire in the next few years with current consultants and coordinators there would be enough positions for them to return to the classroom and deal with students directly. This could also help to reduce class size which would have a positive impact on student learning. I also see far too many middle managers. For example, if a floor in a school needs to be waxed the principal should be able to go to the head caretaker in the school and talk to him or her. It should not have to go through someone at the division office to get done. The principal should have more control of the building within their allotted budget. Finally, the elimination of the school boards would have very little impact on student learning. Our school board members alone have expenses of over \$350 000 (I have heard some school boards have expenses in the \$700 000 range). School boards have very little decision making power and their influence over policy, beyond hiring the director, is minimal. Finally, the duplication of services between the catholic and public school boards is very inefficient. Through the education act the catholic schools cannot be eliminated. However, there is no reason to have two school divisions in this part of the province with two sets of office staff. Holy Family could be amalgamated with South East Cornerstone with one superintendent who would oversee only the catholic schools. Again the loss of positions (secretaries, payroll, etc) at the division office level will put some people out of work but if changes are implemented over a few years these positions will be eliminated by retirements not layoffs. There could also be some early retirement options.

I am very concerned with the path that the Government of Saskatchewan may be heading down with regards to changing the governance of the 18 public school divisions. Lloydminster is a very unique and diverse city that has many positives with it being in both provinces. Because over 60% of the students in Lloydminster live on the Alberta side, we receive funding from the Alberta government. Also, because we have schools both on the Alberta and Saskatchewan side of the city, each school is treated the same due to the plan the city and the provinces have established in the past. It is not fair to the students of Lloydminster to have this changed by establishing new school divisions where LPSD no longer exists in its current state. On another note, appointing board members is a scary road to travel. We live in a democratic society and we demand that we are governed by representation by the people. Do not appoint board members as this totally removes the public's say in education, which is one of two major things we hold dear in our province. I am very concerned with the different options being considered for changes to our school governance. This is especially true in how it relates to Lloydminster Public School Division. We currently have a seamless delivery model that allows us to provide services to students regardless what province they live in. This is very important to maintain and would be in jeopardy if we are asked to amalgamate. Finally, the issue of appointing versus electing board members is an easy one. We live in a democratic country and province. Therefore it is essential that school boards be elected. I hope the Minister and others who are making these decisions can see the difference between appointing and electing. I also hope that they take into consideration the unique situation that Lloydminster has.

Our council is concerned with the idea of having appointed board members vs elected board members. With elected board members, we feel that we have more of a voice in rural Sask, as opposed to government appointed members. Having one school division could be detrimental to rural communities. One main concern is how funding will be distributed throughout the province, ie: city schools vs rural schools. The needs for rural schools and city school are different and therefore they should be kept separate. We feel as though with one school division we (rural schools) could get "lost" in the big scheme of things. The _____ strongly opposes this amalgamation and hopes that the government hears our concerns in RURAL SASK.

I don't believe amalgamating the school divisions will be beneficial to the rural communities. We need our board members, they are the voice of all of us concerned. I feel rural communities will suffer if the divisions are amalgamated.

I can only speak to our own school division, NLS D. I am writing as a parent with two children in NLS D. I feel that currently this school division is too big. The students of this school division would be better served if it was reduced as the geographical area that it covers is much too big. This means that often administrators and consultants have to do a lot of travelling which is very inefficient and cuts into the time that they could be doing their actual job. It means that less children get seen and that processes take a long time to be implemented. I feel that for all the school divisions in the province, each school division should only cover about a 2-3 hour radius from the centre of administration for that school division (this may be slightly extended in the North but even in the North you can increase the number of school divisions). For instance, NLS D, should at least be split into two (west side versus east side). Sandy Bay should be placed with the Creighton School Division and Cumberland House should be in the neighbouring school division (which it is actually closer to it than La Ronge). There should be more funding for consultants such as SLPs, OTs and Ed Psychs. In fact, instead of having consultants that are privately contracted, these positions should be employed positions (like the SLP positions in NLS D currently). This means that these professionals will live in the community rather than travelling in from somewhere else. This will cut down on the amount of money and time they are paying for these consultants to travel. This will allow them to see more children. There may be times when it is difficult to employ these professionals and in this situation it will be understandable to get private consultants in for a fee but this should not be the first means of filling these roles and the division needs to have an ongoing recruitment strategy in place rather than "giving up" that they can recruit to these positions. There needs to be more funding for children with learning disabilities with quicker assessments and more staff in place to follow through with recommendations.

I do not feel that Option 1 of the Perrins report would give school system stakeholders an equal voice. As I understand it, there would be one public system with little or no autonomy, but we would continue to have 9 separate systems with local levels of autonomy. Is that fair? Is that equitable? Horizon School Division has undergone many changes. We have a focus on collaborative practice, a Pre-K to grade 12 focus on effective literacy assessment and instruction, and our schools have seen a renewal of technology. We have also rebranded and changed our website and our school division logo. In so many ways, transformational change has been an ongoing practice at Horizon School Division. Will this amalgamation truly be in the best interest of the students we serve? Or is this a plan of the government to completely control the level of education they deem our students deserve? Please suspend this talk of transformational change. Leave our school divisions under the influence of elected board members giving all stakeholders a voice in our children's education.

For Saskatchewan schools, bigger is not better. The last amalgamation took us from close-knit, relatively efficient units to a corporate model that was more impersonal, and where human relations mean less. In education, human relations mean everything. With amalgamation, there were supposed to be efficiencies, especially financial. If there were any, they were offset by new inefficiencies that come with geography and the corporate model. One intended goal of amalgamation was to level the playing field when it came to the various taxation (mil) rates across the province. And then the current government removed that taxation system (school boards no longer had any control), making the main goal of amalgamation moot. It would be better to leave things as it (possibly small geographical adjustments that follow some logic). Further amalgamation will likely further erode overall job satisfaction as the disconnect becomes greater, which could, in turn, erode overall school climate. Further amalgamation will not improve the quality of education in Saskatchewan. When it comes to things like shared resources, for example, current school divisions have the ability to partner. Further amalgamation will not save money. As learned from 11 years ago, any efficiencies will be offset by new inefficiencies. No one has ever, to my knowledge, presented evidence otherwise. If there are clear and logical cost-saving measures that will not affect the quality of education in Saskatchewan, it should be possible to achieve these without restructuring. The concept of further amalgamation is misguided. There is perception and then there is reality. It will not improve the overall quality of education, and the only way it will create overall fiscal efficiency is by harming the overall quality of education. If further amalgamation is what's best for our children, it would have happened during a positive economic climate. The fact the current report and proposals hurriedly came at a time where the province is becoming buried in debt suggests the possibility the provincial government is, at best, grasping at straws and, at worst, trying to deflect some of the blame for the current economic climate and provincial debt onto the education (and other) sectors. Smart politics. Bad for our children.

My concern with many of the changes that have already happened and those that may still come, is that even though it is stated that students come first, that is not the way it is. Unfortunately, when people who have not recently worked in a classroom make decisions for the classroom, it does not work. I don't think that losing local control and making things even bigger can help our classrooms.

I want to start out first by acknowledging that I do not have a child currently in the high school. With this being said, I want to extend my concern over the construction that is slated to begin this January in the High School. I do not understand why school projects cannot be conducted during the summer months when the kids are not in school. In discussion with staff and parents from Hague and Osler, this construction is very disruptive to the class environment. It seems that I am 'sold' new curriculums every couple years on the basis that "this is what is best for our children's learning" (which I do not believe for a moment. If we really were teaching our children in a beneficial format, Mcdonalds and Safeway would not need to have automated change counters and our local city newspaper would not have to be written at a grade 6 level for people to understand.) If we are truly concerned about a child's development, perhaps we should consider what implications constant construction background noise has on their ability to focus, and retain information in an efficient manner. Hey perhaps another multimillion dollar study would be a great idea here! The government sure loves it's studies. Further to this, I have been informed that there is a very good likelihood that asbestos will be found during the construction and need to be handled. I used to work in the construction industry and understand that the areas are sectioned off and everything is done with the upmost care I am sure, but I as you why take that risk? If we actually wrote labor contracts with teeth and imposed penalties, or fines to a contractor, maybe we could actually get the job done within the summer months and not have to disrupt the children's learning process. One that I am told repeatedly, is very important. This isn't an isolated issue either, nor is it a new issue. The school has been in disrepair of some time now, and it has been known to the parents, the board, and the Government. So when things are decided to be done suddenly, and with the knowledge from surrounding schools that "one month" normally means six to eight, I grow concerned about the system and just who is overseeing these projects. In the private sector, I cannot imagine quoting a job to last one month and having it extend 8 times the projected end date. Clients simply would not allow it. So why does it appear to happen repeatedly within the government? Make the scope of your contracts realistic, and have some actual leverage on finishing the job on time. Thank you for your time.

In the 4 years I have been here, I have nothing but nice things to say and thoughts about the schools and teachers in the district... I would like to see Drama and Band continue to be part of the curriculum... My son who is now in Grade 11 has level 2 Autism. As he has become more sociable and realized what his career goals are, the school got him involved in Drama to help him work towards designing movie sets and characters. And my daughter in Grade 9 enjoys band and is looking towards music as a field of study. Keep up the good work

We understand changes are being considered in our education system and we hope you understand and value the local voice and listening to the community. Education belongs to community and we want you to know that we support Saskatchewan school boards and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature. We need to keep our school boards locally elected; and, We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

I believe that we should keep the school boards locally elected, and not government-appointed.

Our oldest child is now 30 and our youngest child is 7. We have had kids in school for more than 20 years and have adapted to three school division amalgamations and our local school closure during that time. I currently serve on the School Community Council where my children attend, and was the chair of our School Board for 12 years until it's closure 11 years ago. My entire experience of rural education has been one of doing more with less. As the boundaries increase to take in more schools and bigger geographical areas, our needs as a small school become less and less a priority to those preparing budgets and deciding on capital projects. We are expected to drive 268km one way to attend our kids sporting tournaments. With services centralized, our busing and specialized student services are already organized and administered 145 km from our local school. The cost of education is an investment in the future of this province. Every dollar spent here, is a dollar saved in the justice system and social services sector down the road. I know, because we have been a foster family to more than 60 children over 18 years. If the provincial government is experiencing the need to tighten spending, may I suggest you look elsewhere. Funding for education has been being squeezed and clawed back continually since our oldest child started school 25 years ago. Teachers work loads are increasing to no longer encompass teaching specifically, but to include breakfast programs, after school programs, supervision and extracurricular expectations. They are paid a pittance compared to their value in my opinion. If there needs to be spending cutbacks, keep your fingers out of the change purses of schools and staff across this province. Start investing time and money more wisely, but investigating other sectors who have yet to feel the pinch of financial restraint. Education has been dealing with that reality for as long as I've had kids in the system. Respectfully

Hello, Just voicing my opinion. I am satisfied with the current Provincial public school Divisions and having elected boards as opposed to provincially appointed ones.

In analyzing the Educational Governance Review Report by Dan Perrins, I could identify many concerns. As a parent in our province, I believe that human resources are the most essential part of our school division. We need competent, engaging, caring teachers and adequate staffing levels. I think that the Greater Saskatoon Catholic Schools (GSCS) currently deliver strategic direction, are effective and efficient, have accountability and transparency, encourage participation with equity. I have very legitimate concerns that combining a Catholic school board with a public school board would tremendously reduce communication between the board and community. As a member of the public, I believe that I should be allowed access to the decision makers and an assigned board would not have the same investment in the lives of our children as would a board that I vote in. Elected boards are the only effective way to represent the local voice. I do not support amalgamations of boards but that Saskatoon's two boards could find ways to work together, as can be seen being done now with joint use schools. Schools are the backbone of communities and I agree that student outcomes need to be at the forefront in our discussions, however local autonomy is also very relevant and important. Christianity is the very reason why I send my children to Catholic schools in Saskatoon and this faith based education system needs to be protected.

It has taken me a long time to think of what my comment is on restructuring our education system. I have worked in the school for 20 years. We are a small town with just over 200 children in our school. When our divisions were changed over 10 years ago our school suffered. We are the very tail end of the Division and tend to be forgotten about. So that being said perhaps change will be good. When I look at Option 1 I am very concerned that once again we will be forgotten about because we are a small town and our needs once again will not be met. We have a hard enough time with communication now with the size of our Division. What will happen when all school boards are consolidated into ONE!! YIKES!! Option 2 and Option 3 are alright as long as the geographic area is not dividing our farm families to travel far distances to school and not forcing our small town schools to close. I am in favour of restructuring our divisions because of the fact that there are way too many positions in Division offices with high pay. That money is really needed to support our children's learning directly in the schools. For example more teachers and support staff are desperately needed with so many diverse needs that are in each school. Every year there is an increase in our student population with higher needs that are not being met. Therefore these students as they become adults are unable to function in the real world. Like I said before CHANGE can be a good thing and I hope that it benefits our children's future!!

I am a mother of four children and I never heard of activity fee for school age children, besides their school fees. Some parents can barely afford school fees never mind extracurricular fees. Thanks.

I teach ELA 20 and 30 . When it comes to education the jargon, best practices, assessment strategies, instructional frameworks etc. can create a lot of discussion and provide endless avenues to explore. Now that I am 2 and half years from my retirement, I see many things in schools, in students and in families differently than I once did. I have also seen a dramatic change in our lives over the past several years. Simplicity is the new key to success in our society now. The noise from media, the screen time from computers and smart phones etc are overwhelming administrators, teachers, parents and particularly students. An excellent example of this will be how many concerned individuals will actually submit their views to this process. I expect it to be a relatively low number...people are too busy, overwhelmed or fatigued. I think Simplicity means: a straight forward curriculum. My ELA curriculum is a vast document I can never hope to accomplish well. And I am experienced. There will be a few teachers who can do it justice...but the curriculum needs to be a simple technical document that many educators can execute in a consistent manner. Finland uses a simple Math curriculum for all of high school etc. I cannot speak for other curricula beside ELA. I noticed the Alberta ELA curriculum is very similar but one simple difference is how it does not distinguish between the five strands as much. Simplicity means schools locally managed by the principal who, in the past was hired to do so. The overall goals and mission statement of the division (or a division) can be the overarching goal, but professional administrators can manage their own schools without superintendent of student services, facilities, etc. if the RESOURCES are available to the principal. Is hiring a local plumber the few times one is needed actually more expensive than managing plumbing on a 42 school basis? I don't know that answer. Simplicity means having professionals such as counselors, speech pathologists available to schools and students in a timely fashion. And perhaps the only way to free up the funds for that is the elimination of Central Office staff. Simplicity means teaching students basic strategies for learning and applying their learning, without filling out a 100 forms about everything else. Simplicity means following through on an educational plan for 5 to 10 years before changing everything again. Simplicity means looking at systems that seem to work at the PISA level like Alberta and apply the knowledge here. Simplicity means setting realistic goals for graduation...not unrealistic expectations when a significant portion of our population is aboriginal students who will struggle to graduate. Simplicity also means more money in the correct places is required to turn around our results. Simply cutting spending on education is too simplistic of a solution. Allocating money in the correct way is the key.

Hi there, I would like to comment on the changes being made to our Education in Saskatchewan. I believe we need our elected members. They hear firsthand, from the teachers and parents (people in the trenches) on what is going on and what is needed in the classrooms of our children. I would like to comment on speech language - My child, who was in Grade 2 last year, and needed assistance with a speech language therapist - received 10-15 minutes a month - yes, a month! And that I had to fight for after I paid out of my pocket for his assessment, etc. I pay my taxes, why do I have to pay for my child to see speech language therapists when they are offered in school up to Grade 4. This year, he is in Grade 3 and has not been seen by her to date. There is no money for it - therefore, our children do not get the help they need. This is just one example of Education requiring more funding. There are many out there - such as - children should learn English before they begin school. Having classrooms sizes of 30 children and if one or two cannot speak or understand English - the teacher takes all their time trying to help that child, no one learns. Having the government control the entire Education system would not benefit our children. Are you planning to visit each classroom, every day to see what the teachers and principals are dealing with? Are you planning to attend every budget meeting at the boards to see how difficult it is to cut money on items you know your children need, but just cannot fund? We will become a number and you won't have time for us. What is our world coming to when you cannot fail students, if they don't understand Math or English one year, the next is more difficult - how do they manage - how do they get into University? They don't get the work done, because in their older years they can get a scribe to take their exams, etc.? What is that? We need our government to come to the schools and see what is needed and what is going on in our schools. Come listen to the parents, teachers and principals. All I ask is that the members of the government physically come and visit parents, teachers, principals and classrooms and see firsthand what is needed. You cannot make such decisions from behind a desk. Thank you for your time.

After reading the report I have a couple comments to make and opinions to share. First pertaining to the Boards. I feel we are a little top heavy in this department. It's not the \$ they earn to do their job necessarily that concerns me but the number of board members we have in our school division. I like the comfort of having a local board member, a face you know, but I feel they could possible be in charge of more than 3 schools. The number of board members could be cut in half. I don't like the idea of an appointed board because we lose the voice of the people who actually vote for these board members. Acclaimed to me means a face I will never see in my school and decisions made without my voice being taken into account. Opinion on the choices of division amalgamations: I am frightened for many reasons if the ministry decides to amalgamate the province into one division. I feel the writing's on the wall due to the recent health care amalgamation and the want of the ministry of education for simplifying things by having the same boundaries. I feel a lot of rural schools will be on thin ice in closing their doors with a huge amalgamation. I know this is a cost saving measure in the big picture but at the cost of who??? Students, teachers, small towns!!! The ESSP will be at a standstill if an amalgamation takes place for the next few years which is a huge cost to student learning in our province. In our school alone we have seen great progress in the students reading levels in the past year since engaging in Fountas and Pinnell reading programs. Cost saving over time will occur if the ministry amalgamated into one huge division by closing the smaller schools (like the one I am currently employed in, like the ones my 3 children currently go to school at, and the one my husband teaches in!!) It scares the heck out of me to try to picture 5 years down the road if this goes through. I see a move, a career change for one, if not both of us, as well of a couple small towns hurting if they lose their schools. We have students come to our smaller schools from a local reserve schools because they like the small, close knit, accepting family we have here. We have families that have moved from Alberta because they like the small town lives and want their children to be part of a smaller school environment. I have a daughter graduating this year with mid 90's average. The guidance counselor has told her she would be great at education and should consider that future. My husband and I have actually steered her away from this career choice as the future of education in our province is sooooo uncertain!! The changes with the last amalgamation were hard enough let alone let's jump ahead and do it again tenfold. Bigger does not mean Better (or Cheaper)

I strongly oppose 'K-12 Education Governance '. What benefit or harm do students receive from this proposal as they are our priority? All our divisions have unique situations and are so different. How fast can major decisions be made if local contact is not there? What happens to professional support staff/special needs now determined by local need?

The amount of time and money spent on these "initiatives" to find efficiencies is a waste. A six person advisory panel would never have the amount of insight to effectively provide a recommendation on how to generate efficiencies within the provincial school divisions. Money is being wasted in all sectors of government and without proper management of these funds to start with; changing the structure will do nothing but negatively impact employees who are putting in the effort to save money and their customers (students, tax payers, patients, etc).

I would like to give my thoughts regarding discussions around amalgamation and appointment of Trustee's versus elected. On the topic of Trustee's, I feel the direction to appoint Trustee's for a predetermined term would be the most effective means of ensuring the educational needs of the students and what is best for a division is managed. The existing system does not allow a division to attract individuals with the specialized skill sets necessary to lead the Division in future strategic directions. This will also eliminate the "protectionism" that is often apparent in the existing model. On the topic of School Divisions, I believe there may be some benefits in amalgamation, however not to the degree which the Minister is indicating in recent media reports. A "one division" mandate would be damaging to the Province and prove in the long run, too costly and ineffective in promoting the best education delivery for our kids. There would be some definite efficiencies to be gained with the reworking of the boundaries presently in place. Suggestion of what this would look like are as follows: 1. The existing Northern Lights School Division should remain "as is". Given the vast geographical area this division encompasses and the unique features for delivery of education to a predominantly Aboriginal Community requires it to remain as is with support provided as required. 2. I see the benefits of amalgamating Northwest School Division, Living Sky School Division and possibly Lloydminster Public School Division into one. There is several areas of overlap in these Divisions with the population they serve very much intertwined throughout the area. 3. Likewise, Sask Rivers and North East School Division could easily merge given the overlap geographically and many of the population being drawn to the Prince Albert trading area. 4. Saskatoon Public, Prairie Spirit are also a natural fit given the demographics and geography. There may also be merits in looking to amalgamate Sun West and Horizon into Saskatoon Public due to similar reasons. 5. Good Spirit School Division, Prairie Valley and South East Cornerstone also should be considered as one division with boundaries re-drawn to move some of the schools closer to Regina to amalgamate with Regina Public. 6. Regina Public, Prairie South and Chinook School Division may also be a good fit as a possible amalgamation given again the trading area to Regina. As I work closely with every school division on their Risk Management needs, I would be more than glad to offer my assistance for any committee related work that may be deemed necessary and can be contacted at the above email at any time. I thank you for allowing us the opportunity to provide our input into this important initiative. Kindest regards,

I understand that changes are coming to the Saskatchewan education systems by means of transformational change. It is understandable to see how the provincial government is seeking to find ways to lower the deficit. Managing a one-billion-dollar deficit is a task that no one wishes to be handed. As an educator, I feel that eliminating local, democratically elected representation is not the way to decrease our deficit. I am an elementary teacher in Greater Saskatoon Catholic School and my own children also attend school in this division. As a teacher and a parent I have seen that the way children flourish and attain their full potential is when they are being well supported by those around them. The same is true throughout one's life. As a teacher and as a parent, I also am encouraged to reach my full potential when I feel valued, heard and understood by a board of education that I had a say in electing and that I entrust with making decisions that will impact me as a teacher, my children and the students I teach. Today's trend is to support local businesses, eat local foods and become involved in the community. Why then, is the provincial government moving in the opposite direction and against the natural human instinct we have to take care of those closest to us? Catholic social teaching stresses the importance of subsidiarity where matters should be handled by the smallest, lowest and least centralized competent authority. Catholic education has unique challenges in this ever changing, fast paced world. I feel confident having a competent board, of locally elected representatives; prayerfully consider what is truly right for the direction Catholic education. In my own personal experience, I have had the entire board of education come into my classroom in 2009 to observe a program I was teaching in order to decide if the program should be expanded into other classrooms throughout the division. I have had members of our school board stop me while I was out with my family and ask about my year as a teacher and inquire about my family. This means a lot to me. Sacrificing relationships in order to save money is not the way to go about this transformational change. We need to find ways that are not only good for the bottom line, but good for people. Sincerely,

Hi, I have read over the report and am very disappointed that a large stakeholder group has not been consulted. The home school community is nowhere to be seen in this report. This is a community of well over 2000 students in the province and they need to be consulted. This will especially be important going forward as various regulations are amended to accommodate whatever model is chosen. I'm not overly concerned about which model is chosen, only that home educators are consulted as this process unfolds. I suggest that a recommendation be included in the final report that home educators should be closely consulted prior to amending regulations and policies affecting this group. The best way to do this is through the Saskatchewan home school advocacy group "Saskatchewan Home Based Educators" (SHBE). Thanks.

I do not agree with amalgamating the school boards within this province any further. They are already operating at peak performance. By amalgamating, you are only putting up a front of trying to save money and are lying to the people of this province. There is no more money to be sucked out of our schools, they are in dire need of more funding. I know that each division works hard at cost cutting and this measure would only save you peanuts, if not cost you more in the long run! I also do not agree with removing our elected officials and making them government appointed. Many people have formed good working relationships with our school trustees that we have chosen by election. By making them appointed you take away our democratic rights and choice and give us someone who may not be fit for the position, and does not have our best interests at heart, but yours! Has this province become a dictatorship because it cannot manage money? There is no evidence that you, as a government, are doing the right thing here by the measures you propose, because you do not state your reasoning or the viability of any of these measures. The public is not this stupid and can see what is really happening here. I absolutely disagree with these changes to education in this province. This isn't the health care system. Do right by this province!

After reviewing the report submitted by Dan Perrins, I see several problems that will negatively impact learning in Lloydminster. Lloydminster is a bi-provincial city, and with it comes challenges that no other community faces. First, the school boards and directors from both LPSD and LCSD work tirelessly to provide seamless education to all students regardless of the location of the school or where the student lives. This is very complex, and simply cannot be done from outside the community. As a resident of Alberta, my taxes are placed with locally directed boards. The funds collected by residents from both provinces are used to provide quality and seamless education for Lloydminster students. However, the models proposed would take Alberta money and funnel it out of Lloydminster into student programs across the province of Saskatchewan. I strongly disagree with this practice, as would any taxpayer from Saskatchewan whose money was being used for student programming across Alberta. Only our local trustees have the capacity to properly disperse the tax dollars from both provinces towards student learning in Alberta. The Lloydminster Charter provides a funding structure to serve the educational needs of students in Lloydminster. The restrictions within the Charter ensure that Alberta funding remains in the City of Lloydminster. The City of Lloydminster administers a municipal levy to ensure equity of services to students across the city. The models being proposed by Perrins would undercut the services provided by the Charter and the levy, and set up a system in Lloydminster of unequitable and unfair services for students in Lloydminster, who may be missing out on educational services strictly based on which side of the street their parents live on. I strongly recommend that the Lloydminster Public School Division and the Lloydminster Catholic School Division be equipped with local school boards that can work with the City of Lloydminster to deliver the best possible education for the students in this bi-provincial city. There is no model within the Perrins report that can possibly address the complexity the Lloydminster educators face when trying to deliver funding, services, and education for students who live in two different provinces within a single city.

I am not comfortable with discussions and decisions being made in regards to the education of our children without the representation of those who chose to educate at home. There are many of us within Saskatchewan who have chosen to remain the primary educators of our children. I am highly disappointed that the report fails to acknowledge these students or their needs at all, despite making claims of Other Partners in Education, 'parent participation' or the ESSP to meet the needs of ALL students (not just those in traditional schools). To ensure our voices are heard and our rights be taken into account when crucial decisions are being made, I believe it is necessary for those who educate at home to have representation on the board(s), which impact the rights and freedoms for the parents and families who choose home education. Statistics support the positive role home-based education has in making successful students, it would be negligent for this to be ignored (See the Fraser Institute's report on homeschooling in Canada [2015], starting on page 10; this form would not let me link to the report) Therefore as a member of Saskatchewan Home-Based Educators (SHBE) I request the following: 1. I ask that SHBE be counted as stakeholder in these discussions 2. I ask that the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students and these persons be educated in the rights of home based educators. 3. I ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators. Thank you.

If the Shell school in Holdfast is closed, which is what would happen if this government follows the health care system, my kids will be on a bus for over 5 hours per day! This is just ridiculous. You will not save money and if you do it will come at the price of our kids education, for the new classrooms will be too full and kids will get lost! This is enough!!! Please think of the children, you have done enough damage already by closing schools, please come up with other ways to save money and leave the bloody kids out of it! Here's an idea, cut some spending and wages of our ministers!

As a Parent of a Grade 10 student I am very concerned with the proposal to further amalgamation of School districts. WHY? This does not look to be of any benefit to my family. Cost savings will be minimal. Local concerns will not be addressed in timely manner, even if there is a local sitting director from my area. Having appointed directors will increase the seemingly out-of-touch curriculum currently being offered.

I have paid my taxes and voted to support the Regina Catholic School Division. If I wanted my kids going to public school I would have sent them there and supported that but I didn't. The board of trustees should continue to be voted locally and not government run! Ecole St.Mary is over 160% capacity, the CSCC had to form a playground committee to fundraise for a playground so my _____ can play which likely won't be installed till she's long gone to high school! Still after all that I believe the Catholic school board is doing far more than our government would!

I am in full agreement with the SSBA and the school divisions in that school board members should be elected and that further amalgamation will not improve student outcomes or services to the students. Bigger is not always better and I feel that with further amalgamation community voices will go unheard with bigger school divisions and with appointed board members. I feel things are going well with the school divisions that we have and it should not be changed. Having recently learned that this government has also asked school divisions to freeze wages and look for ways to save money, like eliminating positions, to help with our province's deficit tells me this province is not looking at the best interests of our future which are our children. Cutting teaching positions creates larger classrooms which in turn creates situations where students do not receive the quality of education they should be getting and those who require extra assistance in certain subjects fall through the cracks. Education and health should not be the areas to suffer as we all require health care and all our children require good quality education taught by qualified good teachers who work hard to make a difference in a child's life

Our SCC is in full support of the move to a more efficient and consistent approach to education in the province. We also see the benefits to having less central office high paying wages, streamline accounting and payroll provincially, and ensure students have consistent supports across the provincial. One school division would be great.

I am in agreement with the 19 school boards that elected officials are the only effective way for boards to not just represent the districts they serve but also ensure government accountability, and vice versa, in the efforts to provide quality education to our children. I also believe that further amalgamation will only increase operating costs, potentially also resulting in the loss of proper representation of rural areas. A possible restructuring that accounts for changing populations does seem like a sensible step to take. To be frank, Saskatchewan's poor grade performance is a bit of a travesty, and cutting costs should be the last priority of the government when our children's education is already suffering. Finding effective ways to boost learning and test scores should be at the forefront of any government action or intervention. Living in Saskatoon, I am grateful to have the diverse schooling options for my boys that I do and I am sure they will thrive as a result. For far too many Saskatchewan families, this isn't the case and more needs to be done to ensure that all children receive a high-quality education regardless of whether they are urban or rural, francophone or anglophone, or in public or Catholic school systems.

I have home educated all 6 of my children, but my children have also enrolled in classes at our local high school, and two of them attended full time once they were in Grade 10. The oldest two are currently attending the College of Engineering at the U of S, and the third is one his way to the U of S next year. I am grateful that our education system allows parents to make educational decisions that best fit their children's learning styles and abilities. With the possible changes to administration and governance in education I would like 1) SHBE to be included as stakeholder in the discussions, 2) the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students, and 3) the governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators. Thank you for your consideration.

Each school board has specific objectives, missions, and goals. It is my firm belief that schools can be better run with a school board running a small group of schools rather than a large number of schools that are diverse. We need the personal touch of interested school board members. Local decision-making is paramount! As a parent and a teacher who has taught in several schools in both the Public and the Catholic School systems, I know that each school, each area, and each school division has it's own needs, purposes, individuality, mandates, heart. We DO NOT want to lose the differences in each of the school divisions, nor do we want to lose the ability to make decisions at a local level. Amalgamation to save money is the not in the best interest of our students and our communities.

Education belongs with the community, please. I do not support the amalgamation of school divisions and elimination of locally elected boards of education. I have grave concern that Government appointed boards of education would not have the governance and oversight required to ensure accountability to the communities that have unique needs.

I just found out about this, and yet this "discussion" period is going to close in a week? You need to give more time for such a huge decision. Give more opportunity for the more rural school's to find out about what this decision means for their kids, schools and community. I also do not think three weeks is enough time to decide the fate of Saskatchewan education. We live in a rural community. I want my children to be schooled in our own community and not shipped off on a bus to school every day. I want my children in a school with teachers that have time to actually get to know my child and to care about their learning. If our child gets injured at school, my time to attend will also be greatly increased. I am worried about what this "transformational change" will do to our school and by extension, our school division. If you redraw the lines for the school divisions, there will be unintentional consequences. For us, this could mean having our high school moving much further than they are now. Our school is small: less than 70 students in grades k-8. If you redraw the division boundaries and remove the limits now in place, then we would have no protection that the school will not be closed down based on enrolment. We are in one of the top 2 school divisions in terms of producing high quality educational experiences with the highest graduation rates. By almost every metric that you can measure by, our kids enjoy one of the best opportunities for success that we can provide.

Please do not shut down the elementary school in Bethune.

To Whom it may concern, As a parent of a student attending Vibank K-12 school I feel it is very important to keep separate school divisions between the rural and city facilities. Currently the student to teacher ratio is reasonable in most cases. The loss of funding over the last few years has resulted in less support staff, but joining forces with the Regina School District will not offer any relief for that. The bus times for rural students are no more than 45 minutes for any student, allowing students more time to rest and prepare for the day. Changing, or amalgamating districts typically results in closures. That in turn creates longer commutes for many families. We live on the prairies where we see the extreme weather on both ends. Extending bus routes for students not only means less rest, but potentially unsafe conditions for those looking at more than an hour commute to school due to vehicle break downs, accidents, etc. I cannot see any strong points here for amalgamating the school divisions. Finances are obviously at the root of this plan and while I realize necessary cutbacks and choices will need to be made, cutting back services and support for our children (our investment into the future of this province) isn't the place to start. Thank you.

To Whom it may concern, I do not support a 6 person advisory panel in place of the current Division board of directors. I do not support amalgamating school divisions. I exercised my right to vote for my chosen school division's current board of directors in the last civic election. This approach seems shallow minded at best. Seriously concerned citizen,

In 2006, there was an amalgamation of school divisions and the employees felt effects as they now belong to a larger organization where they will probably never know all their coworkers. But as they settled into their situation they realized that they do still have a human factor. They were still able to reach payroll or human resources if they needed assistance. They saw their schools repaired and maintained for their communities. Their locally elected board trustees still had a vested interest in THEIR students and what is best for them. When we are now forced into another amalgamation, be rest assured that our school division will no longer exist. We will be swallowed up and become part of the numbers game for the Ministry. Our work place will change, if we still have a job, as well as the services you have access too. Government appointed board trustees will no longer represent the voices in our communities. As an adult I can adapt and change but will this amalgamation truly be in the best interest of our students? These students who are my sons and daughter or the students I help and work with every day as an Educational Assistant. I heard that this was going to save 20 million dollars? I fail to see how this will happen? We have changed all our logos and spent time and money in getting "new" for the horizon school division, how is throwing all that away saving money? I like elected board members. As a mother, SCC member and an EA for division I have a good relationship with our board member and appreciate his input, time and support in our school. I don't want that to change. I do not agree with an amalgamation. I want to keep my children's schools' future in my own hands.

I understand that the Saskatchewan is looking to change the educational governance in the interest of saving money after a budget deficit of over 1bn. I say Don't do it! At best, you may save up to 10 or 11 million. Less than 3% of the budget; and that's only if everything goes according to plan. We could even wind up paying more after changes without in-depth research and major consultation with many professionals. Do not make a decision on something so important as our children's education simply as a reactionary measure to compensate for earlier poor decision making. Cut oil and gas subsidies. Stop funding new natural gas electricity power generating stations. Cut the funding to the coal scrubbers. Do not further touch essential social programs and services such as health care and education based on "potential savings".

Curriculum has changed so much in past 20 years that by grade 3, my child still does not understand time, money, basic math & reading. Why is this? Electronic forms of learning through iPads & laptops seems to start at too early of grade levels. Parents need to be notified more often by teachers of their child(s) progress even before parent/teacher interview times. I do applaud the teachers that make students accountable for their actions. Participation ribbons do not need to be handed out for play days, children need to learn early on that hard work is rewarded. For high school levels, school board should look into evaluating teachers if a large percent of the class average is down or students prefer to do that class online. Possibly more incentives are needed to entice casual bus drivers' employment or hire one person who drives buses any distance for repair. Thank you for placing pictures on buses as well as the # so young students can identify their bus easier.

We need to insure that the needs of all children are met! To do this, we must have teachers and teaching staff!

I am writing with concern over the many proposed changes suggested by Mr. Dan Perrins in his commissioned report, Educational Governance Review Report. While I respect that the Provincial Government, Ministry of Education, along with the boards and trustees have some difficult decisions ahead I do not believe that any of Mr. Perrins' options are serving our communities in their best interest. As an elected official myself, I recognize that decision making is not always easy. You can almost never satisfy one hundred percent of the public. However, we are elected to represent what is best for the majority. In my municipality I believe I speak for the majority in stating that none of Mr. Perrins' recommendations fair well for our public voice. I feel it will be a loss of voice in all of our smaller rural communities like my Village of McLean. Ten short years ago we saw a major restructuring of divisions by the Ministry of Education. Since that time we, as a community, have worked closely with Prairie Valley School District to establish a great working relationship with both our elected trustees and all employees within PVSD's administration. We have seen our student population rise by approximately 40%, our services within the school become more balanced, and the students in PVSD far surpassing provincial averages. Any further loss in numbers of districts or loss of elected officials could and would have large negative impact on these relationships and results. I want you to know that I very firmly back the views taken by Prairie Valley School Division and our Saskatchewan School Boards. I would ask that you take this very strong and clear message back to all members of our legislature: (1) We need to keep our school boards locally elected, (2) We need to keep decisions closer to our communities, (3) We do not support further amalgamations, and (4) We do not support changes to our subdivision boundaries. Thank you in advance for helping bring our voice to the legislature. Your support for our community is greatly appreciated! Sincerely, Mark Towers, Mayor of McLean

I would recommend option 3. Local voices being heard should be of utmost importance, cost savings should not be sought by such options where we as parents will lose connection to the people who are making such important decisions. Please consider that it is hard to quantifying what it is worth to be able to set up a meeting with your local director of education and have a discussion and believe that your voice is heard. I have in the past seeked out a meeting with our director and I believe I was listened to. Something I fear would be taken away if we start amalgamation of the school divisions.

Teachers wages may freeze yet school divisions continue to hire more superintendents and leads members (Prairie South, northern lights, horizon, gssd, prairie spirit...). Many divisions could have reduced costs with attrition but refused and some even added positions and worse yet cut teachers on top of that. This is a shame. There needs to be more accountability when this happens. One school division would ensure consistency in many areas. Many CEOs make over \$200,000 plus monthly expenses and pd. these costs can easily be reduced. Our current system is out of hand.

We send our children to school for the bulk of the day and trust that those in charge will do their best to provide a quality education to them. We should similarly be able to trust our school boards to have the best interests of the children at heart and there is no way we can do that when officials are appointed by the government rather than being elected from those we know that understand our community. Educational reform of any kind should never be left solely to the whims of whatever political party happens to be in power at the time.

We are the parents of two high school students at _____ in Saskatoon. I have been a member of the SCC at _____ for six years and now a member at _____. Being included in the goings on in the School and the Community has always been an important part of being a parent. There have been numerous situations where the SCC has been an integral part in helping to make decisions that affect us all. I have concerns of this (SCC) input being diminished in the future as Mr. Morgan's new plan unfolds. Please be aware that community voice is of utmost importance to the shaping of school life and education for our children. Although appointed committees give strength to the foundation of public education, it is mandatory that our voices continue to be heard. Thank you for your time,

Dear Panel Members: I understand changes are being considered in our education system. As a representative of the people of Saskatchewan, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community. The speed with which the government is moving, the lack of consultation and consideration and the possibility of forced amalgamations threatens rural communities and puts rural education at risk. Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support the Chinook School Division and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature: (1) We need to keep our school boards locally elected, (2) We need to keep decisions closer to our communities, (3) Amalgamations and major restructuring will set back learning and educational goals for many years AGAIN. With amalgamations or major restructuring, the focus is removed from students and refocused on creating a new model under new boards, (4) This would be the second time that forced amalgamation excluded Separate School Boards. (Separate school boards each have 7-10 members for lower numbers of schools and students), (5) If forced to choose an option in the Educational Governance Review, we would choose Option 3B, to keep the School Divisions as they are (with some minor adjustments to a few borders that need some correction). Provided that you do this with consultation as is stated in the report. This will have the least disruption to the system and will allow the School Divisions to get the focus back on the provincial educational goals almost immediately. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

Dear Panel Members: I understand changes are being considered in our education system. As a representative of the people of Saskatchewan, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community. The speed with which the government is moving, the lack of consultation and consideration and the possibility of forced amalgamations threatens rural communities and puts rural education at risk. Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support the Chinook School Division and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature: (1) We need to keep our school boards locally elected, (2) We need to keep decisions closer to our communities, (3) Amalgamations and major restructuring will set back learning and educational goals for many years AGAIN. With amalgamations or major restructuring, the focus is removed from students and refocused on creating a new model under new boards, (4) This would be the second time that forced amalgamation excluded Separate School Boards. (Separate school boards each have 7-10 members for lower numbers of schools and students), (5) If forced to choose an option in the Educational Governance Review, we would choose Option 3B, to keep the School Divisions as they are (with some minor adjustments to a few borders that need some correction). Provided that you do this with consultation as is stated in the report. This will have the least disruption to the system and will allow the School Divisions to get the focus back on the provincial educational goals almost immediately. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

Amalgamation of divisions is the most efficient decision for Saskatchewan at this time. We need to lower PTR in many classrooms and not increase central office staff. We need to eliminate the Board members who are taking the money that belongs to our students - directly in the classroom. We need to ensure our province runs on an efficient education system and there is work to do to move us to that. We need strong, relentless leadership to do this.

I think this is a terrible idea! The size and populations of the school divisions are the least of our educational concerns at this time! I have 3 children in the school system, and quite often I find myself questioning why I bother to send my kids to school! Nobody corrects them when they're wrong, kids that DON'T GRASP ANYTHING are not being held back, and there is NO DISCIPLINE! Kids who can't are told they can, kids who shouldn't are told that they should. Bullying is at an all-time high, and it seems more times than not, the VICTIM is the one who winds up in trouble. Leave the school divisions how they are, and let's focus on the REAL problems with the education system, PLEASE!

Hello: As someone who has participated in local school boards in Saskatoon recently, it is very clear that locally elected boards are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. They are important advocates for ensuring excellence in education. Those elected by our community to represent our community are best able to serve the needs of students-- who are unique to each division and even each school within the division. The decision to have the government take over this role is unfair and inequitable and needs to be reconsidered for the sake of our students. Thank you for doing the right thing. Sincerely,

I feel that I do not have enough information to give a solid yes or no vote. I would like to see 1, 5 and 10 year plan as to how this will look for the students and staff in each school. I would like to see how this will benefit the students and staff and would also like to see where money is being saved and where it is being put towards. I am also concerned as to how one director would be able to manage a whole province. I would hate to see the kids becoming a number of thousands of other students. Also, each school has different needs and I am having troubles seeing how a decision can be made that will benefit a province as a whole. Our school division has been involved in an amalgamation in the past and I have not seen a whole lot of pros in how it has directly benefited the students and the staff at the school level.

Hello I have kids in grade 1, 3, and 6 at _____ School and am concerned what is going to happen to their school. Our teachers bend over backwards for their students and have always made sure the kids are well looked after in their studies. I believe sometimes change is important. One thing I would like the government to look at is how long of bus rides kids will have to take. There are three schools around _____ all within 25 minutes. Why send those kids to bigger centers when you could make one other those schools the center for those towns. Our school just got a new gym floor and a new roof. I now other schools who have gotten that too. To me that will be a waste of money by the government if they decide to close a lot of small school. If the government is going to start closing schools to save money, I really hope they have the best interest of the children who will be our future and not short the children of a good education. They need a good structure to shape them into young adults or the future for everyone will be in trouble. Thanks for your time and good luck with the change.

My concern for the Lloydminster division is the unique situation we find ourselves in as a border city. As a former Comprehensive High School principal, I discovered just how unique we were as I attended the Comprehensive High School meetings. These meeting focused on Saskatchewan curriculum, policies, and proposals. I contributed in this area, but found that I came home empty handed regarding Alberta issues. The Lloydminster school division is responsible for approximately a 60/40 split of Alberta students and Saskatchewan students. I trust that the final decision will take into account this unique situation.

I vote for 3b.

I am appalled, disgusted and afraid of what our provincial government, people we have elected to take care of our province, our families and our well-being, is doing to our education system. I have been a supporter of our conservative government for a long time, but I am starting to question whether I have made the right choice. When the government I helped elect into office begins to threaten both my children's education and my family's livelihood, I can't help but feel angry and betrayed. I am honestly questioning whether my words will have any impact with a government that clearly has no real interest in listening to the overwhelming cries of its provinces' citizens to not do this to our children, or if my words will even be read. But I would be remiss if I didn't add my voice to the outcry. As someone who was educated in Saskatchewan, who has worked in the education system for almost 17 years, who has many friends and colleagues in education, and whose children have spent several years in the education system, I can tell you that bigger is NOT always better. Class sizes are already ridiculously high, and with the focus of special education moving from academics to behaviour concerns, many students who have minimal behaviour issues but who struggle to learn are falling through the cracks. This hurried report that was done in order to facilitate this move to bigger divisions shows that Saskatchewan is falling behind in many areas of academics; larger class sizes are not a way to remedy this. The trend we are seeing in our lower class/middle class culture now is that education is frequently not a priority for many families anymore. As such, the support from home is often minimal, and it falls on teachers and support staff to ensure these students are not left behind. How are they to do that when they are dealing with sometimes 30 students in one classroom, many of whom struggle with their learning, and many of whom live with various mental health issues and other cognitive impairments? In addition to this, the students who do not suffer from any of these set-backs to their education, the "normal" achieving students, also end up being denied their full potential as teachers are forced to spend more and more time trying to accommodate the weaker learners, leaving the stronger ones to learn on their own. This is something I have seen regularly in various classrooms in various schools. I find it almost humorous that a government of elected officials is proposing that moving to appointed school boards, rather than elected ones, is a better option. Many of you only have your jobs because the citizens of this province put you there. Now you want to take away our collective voice by appointing someone chosen by the government, instead of the people of this province, in a place to help oversee the education of our children. I hold a very personal stake in the proposed changes, as well. My family lives in the community of _____. My youngest son attends grad _____ in our community, while my oldest son is in grade _____ in _____ School. My husband has been an _____

_____ The changes that are proposed are going to be detrimental to my family in a very personal way, across the board. My oldest son, who is trying to find his footing in his first year in a new _____ school, will end up just another number in a sea of faces if schools are closed and more and more students pushed together. He is already having trouble keeping his head above water, and I know for a fact he is not the only one. If the province is so concerned with graduation rates, I can assure you that if he, along with many of his peers, loses the benefits of a smaller class size, the odds of him graduating on time will plummet. My younger son, who is academically inclined, will be one of those students left to his own devices because his teachers will have even more on their plates when more students with academic and behaviour needs are put in their classrooms. The

likelihood of him reaching his potential will certainly decrease. These children, and many others, are going to be the ones inheriting this province from us. Do we not want them to reach their fullest potential? The biggest impact, however, will be on our family as a whole. We are fully aware, having been through it multiple times now, that amalgamation means school closures.

Closing our school will most certainly affect our job situation. And we are not alone. When teachers and support staff start losing their jobs because our government decides that these small schools are “too costly” to keep open, how much money will truly be saved as we fight for what few jobs remain and the rest of us need government assistance to feed our families? This whole plan is extremely rushed, which leads me to believe that the government is not truly interested in what its people have to say. We know this province is up to its neck in debt, but money is not the only thing at stake here. How many other plans were looked at? How much time was spent trying to find the least invasive solution? And why does it always seem to be the health and education sectors that take the fall for our provincial financial woes? I do understand not wanting to pay multiple school boards, truly I do. And I can see how cutting teachers’ salaries seems like an easy and effective solution in the eyes of our elected officials who are trying to save the province money. However, our teachers have a ridiculous amount of work on their plates, from assessing, to planning for a variety of student needs, to grading their students, to the actual teaching of our children, and expecting them to do this for lower wages is unfair. I would suggest that before our elected officials consider something like that, they take a long look at their own salaries and question whether they deserve them for the work they do. If the answer is yes for you, it is yes for our teachers. I would like to say I am confident that our government will take care of us, but given the recent proposals, I can’t. I really do hope that our voices will be heard and listened to. Education has changed greatly since I was a student, and in my opinion not for the better based on what I’ve seen over the past 17 years, and I feel very strongly that a huge part of that is because of the increase in class sizes which is related to school and school division sizes. I truly hope that our government will do the right thing for our province, our families, and our children. Every person I know who is aware of what is going on believes that we will be let down in this situation, myself included. Every person I have talked to about this believes this government initiative will leave Saskatchewan with lost jobs, suffering families, and children who will fall through the cracks. I hope and pray that we will be proven wrong; that our government officials, who are supposed to look out for the best interests of everyone, especially our most vulnerable citizens, will listen to the people who elected them. I WANT to be proven wrong in this instance. Thank you for your time.

Get rid of school boards as they are a huge expense and appointed Boards might actually assist the Ministry when it comes to reporting. Get rid of one school, school divisions - control Director salaries - further amalgamate rural school divisions

In my mind, the amalgamation of school divisions across the Province or the change in boundaries, will greatly impact respective areas within the Province. Saskatchewan has varied cultural, economic and geographical issues that can be impacted by changes within the educational governance review. Areas such as Lloydminster in particular may see a dramatic shift in the program offerings which we now enjoy. The funding provided by our bi-provincial agreements can be severely impacted. We depend on a significant share from Alberta which may be significantly impacted by school board amalgamations or boundary changes or both. As such our program of studies within our city boundaries are funded by our tax dollars. A change in the formula to which school boards are allocated funds, will no doubt be affected. The potential change will result in an unfair playing field with respect to separate schools that operate within the border city. Centralized governance will contribute to a sense of disconnect with parents and their schools, and we would lose our say in matters that directly affect our children. All too often, decisions made by governments have a profound affect on future generations, thus we need to closely examine the potential repercussions of transformational change.

I am horrified to think that teachers' wages may be frozen when directors, superintendents, boards, managers, CFOs, continue to have wage increases and there are more jobs at central office and less jobs in schools. One division seems like the best idea. Amalgamate. Fewer divisions. Too many central office jobs (why do small rural divisions have a deputy director?), so many high paying managers, superintendents. We need to be more efficient.

There should be local representation that is elected by the people they represent.

As a teacher and parent, I feel the best decisions about education are made as close as possible to the teaching and learning environment. Our locally elected trustees are best able to determine the needs of our students and to provide the necessary resources for our schools. This is particularly true for our community of Lloydminster where both school divisions work together under our city charter to provide seamless education for all students, regardless of the province they live in. It is in the best interest of all students and communities that education decisions and governance are handled locally.

In response to the "Educational Governance Review Report Kindergarten to Grate 12" by Dan Perrins report I would like to voice my concerns, which primarily lies with the notion that bigger is always better. Let me first explain a little bit about myself, I am a

allowing my children the opportunity to walk to school. I grew up right here in what could easily be described as a typical small Saskatchewan town. In high school an opportunity arose and I attended

This will be my 10th year as a member of our local SCC, as well as many other volunteer organizations in the area. Overall I would consider myself to be a very reasonable well educated individual who genuinely wants what is best for my kids. That does not mean I believe that there should not be any changes to how they are educated, however. Similarly to the Perrins report I will outline some factors of what I have seen to be the results of the bigger, more consolidated governing bodies. Volunteers: There is just no substitute for genuine volunteers, and the less involved in the big picture governing people are the less they are willing to volunteer their valuable time and efforts. This ultimately results in much higher costs. Let me give you an example, as Horizon school division has continued to take greater and greater control of all spending done on a day to day level in small schools, the willingness for people to try to volunteer, with the intent of saving the school some money, diminishes. There was a time when all the grass cutting around the school, but not technical school property, as well as snow removal in the winter was done by local farmers and townspeople voluntarily. Now that it is not seen as a savings to our local school and rather the entire school division the volunteering has ceased and those services are having to be paid for. The fact of the matter is people are much more willing to do something the more direct impact it will have on them. Economy of Scale: There are some obvious advantages to having a larger purchasing power, especially when it comes to certain supplies such as paper, which is the same for everyone. This model starts to fall apart once it trumps all other concerns. A great example of this it the new busses being used in our school division, I can only image they where able to be purchased at a good price considering there is only one type of buss used, a large 48 passenger unit. Where the problem lies here is that there is absolutely no need for a bus of that size for the majority of the schools in the division. So rather than allowing the needs of the school be met efficiently now the entire divisions needs are trying to be met but, not effectively and probably at a greater expense. Comparison of other Juristictions: Throughout the report there are many references to the way other provinces are or have restructured their boards. Now I have to assume this was taken into consideration and just not put in the report, but there is no real attempt to be made to explain if these changes have had a positive impact on the students, not bottom lines, students! As I read the report I couldn't help but think of the old adage referring to jumping off a bridge just because someone else did. Quality of Education: This one is last but definitely not least. Lets not forget that thought the efforts to save money and centralize power that the ultimate goal is to educate children. As stated earlier it is not my opinion that no changes should be made either now or in the future. However it is imperative that the primary focus not get lost. I firmly believe that kids up to high school age could receive a quality education in a one room schoolhouse situation, especially with the advances in technology. Once kids get to an age where decisions will start having to be made about potential careers and life paths I can see the advantages of having larger schools providing the opportunities to better prepare for those eventual outcomes. In closing, I believe that there is no need for any radical changes to the way the schools are governed, if anything it should be dialled back allowing the most informed local representatives to be the ones to make decisions regarding whether or not to; close schools, amalgamate classes, share resources, etc. I sincerely hope that before any action is actually taken there will be thorough consultation with the most important people involved, parents and students.

Please don't take any more away from us rural people! We are far enough from city centers as it is. We already have to travel to the city for special medical/dental treatment. Our highway departments and shopping departments are located in the city. The RM's are getting larger and with less people. We have to travel for everything! Please don't make it any harder for our younger generation to grow up in a smaller community than it already is. Keep the education and administration local!!! If you keep moving the administration centers to the city, there is nothing left for the next generation to stay local for, we have such a low population because the young people want to go were the jobs are - and you just keep taking them away from the rural areas. By making the districts larger, it takes away the knowledge of local needs, it doesn't bring us closer with more resources, it forces the kids to go to the city.

None of these options will in anyway benefit students. None! These are children not numbers. Saving money by hampering a child's education is morally wrong. Please rethink this! Amalgamation has proved to not work in other provinces. We have a large rural base and those smaller schools filled with kids will get lost in the system.

I have no problem reducing costs and with some amalgamation, however I know what happens to local input as in my working days with I was part of a team that amalgamated 9 customer services from across Canada into one big centre in Winnipeg. That particular office had in the area of 240 staff desks and the thought by the very high up management was that everyone in that office should be able to handle every customers needs no matter where. The staff were all provided weeks of training BUT JUST FOR A MINUTE IMAGINE YOURSELF BEING FROM MONTREAL AND HAVING TO LOOK AFTER A CUSTOMERS PROBLEM IN CRANBROOK BC. Daaaaaaaaaaaaaa! Most didn't know where BC was much less where Cranbrook was and then what needs that customer might have. It ended up that we had to re-group the staff into looking after areas and then sometime special products. You are trying to do the same with the school divisions. I have no problem with a certain amount of amalgamation but please keep some local school board (or whatever you call it) input as each area has its own needs and problems. Parents need to have some input in their child's education and what happens in their community. To think that someone sitting in a big Regina office will know what the smaller schools in Kyle, Choiceland, Frontier, Gronlid, or Stoughton might need is dreaming. Their vision will only be of a school in the big city where there kids go and their decisions will be made accordingly. As in some school closure and school amalgamations under the NDP, you will end up with really stupid decisions like no toilet paper in the bathroom of a school but a whole room full of copier paper because someone doing the ordering had no idea of what was needed. (This really happened by the way) PLEASE BE VERY CAREFULL WHAT YOU DO WITH SCHOOL BOARDS.... IT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO OUR CHILDREN THE FUTURE OF THIS PROVINCE! Need money to balance the budget..... what about a ONE time "levy" on all businesses and tax payers (other than low income earners) in Saskatchewan BASED on their income? Our cities do it all the time to help pay for different things the community needs. I expect my comments will be NOT what you want to hear and also am pretty sure that it makes little difference as The Government likely has its mind made up anyway. Asking the people is just a smoke screen. ANYWAY, I was once employed by a large company which amalgamated its cross Canada operation to a centralized location and I can tell you it was not an improvement in operations nor did it help out our customers. In fact many of our customers were very upset with it because they were told beforehand how there would be a short time of adjustment and then services to them would improve. Mostly the short time became 2 years and the services never did improve and I expect still haven't to this day. Truthfully it became hell working there, even though I was in management, because our jobs became "handling complaints". I foresee much the same happening if you amalgamate the local school boards into one central location. The schools in the outlying areas will be forgotten as the staff in the centralized office will be city people and will never get to see the schools in Carlyle, Stoughton, Meadow Lake, Nipawin, Shaunavon , Frontier or the likes. These places will just be dots on a map.... if they even have a map to look at. IT IS NOT A GOOD THING for the schools, nor will it save the Provincial government any money. Then there is the loss of the local School Boards which will also be very detrimental to the schools especially in the outlying areas. ALL THIS FOR WHAT. It will accomplish nothing in my mind. Nothing but confusion and the poor children in the rural areas will pay a big price for this stupid idea. As you can tell I am VERY MUCH against this amalgamation.

I am in support of option 3A. I believe this will allow local voice to remain strong while allowing school divisions to continue in the strategic direction outlined by the province.

I was pleased to see that the report on governance options noted the unanimous support for elected boards and for maintaining the current number of school divisions without further consolidation. Elected boards are indispensable in ensuring that Saskatchewan's schools reflect the needs, and respond to the concerns, of diverse communities around the province. Consolidation should be seen as a non-starter: given the lack of further efficiencies to be gained from amalgamation and the trouble and expense of carrying it out, there is simply no compelling reason to proceed with major changes. The report makes a strong case against major changes to the provincial educational system as it is currently constituted, and I look forward to the government making the right decision on this file, recommending we stay with elected boards in 28 school divisions.

Our school Division is large enough. Students are falling through the cracks because of the shortage of help. Some students are piggy backing off of others because of shortages, and being in rural Saskatchewan, if we go to bigger school divisions, or to one province wide division then we shall certainly be left out more than we are now. Everyone's education starts at school, whether it is Kindergarten when they are starting to learn or whether it's on their last day of High School, we need to put the focus on our students, and those who help them get that education, so they are prepared for the world . Stop using all of the money at the "top" , stop taking the money out of us to fix your mistakes. Just like in Healthcare and the shortages of Dr's, MRI's, nurses and hospital beds, you are ruining the education system. You are ruining lives in healthcare and will do the same in education.

My biggest concern at this time is the governments rushed approach to amalgamation, if the goal is to consult meaningfully with all stakeholders, time, education and input is necessary to reach a decision that meets the needs of our students. I believe local democratically elected school Boards are the best choice for my community where local accountability comes from these boards making decisions based on students and community needs. Students deserve the same high quality education regardless of where they live, their social and economic status, language or ability. Class size and quality education with supports in place to aid in their individual learning needs as well their social needs are a necessity, we need to remember the importance of family and community, education is NOT a business. Education should be open and transparent, parents should not have to jump through hoops to get answers, personal connection is a must to engage both student's and parents in the education journey. I am not fearful of change, I actually look forward to it but I do believe we need to take the time and LISTEN so the path we take actually benefits everyone. I believe we have school divisions who have implemented progressive change and policy, these need to be considered and consolidated not disregarded only to be reinvented (with a lot of cost) 5 years down the road. I believe we need to be mindful of our dedicated employees who are front line workers for our students and their families. Positive working relationships, honouring agreements and protecting their rights need to be considered as well if we want to have a unified province. Our students are our future and we need to educate them in all areas to ensure we are providing them with as many opportunities as possible, they will be our leaders and will continue to make Saskatchewan strong and a desired province, short changing them will not benefit anyone. At this point if I was to choose an option I would lean towards 3a, expecting there to be elected boards and hoping that shared services would not be sparse due to geographic regions. I also would hope that when creating these regions there would be close attention to the type of community and school, examining there needs, demographics, challenges etc... before being lumped with schools who do not face many of these issues or not in the same capacity. The province needs to recognize the benefits of Community School philosophy and education and understand the need for these designations to be reestablished.

We have been fortunate to have members on the GSSD board over the past years that have been from our local area and understood the needs of our school. Making school divisions bigger would lower our chances of having someone who actually had ties to the schools they were in charge of.

After looking through the report submitted to Don Morgan by Dan Perrins, I found there to be no way that any of the proposed changes to the governance of education in Saskatchewan would actually be beneficial to students living in the bi-provincial city of Lloydminster, or any other part of the province for that matter. It is clear from on the onset that considering appointed board members and/or division amalgamation is not what the people of Saskatchewan want. As elected officials, the Ministry is to act on behalf of the people and moving forward with any of the proposed changes would not be acting in good faith of that. It is also clear that this move is being made strictly to save money, and is in no way an effort to actually improve our education system. Locally elected boards ensure that the they are in touch with community needs. In my division, I am fortunate enough to have my board members walk the halls of my school, attend events, and see first-hand the impact their decisions have on the students and families they serve. The recent unfortunate news of the government's efforts to reduce their foolish debt through capping public sector compensation is a petty and desperate attempt to solve a financial shortfall that our government should have been preparing for through the good years of economic success and growth. Instead, even then the government looked to the public sector to make sacrifices, the pinnacle of which was not providing compensation to boards for wage increases last fall. Somehow, the Sask Party still won a majority in Saskatchewan, most likely for lack of a better option, and their downward spiral continues as they drive this province into the ground. Instead of trying to generate growth they arrogantly spend their time arguing climate change, challenging our Federal government on a Carbon Tax policy, and try to squeeze every last penny out of an education system that is already bursting at the seams and stretching dollars as much as they can. Lost in all of this is the fact that Lloydminster is governed by two provincial bodies. Students in Lloydminster are guaranteed equal access regardless of where they reside. The current funding model ensures that as, according to our Director, Todd Robinson, "students are funded based on their province of residency and each Board of Education then harmonizes that funding to provide a seamless service to students of Lloydminster Public and Catholic school division." This model has been in place for over 80 years, and has never failed through good times and bad. For quite some time now, Mr. Wall, Mr. Morgan, and the team that has come up with this report are completely out of touch with the reality of what the students of Saskatchewan need. If they have run a billion dollar deficit, it is not up to the public sector to help recover those costs. Cuts to public services hurt the most vulnerable. Instead, Mr. Wall's government should look at the top percent of businesses and people and put it on them

I would prefer option 3B.

I congratulate the Minister for initiating this review with specific attention to "governance". I've read the Dan Perrins report with great interest. He reports that the cost of "governance" is less than 1% of operational costs so that suggests there is little monetary gain to be made in additional consolidation. He also reports PCAP and PISA results for Saskatchewan students ranking relative to other Canadian students. I find those results alarming and quite disappointing. Also disappointing are the 3 year graduation rates stuck in 73-75% for the last 10 years. I assume that the implementation of the ESSP is meant to address this deficiency on student outcomes when tested in basic knowledge of Science, Reading and Math. A solid grounding in these three subject areas is a core requirement for advancing in any study area of secondary and post-secondary education. I don't have a sufficient grasp of the entire Provincial Education "System" but it seems to me that something is generally lacking our students with academic outcomes reported in the Perrins Report and "governance" doesn't strike me as the issue to resolve poor academic performance in comparison to the rest of the Provinces' students outcomes in comprehensive testing. If School Boards influence the academic focus within their jurisdiction so as to minimize the attention to these core subjects in favour of preferred study area with a "local" flavour, then some amendment to jurisdiction needs to be made so student study is not derailed from adequate learning time spent on the core subjects necessary to be able to function in future learning and work disciplines. Maybe this has very little to do with governance and much more to do with administration and classroom teaching. Additional consolidation would be disruptive and likely interfere with the progress of ESSP. I think it is prudent to stay the course for a few more years to see if there is positive progress on student outcomes resulting from the implementation of ESSP. Our Saskatchewan students have to improve a lot academically in order to achieve better results in advanced learning and in the job market. Globalization is dictating competition beyond Provincial and national boundaries. We have to do better with our students.

Dear sir or Madam: Let me begin by saying I appreciate the fact the minister of education has put value on Catholic education. As a practicing Catholic I see this time and again in our students. I understand there will be a major restructuring of the school boards. I would hope that in this restructuring: (1) Ensures Catholic education will remain distinct, and (2) I will go on record and note that I was in the Nipawin / Tisdale / Melfort area when those three communities amalgamated. If you spoke to anyone in the education circles, that amalgamation did not save any money. The only thing that happened was that there was a lot more travelling, and that there were a lot more middle management positions created. I fear that with the new restructuring the same thing will happen, only on a greater scale. If the education of our children is important, then in the restructuring of the school boards, the end result would be a better student/teacher ratio. I would only ask that I receive a response to this email. I believe that if I took the time to write it, I deserve a response, and not the standard..."Thank you for your submission, we will take your suggestions under advisement." Which I believe really means, "We did not even take the time to read it. To reach people no one else is reaching, we need to be doing things no one else is doing! A problem is an unsolved opportunity!

The stakeholders who submitted to Mr. Perrins' governance report recommend that elected boards and the current number of school divisions be maintained. I wholeheartedly agree. Elected boards are the best way to ensure that those involved in education are accountable and responsible to the communities they serve. The report notes that further consolidation of school divisions is unlikely to result in great efficiencies, and I feel that the current number of boards also contributes to local democratic decision-making. I am pleased to see some of the recommended efficiencies, around transportation for example. I would hope that central procurement and purchasing would seek a balance between price and support of Saskatchewan products/sellers, taking into account local needs and support of local communities. On a smaller note, as someone who has served on boards and also worked for boards, I applaud the suggestion for mandatory board training. Board members are well-meaning but do not always have the same level of knowledge of the education system, or experience on other boards to understand processes and responsibilities. On a related note, I would hope that potential conflicts of interest can be addressed, such as might arise with board members who are also employees of the provincial government. I would hope board members could feel free to express their own opinions and that of their constituents.

Larger doesn't always mean better. It is important to keep community involved in education as well as those working in this area. With the last round of amalgamations, meetings etc became harder to attend as distances became further. Local elected boards have already been eliminated as well as student body elections. Democracy is a very important part of education and these small erosions most stop. Layoffs are always a worry. We hope they will happen in areas of administration when areas get larger, but they always seems to hit front line teachers and staff that help our students directly. Please don't rush this process continue to meet with community members and those working in education.

Sincerely,

I am committed to students in this province. Although many valid points are made in the report, there are way more questions than answers. Financial savings seem to be coming before the growth, needs and well-being of students, teachers and educational staff. Will these "financial savings" also be done at the risk of diminishing educational outcomes? What will the impact be to student education? Will amalgamations cause greater stress for teachers and support staff by adding more bureaucracy and administrative paperwork? Would most of the cost savings in amalgamation not be eaten up by entities such as an Education Quality Council, Provincial Advisory Committee and sector wide shared services? Caring about my co-workers, I also know that amalgamation will certainly impact on our Local Agreements. With amalgamation there is likely to be a streamlining or re-negotiating of articles that could affect Prep Time, Leaves, Supervision Pay, Mileage, and the effects on Admin Procedures such as Transfers. How can these bargained contracts just be ignored? Amalgamation seems to ignore the needs of students and teachers. We need to invest in front line services to meet the growing diversity of needs of our students, not put money into an experimental amalgamation project that may eventually save money. The cost of senior administrators does not seem to be the real issue here. The real issue seems to be a lack of commitment to fully and properly fund education in this province.

Money is important, but education is more important. As a senior, I believe that the only way society will prosper is to have an educated population. The public unfortunately always seems to dislike teachers and education, but fail to acknowledge it is an essential part of why they are where they are. With an education you have a choice of how you spend your life. No or substandard education handicaps each one of us. Do you not as a parent hope your child exceeds what you are and have done? Cut the excess administrative positions and waste, but do not cut front line educators class time or prep.time. There are way too many school board members who have no clue how an education systems functions and they are the ones that should be cut along with all the redundant secretaries,etc. Modern communications lets everyone have direct access to whatever representative or location. Costly board expenses are the biggest problem, how many school board office buildings do we need? Combing public and nonpublic boards is a help for sure, and P3 is a help. Don't be backwards about this situation be forward-thinking. Do you want your kids and grandchildren to be less educated?

We need to keep our school boards locally elected as this will keep decisions for our communities, in our communities. The school divisions were only enlarged 10 years ago and it took years for these divisions to be accepted by the communities. With such a huge disruption, it has only been in the last couple of years that significant improvement in learning has been achieved. At the very least this is not the time to again make such a large change. School boards are already not as local as they should be. Enlarging the gap between students and board members is simply never the right choice.

Leave the school system the way it is. I couldn't imagine 28 divisions turning into 1. How could this help the students or parents?

This is regarding the provincial governments proposed amalgamations of school divisions. Our school council has unanimously agreed that we are opposed to any changes in the size of our school division. We believe that an appointed school board would not be accountable to the local school communities. It would simply be a government job that reports back to government. We believe the local feel of our existing school division will be lost if it is expanded. It is an appropriate size. Although we think changes to the school divisions size are not acceptable, there are certainly ways to make the divisions more efficient. The money spent on this education review could have been better spent on reviewing where the existing divisions could save money.

If you want to save money and improve the quality of education in the province, follow the plan below: (1) get rid of school boards. Most have created all kinds of committees to generate per diems and act as a source of income, (2) get rid of all of the one school, school divisions, (3) put a salary cap on the directors salaries which have become astronomical.

What a waste of taxpayers' money. Look at the role of the Leads members and try to figure out a salary scale that is uniform in the province. The perfect size for the rural school divisions is probably between 6000-6500 students and so if properly aligned, you might be able to further reduce 3-4 school divisions.

I support maintaining the current structure of educational governance in Saskatchewan. Multiple school boards are best able to provide the structure, planning and oversight to specific communities in geographical proximity. As someone who teaches in the largest urban centre in Saskatchewan but grew up in rural Saskatchewan, I am concerned that needs in the rural areas will be overlooked to serve the greater interest of the more populated urban areas.

It has been brought to my attention that the provincial government is exploring options to restructure the school districts within the province. After a quick glance at the proposed options I have many concerns with the options put forth for discussion. My experience with the public school board in my district includes unanswered emails, long wait times for phone calls to be returned, and staff carrying more than one role or job description. These experiences leave me with the conclusion that our board office is overworked as is. By amalgamating districts and making them bigger these problems are only going to increase across the province. Board offices that may not feel the pressure now, will after changes are made. The amount of pressure felt will of course depend on the size of amalgamation that is done. The option to only have one to three school districts across the province is ridiculous from where I am sitting. This province is made up of such diverse and unique communities and people, to think that a central board in a major city or two would be sufficient or equal representation of the people it serves is absurd. Let's face it, there are people in our cities whom have never, in their life, set foot in rural Saskatchewan. Why should they represent rural Saskatchewan or make decisions for people they can in no way relate to? The best way to illustrate this to you is by using our current national government and how out of touch it is with the people, especially the people of the west. This has been a contention for decades, and it is a real one. You are asking to recreate this issue within our education system amongst urban versus rural Saskatchewan. Also appointing board members removes any say that the people of this province have in regards to who will make decisions for them. We will slowly move away from a democracy and into a dictatorship. This is a sad truth and reality that needs to be considered when making changes of this magnitude to an existing government institution. If the option to only have a few school districts passes, this will lead to many Saskatchewan communities feeling unvalued and insignificant to the government they voted for. Just think for one minute, a small town over four hours away is part of a Regina School Board, there is an issue that requires attention so they make a phone call only to leave a message. After several days they call again only to be told the person they are to talk to is out, please leave a message. After several more phone calls over several more days the person decides to send an email, only not to have it replied to. The next option is for this person is to drive over 400 km to Regina and sit in a board office for several hours until someone who is over worked has several minutes to spare to discuss the issue with them. Let's be serious for a minute, this is unreasonable by any standard. By the time the person gets to the board office they will be so irate, angry or irritated that what could have been a simple problem and solution discussion is going to be a heated argument. It is a fact of life those closest to the board offices will get dealt with more quickly and justly because of geographical location alone. It is much easier for someone to come into the office within 45-60km radius rather than 400km. If you are still having trouble seeing this point just think of the movie "Hunger Games", the districts closest to the Capitol were way better off, the farther away from the Capitol the poorer the living conditions. The closer to the school board office the more support and care, the further away the less care and support to those schools and communities. Just think how many schools, students and communities will suffer. I know there is a need or desire to cut costs and reach budget constraints, these options just do not seem in the best interest of the children, schools or communities in which they are to serve. When there is nowhere else to cut from the budget, the next option is to find new and innovative ways to generate income. In no way am I suggesting increasing taxes, rather find ways for the school boards or districts to generate income. Perhaps a study of other countries like South Korea, Japan, Finland or UK, all countries that rank higher than Canada in standard of education. Why not see what they are doing so that our standard of education does not have to suffer, rather perhaps it may go up a notch or two on the scale. Know that I am one of many who are concerned about these proposed changes. I know many who are concerned but will not voice their concerns because they feel like it is just a waste of time and their concerns will not matter to the people who get to make the decision at hand. Please do not ignore the people of Saskatchewan, before a decision is made take more time to explore these options. Show us the numbers, give us a viable option that does not leave the people of this province muzzled.

Sincerely,

Thank you for the opportunity to share feedback on the Minister's proposed governance options. As a veteran teacher, with 26 years of experience teaching Saskatchewan children, I have one lens through which I look when faced with any decision facing education. That is simply, "What is best for kids". While the mandate of the review is stated 'to present governance options that will focus on student success', I am in fact left with questions as to how this possibly can be. Although the focus of the report is on governance amalgamations, there are many challenges to education that will not be resolved through amalgamation. 1) Elected boards are both the partners and watchdogs of Education. These Boards offer our community stakeholders a voice in the Education of our future society members. As well, elected board members bring the interests of their community to the Division. There is wide spread concern, both by folks in education, and those in the community, over the potential of these partners becoming political appointments, and community accountability being replaced by political influence. This is a questionable model of governance that the government is

proposing, and is not what is best for kids. 2) Governance boards require training and education to be effective. I am disappointed that education funds that should be used for improving Literacy and Numeracy with Saskatchewan students will be used to train adults on political bureaucracy. This is not an effective use of education funding, and does not directly impact student learning and therefore is not what is best for kids. 3) The Report is vague about the impacts of streamlining new Division Senior Admin staffs and specialized support positions. By increasing the sizes of Divisions, and therefore increasing distances between schools, I see a direct impact on the face to face time these kinds of support positions can provide for teachers, which will in turn affect what is best for kids. You will recall that the Ministry recently cut the number of Professional Development days per year. Professional Development is critical to a profession that is responding to a more diverse population each year, who are implementing new curriculum (perhaps the Social Studies curriculum will be renewed in the near future). Taking away support for our teachers is not what is best for kids. 4) The report is also vague as to how the restructure will actually save any money. I've made the point that the training of appointed boards, the travel through larger Divisions will be an added expense. The report identifies that several new entities would need to be created to fill in communication gaps. These entities (Education Quality Control, Provincial Advisory Committee, and one for sector wide efficiencies) will certainly come with a cost both in personnel and administration. The report does not provide any information around the cost of these services. I would expect that declaring redundancies in positions will cost the province money in severance packages. Should any money be saved, I question how that savings is intended to be re-invested in front line services supporting teachers and learners? Education funding savings should be reinvested in front line education positions, and used to support what is best for kids. 5) Our province's teachers are served by Local Agreements with each Division. Noting the range of differences between local agreements, there is likely to be a streamlining or re-negotiation of articles. This process will come at a cost as well. The abolishment of these Local agreements would be reprehensible by a ministry working with teachers. Supporting the province's teachers makes sense and is what is best for kids. 6) It seems apparent that the fiscal challenge that the government is facing is a recent phenomenon, as just last year the government ran on an election platform of being a 'have-province' and turning around the economy. Effective Education requires long term thinking. Indeed, the province is in the middle of moving forward an effective strategic plan. Stop gap solutions that are not thoughtful impact the carrying forth of this plan. In the past years of our 'have-province', I have seen our funding cut to Divisions. There has been a lack of funding for EAL students, and recent refugees. There are many days that there are not enough guest teachers to cover absent teachers, due to illness or PD. The most troubling is that I have seen teachers and education assistant positions cut. These are our front line workers with our children. Higher PTRs, and teachers who have more and more added to their plates does not result in what is best for kids. 7) In the report, statistics indicate that Saskatchewan has the fewest number of governing boards in any province west of the Maritimes. The need for amalgamation seems counter intuitive to the reports' own research. Indeed, Mr. Perrins own letter to Minister Morgan indicates that in conversation with 19 education stakeholders including 19 school boards, the STF, SEIU, SSPA, SASBO, parent groups, the government opposition critic, and members of the general public, support the current governance model. It seems obvious that teachers, school boards, school service employees and parents would have the most valuable knowledge and opinions with respect to Education. That input has not been formally reflected in Mr. Perrins' report. A report without stakeholder input seems disingenuous. Fiscal management and bottom lines appear to be driving decisions facing the management of Education. I urge the government to investigate and accurately report the specific cost savings that amalgamation offers. Further, I would hope that the government frame their thinking to see Education as an investment in our society, rather than a place to find tax savings. My hope is that matters of Education governance and otherwise are decided with the most important criterion in mind, that being what is best for kids.

Boards of education should continue to be voted in by the public. Public education should remain free from partisan party politics. The government of the day should not be the one to dictate the direction of school divisions. Decisions that are made about education should be made in the best interests of the students and not done in a rush to save money. Our children should not be the ones to pay for government deficits by having an inferior education because the government chose to cut corners. Education is an investment in our future. Education saves the province money in the long run and any cuts that are made now are only going to be for short term gain.

I have seen a lot of changes in the school system in this province. Some changes have brought improvements; however, the changes which resulted in the decisions being made farther from the front lines of the classroom are not the kind of change that brings improvement. Moving towards larger school divisions is not going to improve the instruction in classrooms. The last round of amalgamations made it so we no longer were able to make connections with others teaching in the same grades, it made it more difficult to access extra supports for students who needed it. Bigger is not better in education!

I am a retired for 10 years and still do the occasional subbing. This is what I have noticed...and I often tell the staff I'm glad I'm old and I mean it! Teachers are feeling left out of decision making . Courses are constantly changing; they are off to workshops learning about these courses. Good times for subs, as we get a lot of work this way, which costs the system valuable \$. Not to mention speakers, travel and purchase of new materials. There is a feeling that salesmen come and sell the people in the offices on their math, reading etc. And the teachers have no say on these changes, or input. Case I point whole language was on its way out in the states when it was introduced here....I closed my classroom door and kept teaching Anna Inghams method because I had always had success with it...teachers feel like they don't matter and that the people in the offices don't know or care what is happening in the trenches...where the basic work of education is happening. In our school division there is zero retention which means no students have to repeat grades. While I taught I often had "the talk" with parents in June. Teachers know when students are going to have difficulty the next year...especially in the younger grades. So much depends on their maturity, remember they have only been around for 4 1/2 to 5 years and those 6 mos. mean a lot in terms of brain development and readiness for school. When they are moved on even if it is obvious they will have difficulty they will have difficulty the next year and usually by grade 5 or 6 they may turn into discipline problems to defend their ego....eg....I got 27%...I must have spelled my name right. By high school they do nothing because they can and often by the time they can be held back it is too late. Very few students are intrinsic learners....my daughter was one but both my boys needed to know they had to pass their tests..I don't think I would have graduated under this system as I too studies because I wanted to move on. In my talks with parents I told them that the ones of us who care will recommend students stay back and the ones who don't care are happy to just move them along...let the next teacher worry about it. Worse yet you have students who are not ready passing on and the units in their wisdom have cut teacher AIDS who are needed more than ever to give extra help to these students...they have hired many managers .and assistant managers ie for janitors, buses etc ...and meanwhile in the trenches teachers are expected to teach the special needs students, as well as those who are behind in their work as well as the average students and keep the above average student challenged and teachers are also being cut and those remaining have a full load of students. Teachers give standardized tests ...again a boon for substitute teachers but they wonder what is done with the results. One only has to look at the latest stats that put SK at the bottom.....I remember when we were one of the top educators....10-15 years ago. My daughter went to the states 12 years ago as part of her training for a wire line job after her engineering degree and said that the most of the Americans that also took the course we're not hired....I wonder if that would hold true today. I believe if there needs to be changes we need to go back to the smaller units. We know our superintendents and saw them often....the office was the superintendent and his assistant and about 3 office people. They were available to talk to and know what and who was working. They listened to our problems and our successes. The principal was the janitors manager...he know if the janitor was doing a good job and what needed to be done. The teachers do not have this now and I feel it has taken a lot away from their motivation. Why even bother giving tests?...isn't that also hard on the students ego? I don't like to brag but I got into difficulty with my husband as I stayed at school usually until 5:00 ...planning lessons and individualizing assignments and I loved my job because you could see results. We had TAs to help those students who needed it and they too had to have things planned for them. If I taught in this system I would likely leave at 4:45I think I would give up on achieving success and it would be just a job and not a passion. As a footnote, it seems bigger in the health regions has not worked out well either...bigger is not better... It just gets too impersonal...and has not saved the money...but in the end has cost more with poor results.

As a rural community member of _____ I don't believe that any of the options outlined are viable. There must be some thresholds upheld before moving forward with any rash decisions. I fully understand the financial challenges we face as a province but I do not understand how an amalgamation of school Divisions is the answer. I would like more thought in regards to existing legislation and I would assume that it will be reviewed. There must be changes to it in order to protect our schools and our children's education. What about transportation. Today we already have a pre-existing issue and amalgamating is certainly not going to make that go away. If anything it could pose more challenges. As I understand this will not affect the urban community at all. Transportation needs to be a part of that discussion no matter what the final decision may be. Certainly the province must have some cause for concern of our rural communities.... if a school closure were to happen it could be the demise of the community. Schools attract young families... certainly that says something. We have already lost our voice once and also lost some things as a rural school in the last amalgamation i.e.) tuition grants and huge funding cuts in the excess of 10 pct.... another amalgamation will only create more issues as such... even if they are unintended. I just hope that all aspects are looked at as this is directly impacting the future of our province it cannot be just looked at from a financial aspect... this is our children's future.
Respectfully _____

This is not a good thing. 1000 teachers will be cut from public school divisions and one board will be making decisions for students all across the province. Students in North Battleford, Ile A La Cross, Saskatoon, are completely different in regards to diversity, economics and academics and should not have the same individuals making decisions for all. Our children are the future of Saskatchewan and our future work force. If you don't invest in them or their education by cutting teachers and education funding then you are not investing in Saskatchewan's future.

I am in favour of keeping locally elected boards for the following reasons listed: -serve the needs of local students/parents, - accountable to the electorate - are the voice for the community -advocate for ensuring quality in Catholic education. Local representation in education helps ensure that educational needs are being met for their community and are crucial in a democratic society. Boards are a liaison between students/community/government that allow for continued positive growth in education. Elected boards of education bring awareness to the government on issues that are affecting the youth of today because of their involvement with teachers/ students/ parents and community. Boards listen, observe, and partake in school events representing our government. They ensure that today's youth are educationally ready to take on the responsibilities of the future. Who better serves the needs of students in our own division, own schools, than those elected by their community?

Please continue to have both public and Catholic locally elected boards.

Please do not amalgamate school divisions into one central board. The divisions are already large and impersonal. To move to one centralized board with no local elections or local representation will further exacerbate this problem. Families are having trouble communicating with their boards and getting solutions for issues like bussing, student services and support workers for their children. One centralized board will be even more prone to one -size -fits- all solutions that do a disservice to being responsive to innovative and common sense solutions to family concerns. All a one centralized non-elected board will create is more levels of bureaucracy for school principals to wade through to get action for their school. Money will be wasted paying high wages to mid - level newly created positions whose job will be to pander to the board and be shackled from finding local solutions to concerns. I would argue that we need to put more money into front line workers- teachers, EAs and youth workers, who have daily contact with students.

To Whom it may concern, As a homeschool family we thank you for the opportunity to share our thoughts on the K-12 Governance Review. Our hope is that SHBE and HSLDA be counted as stakeholders in these discussions. We would like to see the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students. Lastly we would ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators. Thank you again for this opportunity to share our input with you and we look forward to the possible changes to come. Sincerely,

Hello, I am a mother of two young girls that lives in . My husband and I chose to move to because we loved the small town feel so close to a big city. One of the biggest reasons for moving out here was because there was an Elementary school! is a great school. With 'transformational change' coming in the near future I have some concerns and comments. Firstly, will the thresholds for rural schools remain the same? This is important to me and my community to assure the school remains open as long as it remains populated. Right now we operate at 117% capacity. Secondly, will there be guaranteed bussing for rural students put into public school legislation? If in the very unfortunate event that we could lose our school, would bussing be guaranteed for our children? Those are my concerns. With change comes growth. And for that I am excited about.

. When looking at change I think the idea of a Pre-K program implemented into the Saskatchewan's school program. Thank you so much for your time and consideration. After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report we would offer the following feedback: We do not feel that the options presented in this report will result in significant cost savings without negatively impacting the quality of education for our students, eroding community voice, and affecting the sustainability of our community. We support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for students and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). We do not support the concept of an appointed Board of Education. We believe local voice is an essential part of a successful school-community relationship. We do not support any of the 3 models presented in the report. We feel forced amalgamation puts our school, and many like it, at risk of closure. We want to know what potential changes there will be to the rural school closure thresholds that are currently legislated. We feel this is a critical consideration in evaluating the options. We would like to see a permanent solution for high school transportation and are concerned what impact forced amalgamation will have on bus ride times for our students. We believe that further progress can be made in existing school divisions to find sector-wide efficiencies and cost-savings and recognize that the government may need to be more directive in requiring these sector-wide efficiencies to be realized.

Please do not make our Divisions even bigger. They are too big now as it is. We need to think of the students and what is best for them. This is not a business and we need to remember that. We are helping to make these students ready to go out into the world to do what they are destined to do. We need to give them the best chance to succeed in whatever they choose. We need to know who they are and help them learn and succeed in school. I truly believe we need to leave things alone.

Amalgamating school divisions and eliminating local elected boards would finally allow decision making to be consistent in the province. Board members allow central office staff and themselves to attend pd and meetings all over the province, country and internationally while cuts are made that affect students day to day learning. Board members increase their own amenities while refusing to increase or maintain support in classrooms. Board members allow central office admin staff to hire their relatives and friends. All of these issues would be eliminated by having a central school division.

The timing of this "consultation" is unfortunate and does not give adequate time for thorough feedback. I am concerned that over centralization in education (specifically option one and two) will scare teachers into not wanting to be vocal about problems for fear of retribution. I am concerned that the individual parent voice will be lost. I am concerned that when I advocate for student's needs, the depth of need will not be understood. I am concerned that support disseminating from a large centralized location will be slow moving and stalled with red tape. Please take the opportunity to engage in further discussions with the STF, SSBA, LEADS etc and with them, make the correct long term decision for education in this province. Your partner in education,

I am very concerned about the new proposal for education governance. It is my belief that it is in the best interest of the students in each community to have a locally elected board, as well as keeping the school divisions as they are currently. By having locally elected boards, these people want to be in this position and have a true interest in the students, schools, and communities. This is what we strive for in education - what is in the best interest of our students. Also, I don't believe amalgamating school divisions is the answer to saving money or is in the best interest of our students. I have talked with other teachers who have been involved in amalgamation and their experiences were not pleasant. Some of the classrooms ended up with having 35+ students in one room. This is definitely not optimal! Is there really that much cost savings with having people travel from great distances to meet? My guess is that there would be less services for the students - such as OT, SLP, etc. which again is not optimal. Perhaps there are better answers/solutions to save money. We, as society, and especially all people who work in the education department, should be focusing on what is most beneficial to all students. I believe having locally elected board members who know their community and its unique needs, who know the individual schools and teachers who work there, are the best people to help make decisions that affect the students in that area. Please make decisions that put the students first.

I have read the report and while I understand the appeal of moving towards fewer divisions or regions, I am very concerned that the report does not indicate whether the school boards would continue to be locally elected or simply government appointments. I am concerned that an appointed board would not be as responsive to the needs of local schools and parents.

To Whomever it May Concern: I am writing to you as I have recently caught wind that the government is exploring the option of moving to one school board for the entire region. I am a 24 year old female with 2 children who have not entered the school system yet but will very soon and I am very concerned with this proposition. I strongly urge you not to continue with this decision for the following reasons: (1) As a member of a very small community I feel it is very important to have a local democratically elected school board. It is so very important that we have a voice for our children's school and education. Our school is the heart of our town and our kids are the future of our community. How is it beneficial that one board makes decisions for the entire province? Each area is so very different so why treat them all the same? The system is not broken so why "fix" it? If our school closes, our community will crash and who will want to move here? Our hospital has already been stripped of us and our health care is nil... if our school is forced to close we will have nothing. (2) A large portion of the funding for education still comes from local property taxes. Yes, the tax rate is set by the province but we, the people, still pay the toll so ultimately our voice should be heard. (3) I fail to see the point of this movement. How will this save us any money? The NDP promoted consolidation held back education for at least 5 years and cost money rather than saved it. Thank you for taking the time to read this letter and consider my concerns.

We need to continue to elect our own school division board members. Locally elected board members know the needs of the students in their school division because they are members of the community. They keep the students best interest in mind and they are accountable to the community.

The existing method of leading school divisions is not working for students. Saskatchewan has the lowest PISA scores. Our grad rates for FNMI students have plateaued at an unacceptable level. Boards are currently not educated in leading the improvements and changes we need. Divisions are adding more or maintaining central office jobs (with great salary increases). I vote amalgamation!

A new teacher's thoughts on the educational governance report: Graduating from the University of Regina I was excited to have the opportunity to gain experiences in many different school divisions throughout my post-secondary career. Each division working hard to fuel the specific needs of their students and their families. How did these school divisions know what specific areas their student's needed support in? Because these divisions are made up of locally voted community members that have grown up and know the life of their schools well. This idea of enriching our students based on their specific needs is very inspiring and thrilling for a new Saskatchewan teacher. I have spent the last 2 years working closely with my division and its employees to fill the needs of not only the students in my classroom and school, but within my community too. This leads me to the surprise I faced when learning that individuals of government, the ones who are looking out for Saskatchewan's wellbeing, with such high stature and knowledge believe that it is in the best interest of our youth to amalgamate into one school division. It seems to a new teacher to be a simple concept in understanding the differences teachers see in their students all across the province. I for one would see differences in my students socially, economically, and academically compared to a school in a new Saskatoon suburb one hour away. Does the government truly believe that our diverse students in this province should be under one umbrella? This is NOT in the best interest of our students or our province. Saskatchewan thrives off of our youth attending post-secondary or entering the work force in Saskatchewan. I personally believe that students will not receive an ideal or healthy education being under one school division. I had my opinion formed prior to reading the document written by Dan Perrins, but had my opinion confirmed as soon as I saw the cover page. Spread across the cover was 5 pictures of 5 students. Each student of a different ethnicity. Does the government honestly believe this cover page is going to trick Saskatchewan citizens into believing the new governance report is going to benefit students of all cultures? A single division does not benefit the various ethnic backgrounds found in all areas of Saskatchewan. While my school educates a large population of children, the school three blocks away houses many Children. It is our local school division and members that understand that these two different schools three blocks away need completely different supports. A single school division situated hours away would never be able to understand these needs. As a new teacher I am grateful to be teaching in Saskatchewan as I am proud of the education it provides to its students. Don't change the good that we are currently doing.

I am vehemently opposed to a restructuring of our school system. Larger school divisions will only create more shared services meaning that wait times to see speech paths, Ed Psychs., counsellors, etc. will increase. Students are sadly underserved as it is. If local input is removed by getting rid of school boards, the sense of community will be lost. Decisions will be made far from the heart of communities without knowledge of local issues and situations. The "one size fits all" model does not address specific student needs. I urge the Saskatchewan government to leave decisions to those who know the local issues and needs of education in communities. Our future generations are counting on us to make the smart and the right choices now for long term success, not short term short-sightedness.

Further amalgamations and changes to educational governance at this time in Saskatchewan are not in the best interests of the children we serve. Additional years of upheaval and restructuring take resources away from classrooms. We will find ourselves with fewer accommodations allowed for local needs. Larger divisions, or one mega division, will result in less classroom support, less occupational therapists, less speech language pathologists, less educational psychologists and higher pupil-teacher ratios. Travel time across large divisions will cost extra dollars and cut into the number of hours available for delivery of services to the most needy of students. Having less divisions does not lend itself to saving money on administrative costs. There will still need to be administrators with regional supervisory roles. Appointing trustees without the needed background, passion or special interest in education will not put students' needs first. The nature of appointments is that you can also be fired from that appointment if you are not furthering the government that appointed you. Elected officials are currently doing an excellent job of overseeing the local needs of the students in their schools. I do not support any of the changes outlined in the Perrins' Report.

We vote for
Boards who are not local and we vote for amalgamation. These kinds of decisions should not happen.

I currently live in _____ but plan to move to _____ within the next year. My daughter is in grade one and I'm already fearful her educational opportunities are limited because we live rurally. I oppose the amalgamations and appointed leaders. Thanks we who grew up in urban center do not understand the true issues facing rural communities and the losses that come from decreased access to services.

I do NOT support the idea of one big school division! I recently got married and purchased a new house in a small town. I would hate to see small town schools close! I plan to start a family and it would be such a shame to have my kids go on long bus rides to a neighbouring school. I work in a municipal office and would like to see the school tax revenue stay in the town.

I am in favour of keeping the school boards as they are. I believe that we will have lesser relationships with parents, parishes and the community. This is what makes Regina Catholic so special.

I am in the generation that is currently filling schools with eager to learn students. Children that enjoy going to school, and in turn receive a wonderful education. Amalgamating divisions will not provide children with this same education. The first problem comes from the students falling through the cracks during the amalgamation process. No parent ever wants their child to slip through the cracks of education, while members are busy focusing their time on creating ways to govern hundreds of school in the province, rather than focusing their time on the education of our students. The process of amalgamation is lengthy and takes years, why should current students suffer and have a lacking education, when things are already enriching for them under their current school division. The second problem comes from the exact route of this survey. Many parents in Saskatchewan do not own a computer or have access to one due to financial circumstances. How can a single school division in Saskatchewan make fair, accurate, just, and healthy decisions for it's students when every schools is needing different things. Some schools with low economical families are trying to keep their students awake during the day, or are concerned with having them get a proper meal while at school. Other schools face struggles regarding only having one classroom iPad. Smaller divisions take care of the well-being of our students. The boards of these divisions understand the lives within the communities and the struggles that lie within. No macro school division will ever be able to provide these understandings and emotional/academic supports to students. Regards,
A concerned community member and parent

I do not support any changes to educational governance. My three children have already been through amalgamations within their school division and the upheaval that it caused cannot be repeated upon the heels of the first. Resources, time and attention spent restructuring will wipe out the work already done in order to start over. Children should not have to wait for support services, timely in-services for their teachers, or other interventions to happen because all administration has been ordered to restructure on timelines that dictate their primary roles are not allowed their full attention. Further amalgamations will mean kids will have longer wait times for OT, Speech, EdPsych, and other supports as they must travel further and cover more kids. The number of students in classrooms is of major concern. I do not want my children to toil day after day in a classroom where they are one of a crowd of kids that the teachers are unable give the attention they deserve. I want to be able vote for my school board member. I want to be able to vote for someone whom I know has a personal interest in providing the best possible education to my children. I want someone local that I know will listen to me and my concerns and whom I can trust to bring my concerns to the Board. Our children are our future. I will not support short-changing their education in order to save the government from their lack of fiscal foresight. Leave the structure as it is.

This email is to add our voice of opposition to the proposals regarding the Educational Governance Review. We are residents of Lloydminster who reside on Alberta side and we want our taxes to be used in Lloydminster school system! And we want our local school board members to represent our cares & concerns locally!

Hi There! I prefer the school boards to remain separate. If anything we need to be hiring more support staff and teachers to get the best education for our kids as possible. I am tired of hearing about all the cuts and the potential for cuts. Education is one of the most important factors in our children's lives. I want my children to have the best life possible as well as all the other parents out there. More one on one time. An enriched education that our kids blossom into educated adults. In fact taking things a step further, teachers should have the costs to decorate their classrooms covered. It is a shame that this comes out of pocket. I would also like to see even more support in rural areas so all kids feel safe and receive the support they need. Please for once just leave the system as is. I am so happy with the way the Catholic school division runs.

I am a Grandmother with 4 grandchildren in the province and I am very disappointed in how the government is putting savings of money before our children education. We must first nurture our children, then educate them to be our leaders and be proud of them. Every change made should always be thought out first, making it better not taking away or making changes that throw our kids under the bus. Our teachers are over worked, and given duties above and beyond. We need smaller classes, TA for special needs, resources to expand our children's knowledge. I work on the U of S campus, it is becoming a culture of money, money, how about Education, the best!

I have been a supporter of the PC and Sask Party but find the Perrin Report and the perceived need for such a report offensive. The report suggests that one option is that Boards be removed and replaced with government appointees who would be more educated or knowledgeable and would, no doubt, agree with everything the government suggests. Boards are now elected and do not go through a screening process, ironically, much the same as MLAs as well as urban and rural municipal officials. What they do is represent the wishes of their electorate even though those wishes may not comply with government decree. Democracy is not just for the privileged few but represents us all and we abide by the decision whether we agree with the outcomes or not. We all thought that the vendetta against school boards would end with the recent amalgamations and the removal of taxing abilities for school boards. School Boards are not the problem in regards to educational outcomes nor are they the reason the province is in debt. Get on with the real issues and leave the smoke and mirror philosophy to guys like Donald J. Trump. P"S" This is not fake news

I have the following concerns with the potential direction of education in Sask. 1) Loss of effective and accountable public voice 2) Unintended consequences of amalgamations and appointed boards 3) Less say, control and input in your child's education 4) Loss of relationships with parents, parishes and community

Lloydminster is a very complex and unique place to live and work. The bi-provincial nature of the city sometimes makes it challenging to get things done when it comes to working with two provincial governments. Many issues from sales taxes to carbon taxes create situations for inequality in Lloydminster and these have all had to be addressed with special consideration to ensure that residents on one side of the city are not disadvantaged as a result. The Lloydminster Public and Catholic School Boards are well versed at communicating with both provincial governments in order to ensure that the delivery of service to our students, regardless of where they live, is the same on both sides of the border. I am deeply concerned about the consequences of any of the options presented in the Governance Review in terms of the delivery of service to the students in Lloydminster. I am of the understanding that under our current structure, a significant portion of the LPSD budget is currently provided by the Alberta Government. I wonder what will happen to the funding from the Alberta government currently allocated for the students of Lloydminster within the options presented in the review. It is essential that students in Lloydminster continue to receive equity of opportunity and seamless delivery of services to ensure none are disadvantaged by where they reside. Changing the current educational structures within Lloydminster poses a significant challenge that must be considered carefully. Ultimately, decisions must be made that are in our students' best interests.

I would like to see the school divisions remain the way they are please!

As a rural resident with children who will be soon entering the school system I am concerned about potential changes resulting in the closure of more rural schools. I think that in order for children to be part of their community they need to be educated in that community and not shipped off on buses 50+ KMs away from where they live. Also spending hours a day on a bus takes away valuable family and free time that small children should have access to. Potential savings for the government should not come at a cost to the quality of life of those living in rural Saskatchewan. I also have a _____ and right now _____ is unable to access any services from the school district because the early entrance program was cancelled due to funding. I hope that any change will result in better resources for special needs children as well as the guarantee that schools in small communities will not be closed down.

I believe that one provincial school board will not be beneficial for our rural community and the children in it. The focus will not be on the students. It will be on administration and change management. By forcing amalgamation, it will set back the advancements in literacy that have been made and cause disruptions. Teachers are finally comfortable with their curriculums and are having success in advancement. Boards need to stay locally elected and we need to be able to keep decisions close to our communities. Students will not benefit from moving decisions away from here. The needs in rural areas are different than that of urban. Health and education are not the same and therefore, it should not be assumed that just because something may be good for in the area of health, doesn't mind that it will work in the area of education.

Amalgamating school divisions yet again will not improve "things" for our staff and students. It took 10 years to get to some normalcy after the last amalgamation. You need to put students and staff first. By putting resources into our schools and treating teachers as professionals will only allow for better things to happen. Teachers are already over worked and under paid and amalgamation is not the answer to saving dollars. The government needs to speak with the front line workers and be team players to come up with solutions. This top down approach by always changing things and having teachers and students "put up with changes" does not work. Unhappy employees and parents do not make for a better education system or a better Saskatchewan. It's time the government listens! We are all in this together for the betterment of educating the next leaders of our country! Amalgamation is not the answer here!

Dear Advisory board, I understand changes are being considered in our education system. As the MLA who represents our area, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community. Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support Saskatchewan school boards and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature. We need to keep our school boards locally elected; and, We need to keep decisions closer to our communities because many of the rural schools will lose their voices when decisions are centralized to encompass both larger cities and the small towns in South West, Saskatchewan. Decisions are likely to be made based on a mathematical equation without factoring in what that looks like for a student out in Gull Lake, Hazlet, Consul, _____ . Unless you have a community connection, the people making decisions will likely devalue the most important part of school, the students. Let's put the students in Saskatchewan first instead of last. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community because like each person, they have their own personality, strengths and needs. We cannot just provide a band aid solution. We need to know the communities and make decisions based on what is best suited for the students within the schools. Sincerely,

To "ensure efficient operational success" means spending less money. Since the entire governance cost of all Saskatchewan public school boards put together is less than \$12 million, there are no direct savings of any significance by either revising or even completely removing the current governance structure (which would not save all \$12 million since something would have to replace it). Therefore, the purpose of scrapping the elected boards must be to have direct control over spending of all the current school divisions. And the only way to achieve savings of significance (for example, a 5% savings of \$3 billion in education spending would be \$150 million) would be to close schools and layoff teachers. There are no other parts of the education system that could be trimmed enough to produce this scale of savings. So which schools will you close? The rural community schools that will always be smaller than the city schools? There is only so much saving that can be found through amalgamation before the costs of those transforming changes and the disenfranchisement eats up those savings. None of the options that Mr. Perrins wrote in that report has the potential to pay significant financial dividends in the long run due to the well-known costs of implementation and transition, even if it might appear that there would significant savings prior to the next election. However, all of the options would result in significant losses to our children and their education. The courtesy of a reply would be appreciated.

Math needs to go back to a more traditional teaching method. 1. Kids need concrete before they can deal with abstract. Estimating, as an example, is confusing because it is abstract and it is taught while kids need concrete instruction; their brains are not at the right level of development. 2. Kids don't need a lot of electronics. When I was in school, the smart kids took computers because 'they'll need to know how to use them in the future.' DOS is not helping me today and computers of the future will not look like computers of today. It's good to integrate them when possible but it's also important to simply develop the mind. 2a. Paper and pencil is good because it is instant-on technology, there are no passwords for mom and dad to not have and school work then get stalled. Fewer moving parts means less stuff to break. 3. Numeracy is equal to literacy in importance. Example: I bet good money you are not sounding out every word I am typing here. My grades 5 and 6 kids are learning their addition tables (yes, addition) at home because they haven't learned them at school. We'll move on to multiplication, fractions, decimals, etc. because I'm not sure they'll be ready to handle university when it comes their way if we don't teach them at home. That's a shame. I spent some time talking to people at the board, the trustees, the ministry about 3 or 4 years ago and told them we were in trouble - this was shortly after a set of tests showing SK scores staying the same when BC, AB, MB scores went down. It seemed obvious to me what the problems were and, sure enough, they are now happening. The circular reasoning and blame shifting I found at that time was frustrating to the extreme. I'm a parent, I'm a voter, I'm a taxpayer and I am frustrated by the fact that we are using the same curriculum and watching things fall apart. Change is needed - and flashy buildings are nice, but really, all kids need is decent instruction, pencil and paper. Feel free to contact me if you would like,

I feel that I should have a say, we all should have a say, and more importantly a choice in our children's education. I don't agree with amalgamation.

Our students cannot benefit from a centralized form of governance for education. We are much too far from any large center. Boards cannot be appointed by government. This removes all accountability to rural areas from the system. Who will advocate for small rural schools. School administration cannot take over all administrative responsibility for schools. Their mandate is to create healthy learning environments for students not order paper, review contracts or contact services for maintenance! In an effort to create efficiency this government will ultimately weaken learning for our students. Let's talk about cutting wages or positions in middle and upper management rather than our front line workers who take on most of the responsibility for student success in our Province.

The state of financial affairs and its cost to public education concerns me deeply. I myself am a new teacher in Saskatchewan, and am also newly married. I'm from Saskatchewan, and would love to stay here and raise a family; however, the employment opportunities in my field in the foreseeable make the chances of that seem slim. Other provinces (notably BC) are increasing funding for the hiring of teachers and support staff, and in the wake of massive cuts made before the 2016/2017 school year we are facing the likelihood of more cuts again next year. Schools need money to function properly, and to provide students with the teachers, and school budgets for arts and extracurricular to enrich their public education experience. Last year in my Division, massive cuts were made, many teachers were shifted around and many untenured teachers lost their positions. Young teachers like me will not be able to stick around to see Saskatchewan rise out of the current economic turmoil it is in in the public education cuts continue. I am a Conservative politically, and I do understand that cuts have to be made in order to avoid crippling deficit, and I understand the logic behind the cuts last year. However, if cuts continue, the public education experience that I had; where I could choose to be involved in a rich plethora of extracurricular and arts programs will not be the experience that my children get. Public education is a service to society in the sense that it builds tomorrow's leaders, and it is not right that we sacrifice so much of what public schools offer kids in order to cover a deficit in difficult economic times. I hope that the Wall government does not continue to pursue cuts in public education; for my sake and for the sake of my students and my children. Take care and God bless.

Please leave our school board as it is. We have a wonderful system that is much better than other divisions. We specifically moved so our children could attend Prairie Spirit and would be heartbroken if this was taken away. We have one daughter attending the Saskatoon Public School Division which needs a lot of work. Prairie Spirit is hands down better and there is no need to amalgamate prairie Spirit with our divisions when ours is already top notch. Amalgamation will only hurt our children.

I do not wish to comment in detail on the benefits or drawbacks of the proposed plans. I am quite sure many factors are being considered, about which I know very little. However, as a _____ for the past eight years, I do want to reflect on the immediate and potential future impact of the shift in focus from learning to governance in public and governmental discourse. In the past years, since the last amalgamation and curriculum renewal, our Division has focused very specifically on designing and living out strong assessment and learning plans that address each student's needs in a timely and targeted manner. We have re-imagined assessment and learning, have refined our Response to Intervention processes and enhanced our learning environments. This has been no small amount of work and has required a crystal clear focus. We are very proud of the work we have done (and continue to do) and we know we have committed and passionate educators working inside classrooms. We also know there is still much to be done. Shifts like these take time, perseverance and teamwork. The proposed changes to governance have dramatically shifted attention away from this great work, toward discussions about finances, employment, roles, prep time, Boards of Education, Division structure and so on. These are important issues, too, but I have already seen the desire to reflect on instruction and decision-making diminish in favour of dwelling on job security and compensation; all topics that move us away from talking about learning and students. Further, I have witnessed the morale of educators plummet as a result of public discourse and I worry about the impact on our young learners. Teachers who are treated and viewed as professionals work hard, reflect often, and feel empowered to change the lives of young people. When this isn't the case, we can imagine the result. My greatest concern is not about the details of governance shift (although that matters to me, too). Rather, it is the reduced attention we are paying to children. We rarely hear mention of them in the media releases, in the media coverage, in the rinks and in the parking lots. We need adults who unfailingly look at the young people in front of them as opposed to over their shoulders at the factors that affect our comfort, security and purpose. I respectfully submit my concerns and implore those making decisions to really seek and hear the voices of students and their teachers in the proposed shifts. This relationship is sacred and we cannot drive attention away from the deep learning this relationship brings. Let us focus on learning. Let us continue our good work. We don't want to start again.

In regards to the options being considered I am concerned about the following: 1. A single public school board for management of all 606 public schools seems to be a very large task and how do you understand and accommodate the needs and unique challenges of all 606 schools. I think this would just make things worse, rather than better. For example, the issues and challenges of rural areas are different than urban. I could see possibly a reduction of the 18 but not down to 1. I also think that it makes sense to change the boundaries to support local community needs. 2. I feel that myself as a parent would be losing my voice if board members are appointed. I feel the members that are appointed are chosen by the community and are there to represent the thoughts and opinions for that community. Thank you,

I would support combining the regions into 4 from the current number. I would also consider the value of the "partner in education" with respect to their contribution to student outcomes. If funds are used for these associations, rather than invested in the students, then maybe it is time to dissolve them.

My wife and I have 3 children. One just finished 1st year of post-secondary, one about to graduate and the last in grade 10. We have lived the effects of the last amalgamation and have been part of the long journey to get here today. Once was enough. One of the things that helped us to get through all the changes was being able to have access to our locally elected boards. When we had concerns or issues that needed to be addressed, a face to face meeting with someone who is from our area often was enough to deal with the situation. The very thought of losing that ability seems like something out of a bad dream. The idea that an appointed board could be in charge of something as personal as education seems like something one would read of happening in another country. It is very obvious that there are those in the education sector that are always complaining about government, but there are several times more that are thankful for the generous funding received. The idea of punishing all because of a few whiners seems quite a silly business decision. I think one of the most important attributes of a leader is the ability to stop...re-think...and then do the right thing. In this case, the right thing to do is work with the tools already in place. Tell the locally elected boards how much to save, and they will, and they will do so without effecting children. Work with locally elected boards to enact changes to governance that the province would be more comfortable with. Complete control belonged to the last government that we as a province got rid of. We elected you because you empowered us to make local decisions and look after our communities. Don't go back on your word. Trust us to help. Respectfully,

We are concerned about the options available. None seem to be in favour of what is best for the children within our province. There are many questions that are left unanswered. We hope there are no decisions made until further more concrete information can be provided. Dear Panel, Thank You for your past work, and the work you are conducting now to make education better. Schooling is an important aspect to our lives today, and striking a balance between quality of education and cost of education mustn't be easy. Today in our school, some students are struggling. More numbers than most people would like to see. The teachers are troubled also. They say they don't have support from those above them and have to stick to timelines of curriculum. Seems as though they are stuck between a rock and a hard place. Those in the Division office say that they are busy figuring out things from the last amalgamation. For the last few years their focus has been on administrative issues and not the children. They say they are now just getting their attention back to the children. That being said, while I understand the need for education to be affordable, I feel it's time for education to be effective. Moving kids on because the help for them isn't available is not helping anyone. If you must change something, please choose a path that will minimize the time the division offices must spend re-organizing themselves, and let them get their focus back on kids and teachers. Thank You for the opportunity to share my views.

Dear Hon. Don Morgan, Minister of Education Thank you for having Mr. Perrins perform this report. I learned a lot from briefly reading through the report and I think it makes sense to review and receive opinions on the state of our education system to stay accountable to ourselves as a province. I also thank you for making a commitment to continued Catholic education. I have heard that our school division is completing their 3 year plan to take us toward the goals set for 2020. We look forward to the ministry's support on this plan. Our school division has one of the highest graduation success rates in the province, especially for First Nation and Metis which would include our children. To loosely quote the speaker and author, Matthew Kelly "The Catholic Church is a sleeping giant" I believe that is true as much in Canada as in the U.S. They do (and have done) a lot in this country, especially in the pioneering and continuation of education in Canada. Those of us who were raised with Catholic education are truly thankful for that constitutional right. Sincerely,

While I can appreciate the benefits of amalgamation (option 1 and 2) on a large scale economically, I am concerned about the very specific, contextual needs of students throughout Saskatchewan. As we are located within a province that is entirely ceded through treaties (and hence treaty obligations) regarding education as well as ongoing processes of reconciliation, we need to mindfully and critically support students (Indigenous and non-Indigenous, newcomers, English speaking and French speaking Canadians, rural and urban dwellers) in diverse ways. As any educator is aware, there is not a one-size fits all approach to effective and authentic teaching and learning. As such, equitable and effective allocation of resources and policies/practices is less likely within a single or regional school division. Merely "placing" representatives from one of the Indigenous communities throughout our province on an advisory committee does not adequately and authentically represent the diverse Indigenous nations throughout this province. Essentialising these communities in this way continues the marginalizing, assimilationist, whitening policies of the past.....We need to be better than this.....our children deserve it. Ethically, we need to step up.

I am concerned with further amalgamations of school boards. It has taken quite some time to develop a good working relationship among division staff since the last amalgamation and I feel making changes, creating larger divisions would not be a wise move. As a staff member, I trust the staff I work with at the division level and feel part of a dedicated team of employees – as part of this team, I want to work toward our common division goals, am conscientious of cost savings – I think this system is working well and should not be altered. If all divisions worked at cost savings, staff efficiencies, I feel this would be more effective than creating larger divisions.

Keep the school boards the way they are!

The government of SK is responsible for full-funding education in the province and should meet the public's expectations to do so. All of citizens of SK are stakeholders in education, and should have the ability to make decisions about education in their own communities. Decisions regarding instruction and learning should be made at the local level where the consequences of the decision will have the most impact.

I am in complete disbelief over the amount of time wasted over this report. Nothing in this report says anything about how the school divisions are being run now. So how is it better? Tell me how making the province one school division better. Tell me how eliminating the school boards is going to make things better for my children's education. You're taking away democracy which is a constitutional right and that is NOT okay. My children go to _____ School. _____ I know that their teachers are doing the best job that they can and giving my children the best education possible. If you take away the Board, if you cut back jobs, then what happens to the quality of education for my kids? How well do you think those teachers are going to do their jobs, knowing they could be cut at any moment. Quality education is a right for all children and I can't believe that you are considering making changes that could potentially damage thousands of people's lives.

Whatever change is ultimately adopted must increase the educational wellbeing of all students in Saskatchewan. The efficiencies to be gained in the K-12 system are definitely in middle management, consultancy and board costs. How are divisions managing their bureaucracy? Classrooms look similar throughout the province - there is a great variety about how boards spend on discretionary items such as consultants, superintendents, board costs, etc. (middle management). The possible restructuring of education should focus on gaining efficiencies at this level and channeling these gains to the classroom or back to the taxpayer. If the choice is made by government to keep boards, they must be elected rather than appointed; the only real purpose boards currently serve is cosmetic representation - if this is lost, boards have no purpose, and directors can directly liaise with Ministry.

I do believe there should be some sort of combination of school divisions in SK. There needs to be people in place in these offices that know a city school, a rural school, an inner city school and a school with a rapidly growing population have very diverse needs. They need to support the needs of ALL students, educators, administrators, and support staff. If there are jobs lost it should be from the top down. If there is amalgamation there should be more teachers and especially EAs added. Teachers and support staff do not get paid enough for the jobs they do educating our children. To treat these essential positions as poorly as our government has been is a terrible decision by our current government. As a parent I value education as very important for my children. I want them to succeed in life and to appreciate those who have guided them along the way. Our government does not appreciate the people on the front line day to day. Thank you

Please take into consideration that our Regina Catholic Schools should have their independence and be locally elected. We want our "Catholic" values and decisions held closer to our catholic community. We say "no" to amalgamating the school boards. Our students do no benefit from moving decisions further away from our community. Thank-you for your consideration.

I am a working mother of two young children. The cost for our schools is going to go up, and we the public will be paying for it. Our children's education will not be so free for our choosing, it will be chosen for them. Our community will have less say in our children's own future. Amalgamation will take place and six people who are not part of our community will be appointment by government or Dan Perrins to direct our children's education, advancements, specializations, sports, arithmetic, changing the education even, for less important reasons then the ones that matter. What about the child, and the votes of the parents and their say in their education, with the teachers and staff that guide our children. They will be puppets in the bigger picture and it won't be up to us, the community the children anymore. It will cost us more, to line the pockets of the government, and the six picked to govern the 600 plus schools across Saskatchewan. I say no to Dan Perrins on option 3B, and support my school divisions advocating against the proposed options.

I don't see why things can't be left alone. Our school division is big enough and works just fine. Why change something if it isn't broken? Leave it alone!

I am asking you to reconsider the possibility of having only one school board for the entire province, without going into the details which I am sure you have heard and I agree with I do believe this is a step in the wrong direction , not only for the school system but for the SASK PARTY when it comes time for re-election, please reconsider and take some time to evaluate this process, this time line for a decision this important is far too short, thank you, a SASK PARTY member,

I feel that K-12 schools should put more emphasis on good character/behavior building as well as personal accountability. - especially in the elementary end (many children don't receive this at home). Habits/attitudes that children develop at the elementary stage of their school life become more enhanced/engrained in junior high and high-school (and throughout their lives) - it is best if they are positive habits/attitudes that follow them out of elementary and into adulthood... Academics are important but so is being a polite respectful person - regardless of age...

We need more voice at the local level (not less) so that schools can do what is in the best interest of their students and to make informed choices with the limited resources they have been given. The suggestions in the Perrin's report on more centralization will further deteriorate the ability for schools to do what is in the best interests of students and be flexible to local needs. If there is no real financial savings to be had (as the Perrin's reports states) why are we not looking at strategies to give teachers the resources they need for larger and more diverse classrooms than there has ever been in this Province! If accountability is really valued in education, do not take out what little there is left and further reduce boards or appoint them. Keep democracy in education - for the people, by the people.

I understand changes are being considered in our education system. As a representative of the people of Saskatchewan, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community. The speed with which the government is moving, the lack of consultation and consideration and the possibility of forced amalgamations threatens rural communities and puts rural education at risk. Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support the Chinook School Division and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature: (1) We need to keep our school boards locally elected, (2) We need to keep decisions closer to our communities, (3) Amalgamations and major restructuring will set back learning and educational goals for many years AGAIN. With amalgamations or major restructuring, the focus is removed from students and refocused on creating a new model under new boards, (4) This would be the second time that forced amalgamation excluded Separate School Boards (Separate school boards each have 7-10 members for lower numbers of schools and students). If forced to choose an option in the Educational Governance Review, we would choose Option 3B, to keep the School Divisions as they are (with some minor adjustments to a few borders that need some correction). Provided that you do this with consultation as is stated in the report. This will have the least disruption to the system and will allow the School Divisions to get the focus back on the provincial educational goals almost immediately. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community. As a rural resident, with children attending school in Saskatchewan, I have many concerns about the transformational change of Saskatchewan's School Boards. My children come first and I believe if the wrong option is chosen regarding the school boards, that my children's education will be effected. Please don't rush this decision and take the time to listen to the people of Saskatchewan. 1)This is the second amalgamation in 10 years that the public school board has had forced upon them! Why AGAIN are the separate school boards being left out? 2)After the first amalgamation schools were closed and communities hurt. If this amalgamation proceeds ahead, it will send a strong message to rural communities that centralization and urbanization is more important to the government then our children's education. 3)Boards must be locally elected. Appointed board members will not be impartial. Local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities. Students will not benefit from moving the decisions further away from the community. Please think of our children and their needs.

Further amalgamation does not help with rural schools as we have so many smaller communities that use rural schools. If this change is adapted; how far away will students now have to go to a school; how long will their bus commute now be both in the morning and in the evening; how does this benefit the children with their school/home life balance? Rural schools help to alleviate the need for huge classroom sizes and help with more one on one time with students that may require extra help. We will have no guarantee or protection of our rural schools being closed, as our rural school boards are the voice of students, teachers, parents and community. I understand that the need to save and cut costs is necessary, but not at the risk of our children's education. Maybe standardization or centralizing other things like payroll and procurement may be an option to look at instead. Save our rural schools.

Enough about cultural diversity already!!! The students need to be taught Canadian history, European history, American history.
My daughter doesn't even know the very basics with regards to Canadian geography and history or Europe or America either.

Questions and Concerns with the Educational Governance Process: With larger school divisions, how can we meet the individual needs of all schools throughout the province? Our province is diverse and so are our schools. School dynamics 30 minutes down the highway can change significantly. In education we strive to meet the diverse needs of each individual school and the professionals in this field do a great job in doing that. If there is larger school divisions there will be some form of disconnect and understanding of the diverse needs of all the schools within the province. To say that all schools will be treated equally should mean that all schools should be treated equally based on their diverse needs and not on simple formulas. This diversity can change even within a school. For example, we can have a classroom of 30 students that are all basically at the same level and the needs of the student are met easily. We can also have a classroom of 14 students that has wide range of needs which may include being behind a few grade levels in reading, to having an IIP, to having an LD, to having mental health issues, to having behavior issues. Even though this class is half the size, it is significantly more demanding before, during and after each lesson that is taught. When there is direct connection within the system it is easier to understand and resolve the issues. Formulas work well in some situations but like everything else, there are special situations. In bigger centers there are more readily available supports whether they are from the health care system or from community groups like Big Brother. So in those centers having a higher number of intensive needs students or students on individual programs are easily handled. In centers where there are very little to no supports the demands are put more onto the school. Will this be considered in a larger system? Can staffing be assigned based on pupil teacher ratio(PTR)? In larger schools I would assume it would work, in smaller schools it most definitely won't. Will this be recognized in the big picture of things? Or will we all be painted with the same brush? What is equitable education as defined by the government? Again, is it based on formulas or is it based on what is best for the students. Presently my understanding is that some monies that are designated as vulnerable sector money is based on the first nations and metis people registered in a school. If this is the case I see this being wrong. The race of a person should not designate whether they are vulnerable or not. The vulnerability of a student has many factors and race should not be one of them. Factors I believe should include addictions issues within the family, mental health issues within the family, family dynamics (Are they separated? Are the parents working together or fighting? Are they living with their parents or grandparents? Are the parents working away from home and for how long?), community dynamics, support systems within the community, etc. Being in education for 26 years has shown me time and time again that these are the issues that can make or break whether a child will be successful in school or not. Will there be baseline staffing for small schools or will they expect fewer staff to do the work of what we already have in place? Staffing is tough in rural and remote communities and if these issues aren't addressed it will result in school closures. Work conditions need to be attractive if we want to attract staff and keep staff in these schools. What is the cost savings of this proves? Throughout the Perrins report I do not see any dollar figures attached to how much will be saved. How much did it cost to do the report? How much is it costing for the panel process? How much is it going to cost to make the changes? And is the money being saved going to be put towards education once the deficit is paid off? Is transformational change something that could have been handled within the system itself? Could the government given the present school divisions the directive to cut money to a certain amount with certain criteria such as less school divisions, not touching the front lines of staffing, etc? Last budget it seemed like the government said here is your pot of money, make it work. Some school divisions had savings without cutting any staff while others cut a large number of classroom staff? I totally understand that Catholic people are entitled to a Catholic Education and will not argue this point. But if we are talking governance, does it mean that they have to have their own Board of Education, own Director of Education and own Superintendents? Could a public system and Catholic system amalgamate and continue to offer a Catholic education as they do now in some schools while in other schools continue to operate as we do now in our public schools. And the other question that I ask is how can a school that is offering a Catholic education have non-Catholic teachers working in the system? As a non-Catholic I have worked a temporary contract in a Catholic system. My religious affiliation did not affect my teaching performance but I was completely unable to address any religious questions that were asked of me to level that I should be able to when working in such a system. I truly enjoyed my job and wished to stay but was informed at the end of the school year that due to my religious beliefs I was no longer able to teach in that system. Yet today, a number of non-Catholic teachers work in the separate system. The Saskatchewan government has set long term goals for education in the province such as increased grad rates. Since these expectations have been put forward the education sector has pushed forward and are addressing the specific and meeting the requests. Grad rates are increasing in across the boards and the 4 and 5 years resiliency rates are also increasing. Point being is that when you put a challenge onto the education systems, we will meet that challenge keeping in mind that the students come first. If the transformational change is just about money and we lose the focus of the student achievement we are going backwards. If transformational change helps the educational process and

student achievement I am all for any changes that are coming. Its like everything else in life, change is fantastic if it is for the right purpose and money should not be the driving force behind change. You can't tell a farmer to feed his family if you don't give him the land or the tools to do it. Thank you for your time in reading this email. As the due date for input into the transformational change is here I sit back and wait with anticipation the news to come. The process that has taken place has been quick and in my estimation without proper consultation of the public. As more and more people are becoming aware of the situation that education faces, there are a lot more discussions and philosophies that go into it. I am stuck on the time frame and the timing of the process. If Prime Minister Trudeau used the same time frame and consultation to impose a Carbon Tax on the provinces I am sure that we would all be up in arms, especially Saskatchewan as Premier Wall is doing what other premiers should be doing and standing up for the province. Why is this change coming so fast? Is there an issue with the current system so great that we need to address it immediately or can we take our time and make sure the decision we make is correct the first time? This is what we tell our students when it comes to doing their work. Are the options based on successful models from elsewhere in the country or around the world? Like the old saying goes, "Why re-invent the wheel?" Why not look at models around the world, find ones that are working well and make them ours. The Ministry of Education is doing this already with the Hear Their Voices initiative. From the data I have seen with the program it not only worked in New Zealand but it is also working in Saskatchewan. Why not do this same thing with the governance? Another concern that comes to the fore front is that rural and urban schools are different. What works in the bigger city schools don't necessarily work in the small town schools and what works in the small town schools does not work in the big city schools. At we have a student voice group that gets input from the student body about how things are going, things they would like to see and how we can make some changes. Being a small school this is a great way to collaborate with the students. I meet weekly with the group and we get great feedback. I get to listen to the students and the students get information about why things are the way they are from me. A group of this nature would not work in a large school as they would have way to many voices to hear. In a large school class sizes can be higher. If there are three forms of Math Workplace 10 then the teachers could potentially put students with the same abilities within the same classes. The teacher would then be teaching students with close to the same abilities and therefore a higher the number of kids in a class is easy to manage. In small schools we may only have 15 kids in the same class but they can be all over the board when it comes to ability. The same class may contain students with IIP, modified math, alternate math as well as the regular program. Some years they also have an enrichment they should do to help some students from becoming bored and becoming a behavior issue. With present day school divisions those factors are still recognized. Don't get me wrong...I am not against change. In fact I appreciate change especially when the reason behind it is for progression and the betterment of the students. Before we unleash a new educational system upon this province I ask that you show us, you show the kids, how this will make education equitable around the province and how this will give our students a better chance for success. Yours in Education,

Dear Government of Saskatchewan, I understand changes are being considered in our education system. As a representative of the people of Saskatchewan, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community. The speed with which the government is moving, the lack of consultation and consideration and the possibility of forced amalgamations threatens rural communities and puts rural education at risk. Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support the Chinook School Division and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature: 1. We need to keep our school boards locally elected. 2. We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. 3. Amalgamations and major restructuring will set back learning and educational goals for many years AGAIN. With amalgamations or major restructuring, the focus is removed from students and refocused on creating a new model under new boards. 4. This would be the second time that forced amalgamation excluded Separate School Boards. (Separate school boards each have 7-10 members for lower numbers of schools and students). 5. If forced to choose an option in the Educational Governance Review, we would choose Option 3B, to keep the School Divisions as they are (with some minor adjustments to a few borders that need some correction). Provided that you do this with consultation as is stated in the report. This will have the least disruption to the system and will allow the School Divisions to get the focus back on the provincial educational goals almost immediately. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community. Sincerely,

We are a vast and varying province whose school boards need to remain locally elected in order to best serve our children. It is impossible to believe that the rural schools, northern school and urban schools would all be best served by one board, especially a board that is appointed. A city board that has no connection to rural concerns would be disastrous. Please consider this when going forward. While some amalgamation may HAVE to occur, the less reduction in boards, the better.

I believe that school boards need to continue to be locally elected so that decisions and governance can remain at the local level. 2. It appears to me that the Province's decision to implement ESSP ran counter-productive to the governance system employed prior to 2012. The evidence can be seen in the results that SK shows in Science, Reading and Math compared to the rest of Canada. I believe that this is evidence that local bodies should have the ability to remain close to the decision making process for local schools in order to deliver programming/ influence the delivery/ prioritize learning at a local level in a manner that works for individual communities. 3. This report and the decisions that come from this report are critical for the education that we are providing our children. I am shocked at the abysmal manner that the engagement is happening: the report has not been delivered in a manner that is accessible nor understandable to all, nor is there adequate communication in how important this decision is. If the Government of SK was truly interested in engaging parents and the public, the engagement would happen at the community level in a manner that is available and understandable for all parents, including those that do not have post-secondary education, or do not understand the implications of the decisions that are being made. And 1 parent group and "members of the general public" (undefined percentage of representation) does not make a comprehensive engagement initiative. Shame on you for engaging in a manner that will not ensure an appropriate representation of the parents and community that are most invested and interested in the outcomes that will result from this decision. I am extremely disappointed in this consultation process.

It's very important to me that associate schools are given a spot on the board, along with home educators. Our children currently attend _____ and we home educated them previous to that, for 3 years. First of all I want to say thank you on behalf of our family for allowing these wonderful options in educating our children. We know that they are a priveledge and we don't take them for granted. Every day, we are thankful for them! Moving forward, I request that SHBE, HSLDA, and a representative of HCCA be counted as stakeholders in these discussions and that the registering authorities who are accountable to those groups would be appointed by the province, to keep them accountable for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students and students attending associated schools. I also request that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators and those in associate schools. Thanks so much for your consideration - we appreciate you!

I have concerns that rural schools will not have their needs met should all school boards be amalgamated into one provincial appointed board. Common sense dictates that the priorities and challenges are different in a rural school than in an urban school. Money, always in short supply, would be spent on the needs of the majority and rural/aboriginal students would suffer. I would suggest that having local individuals involved in making decisions and delivering services is a benefit. They have a vested interest in the success of their school and division and therefore give more freely of their time. A large appointed board would treat the position as a job only. Please carefully consider the importance of having fair representation for rural and aboriginal students. It is in the best interest of our province to ensure our rural communities stay viable and having a good education available locally for the children is necessary to meet that goal. Agriculture is an industry that will always be a cornerstone of our provincial economy and young families need to know their children will be educated well without having to travel great distances.

The work our 14 Board members, 1 Director and entire staff do each and every day to look after 41 schools in our Division to meet the needs of around 6400 students is indescribable. Amalgamating into one where there will be 1 Board, 1 Director, 28 school divisions for approximately 700 schools and 176, 000 students will have nothing but a negative effect on Student Learning, Safe and Caring, Literacy, School Leadership and there will be no community representation. Amalgamating has got everything to do with cutting costs and nothing to do with the students' needs.

Having worked in the public school system, and having children in the Catholic system, I highly value the choice that two systems provide. The public system focuses on the student's growth through mental, physical and emotional development, while spiritual development is an important part of Catholic school. I have also observed an increase in testing mandated by government, to keep teachers accountable, which has resulted in less instruction time in the classroom. Reducing this bureaucracy would increase instructional time, therefore improving student outcomes. It seems to be getting more common for instructional time to be taken up by businesses marketing to children. This is especially concerning for me. School pictures is one thing, but having a company in 3 times a year interrupting classes to sell photography is too much. As well, we had an "artist visit" from someone who did a workshop with the kids teaching them cartoon drawing and then using high pressure sales tactics to sell how to draw cartoon books. We need to guard our schools against this. I fear it is happening more and more as funding gets cut. Our students are being taught in this case by marketing reps from companies. I would like to see some policies in place to protect against sales and marketing in schools. Increased funding would allow for higher quality instruction without the conflict of interest that these businesses bring.

The Council for the Rural Municipality of Fox Valley No. 171 unanimously disagrees with the process, options and timeline presented in the Educational Governance Review Report. All four options provide fewer school divisions, fewer locally elected boards of education, decisions being moved further away from the communities and a HUGE impact on the students. Council feels this review process is being rushed with no discussions happening at the local municipal levels. The "fifth" option that should be included in the report is keep the school boards at a local democratically elected level. Local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities. The pattern here is local and education belongs to the community. The schools and municipalities currently within the Chinook School Division have experienced forced amalgamation in the past. It took at least 5 years for the Boards, formed only 10 years ago, to become accepted as the community's school system. It took years for administration, staff and students to adjust to the new school systems. Significant improvement in learning is just beginning to be achieved in the last couple of years and consolidation of the school boards will set back the advancements that have been made in literacy and numeracy for years. As locally elected officials, Council does not want to see the students and staff experience the negative and quite challenging obstacles again. As municipalities, we are required to collect education property taxes from our local ratepayers, on behalf of the school boards. These property tax funds need to remain within our local school divisions. Council fears that if these property tax funds are centralized, smaller rural schools will be allocated less funds and hard decisions will need to be made, possibly related to program cuts and lay-offs. At the end of the day, the Saskatchewan Student needs to be put first. This Educational Governance Review Report is primarily about money and cutbacks. What about the children? Our children are our future, why is it so hard to invest in them? They need us to guide them and give them our greatest care and attention. The Council for the Rural Municipality of Fox Valley No. 171 is urgently requesting the Provincial Government leave the school divisions the way they currently stand. Thank you for your consideration and we await your reply. Yours truly,

Leave everything alone! Don't change anything!

I will begin by sharing that I have been a school board member for 16 yrs. and was involved in the great amalgamation of 2006. This was an enormous feat which created much anxiety and confusion. Newly elected boards were mandated to create new divisions encompassing legacy divisions which was complicated, frustrating at time and very demanding of all board members/ employees. I can honestly say that it took several (5) years for the board to function in an effective and efficient manner. We are now at the point where we can see the result of our hard work. The education sector strategy plan introduced by the Government is a worthwhile document and we have already noticed it's result albeit only 2 years old. Our school division has been able to operate under any government mandated budget and if given a budget amount would be able to achieve the same results. I guess that is the sad thing about this announcement as nothing concrete has been presented to boards and one wonders where the vision of the government is? The missing link here is the continuing efforts by all divisions to educate our children. Nothing is mentioned about how this will affect them as a mega board would not know the demands in our schools and it is felt that the children are the ones that will suffer the wrath. I compare this short sited effort to the NDP's closure of 52 hospitals and the hardship that it created to the rural residents. To this day it is still a topic in rural Saskatchewan and we are witnessing its shortfalls everyday... The removal of elected school boards will only negate a small amount of money in the whole scheme as severance packages will have to be paid to staff and the creation of a new appointed board will come with a huge financial commitment. There are so many other avenues in school budgets that can be tackled such as Linc agreements, transportation and yes increasing the school tax on property.... I hope that caucus will take the time to research all the pros and cons and not only think of the quick fix. Listen to the taxpayers as they are the ones that are footing the bill.

As the governance review process continues and final recommendations and decisions are made, please keep in mind the importance of ensuring that faith-based education must be maintained and represented in any governance model. In the province of Saskatchewan this has always been essential and it will continue to be valued and supported by Saskatchewan residents.

I think making the proposed changes will be damaging our public education sector. What we stand to lose is: 1) Loss of effective and accountable public voice 2) Unintended consequences of amalgamations and appointed boards 3) Less say, control and input in your child's education 4) Loss of relationships with parents, parishes and community partners I honestly don't see a benefit and find that it will be harmful to our schools and essentially their students. I have also written my MLA to this effect. Please reconsider your point of view

Please keep Catholic schools a community effort b/w school, parish and community. I am sending my children to Catholic school to be taught and live Catholic teachings with likeminded students and staff who are familiar with parishes and community volunteers and activities. It takes a village to raise a child, this is how I was raised, and this us how I hope to continue to raise my children.

Although I can appreciate how centralization of services and removing redundancy can save money, education's unique client base is never served well (the goal is to increase graduation rates, right??) with a one-size fits all model. Arrogant overspending by the SaskParty has once again put our province in a financial mess. Amalgamation of local boards, the only ones who understand the diverse and specific needs of the client, is only being considered because Brad Wall has made poor spending decisions in other areas (Regina Bypass, New Copper Dome, A Stadium Without a Dome, GTH Land, Skip the Dishes...). I have no issue with the government commissioning a report on education as the last report was conducted by the Equity Task Force back in 2004. It's been over a decade; taking a renewed look at education is welcomed by the profession. But reducing the number of school boards has already been done, Brad; we went from 82 boards to 28 boards in 2006. Perhaps it is time to look for new, forward-thinking ways of doing things. (I'm also not convinced that the Minister in Charge, an approaching 70 year old, born and raised in the largest city in Saskatchewan, never taught a day in his life lawyer, has any idea whatsoever of what K-12 clients across the province need right now.) What if there was a new "World Board of Governance", implemented to make decisions for all the States and Provinces in the world about how to spend money? Would the SaskParty like to be told by the "World Board of Governance" how to operate in Saskatchewan? I think not. I imagine Brad Wall would say that he knows what's best for his province, because he lives here and understands what the people need and want. He wouldn't want some "World Governance Board" pretending to know our needs; so disconnect with our Saskatchewan realities. Well, local school boards know what's best for the parents and students in their community too. Educators often have a hard time properly articulating the effects of quality education for two reasons, 1) the numerous positive externalities are difficult to quantify, and 2) governments operate in numbers. This is not only unfortunate, but it is also the reason why we need to trust local educators, not members of government, to make decisions that affect our sons, daughters and grandchildren. The government is making rash, uneducated decisions to find money in all the wrong places, we as citizens of this province are foolish to think that any of the proposed options have anything to do with improving outcomes for our students.

A large percentage of the funding for education still comes from local property taxes. While the Province sets the taxation rate, the local taxpayers still pay the toll. Taxpayers deserve local representation for education. This is different from Health where all funding except portions of capital come from the general revenue fund of the Provincial budget. Locally elected boards are responsible for placing student needs first when making decisions, and are accountable to their electorate. They are responsible for ensuring all students within their jurisdiction have equal opportunities to reach their maximum potential. This may be lost with larger elected boards or appointed boards who may be more influenced by politics because they are responsible to the government who appointed them.

Please leave things as they are! We as parents don't want to lose our voices for our children!

Local democratically elected School Boards are the best choice for my community. Local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities. School boards make planning, staffing and budget decisions close to communities with the resources made available. It also encourages civic engagement in education. Based on past experience, amalgamation will put the focus on governance, administration and change management. Students will become secondary focus setting back the advancements that have been made in literacy and improved graduation rates. The previous NDP amalgamation caused disruptions for at least 5 years and education spending continues to rise. Economies of scale have been realized. This would be the second time that forced amalgamation excluded Separate (minority faith) School Boards, firstly in the NDP action and now in the SaskParty proposal. It took at least 5 years for the Boards, formed only 10 years ago, to become accepted as our community's school system. Significant improvement in learning is just beginning to be achieved in the last couple of years. A large percentage of the funding for education still comes from local property taxes. While the Province sets the taxation rate, the local taxpayers still pay the toll. Taxpayers deserve local representation for education. This is different from Health where all funding except portions of capital come from the general revenue fund of the Provincial budget. Locally elected boards are responsible for placing student needs first when making decisions, and are accountable to their electorate. They are responsible for ensuring all students within their jurisdiction have equal opportunities to reach their maximum potential. This may be lost with larger elected boards or appointed boards who may be more influenced by politics because they are responsible to the government who appointed them.

Dear Honorary Brad Wall: I understand changes are being considered in our education system. As the Premier of our province, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community. Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support the NESD and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature: (1) We need to keep our school boards locally elected; and (2) We need to keep decisions close to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

I am a concerned Grandmother who has two grand-kids in rural school and one grandchild in city Catholic school. Just wondering IF this new legislation is implemented (I know so far what I've heard is that the majority opinion is Not to have a change to leave as is) how this will affect the rural schools..... as far as funding, staffing, teacher-child time ratio, where will the division office be: re: travel times for meetings etc.... who will decide on the hiring, how much input will a local board still have. As you can see I have many questions and I'm just a Grandma!. How much money was or still is being spent on the Don Perrins Report and the six people traveling around the province to these meetings.....could this not be spent more wisely?? I know Mr. Wall is always concerned about his provincial citizens and wants the best for them - I'm not sure with this new legislation and wanting to cut teacher's wages will be of any benefit to Mr. Wall's future provincial citizens; you won't have the best teacher teaching our children so how can you expect a greater percentage graduating by 2020? I am a Sask Part Member and have great respect for Brad Wall but this proposition I'm not agreeing with and I really have concerns about the future education of my grandchildren and the future of the Catholic School System in Saskatchewan(which I DO NOT want to see fade away!) It seems as soon as a political party is short on money the first things they hit are the Education and Health systems and ultimately Me the Tax Payer. Your advertisements rave how good Saskatchewan is to its people....prove it! I commend Brad for really fighting against the Carbon Tax as we already have the PST and don't need another tax.....if he fails on this I hope he will do away with the PST. Thanks for listening and I hope and pray that you the government of Saskatchewan will listen to the People and Not just go ahead with your plans anyway disregarding the majority opinions.

WE NEED TO KEEP OUR SCHOOL BOARDS LOCALLY ELECTED WE NEED TO KEEP DECISIONS CLOSE TO OUR COMMUNITIES. Local democratically elected school Boards are the best choice for my community. Local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities. School boards make planning, staffing and budget decisions close to communities with the resources made available. It also encourages civic engagement in education. Based on past experience, amalgamation will put the focus on governance, administration and change management. Students will become secondary focus setting back the advancements that have been made in literacy and improved graduation rates. The previous NDP amalgamation caused disruptions for at least 5 years and education spending continues to rise. Economies of scale have been realized. This would be the second time that forced amalgamation excluded Separate (minority faith) School Boards, firstly in the NDP action and now in the Sask Party proposal. It took at least 5 years for the Boards, formed only 10 years ago, to become accepted as our community's school system. Significant improvement in learning is just beginning to be achieved in the last couple of years. A large percentage of the funding for education still comes from local property taxes. While the Province sets the taxation rate, the local taxpayers still pay the toll. Taxpayers deserve local representation for education. This is different from Health where all funding except portions of capital come from the general revenue fund of the Provincial budget. Locally elected boards are responsible for placing student needs first when making decisions, and are accountable to their electorate. They are responsible for ensuring all students within their jurisdiction have equal opportunities to reach their maximum potential. This may be lost with larger elected boards or appointed boards who may be more influenced by politics because they are responsible to the government who appointed them.

To whom it may concern: I am a parent in Horizon School Division, and president of the School Community Council. I believe one of the purposes of education is to create a critically thoughtful citizenship for Canada who has the opportunity and responsibility to use their public voices to inform decisions that affect their lives. Over the past few years, in public education and in public health, the local citizenry in Saskatchewan has had their voice stripped away to become further removed from the centres of decision-making. What has occurred is a distancing of decision making from the people those decisions affect, which negatively effects local communities and schools. The decisions become politically and financially driven, and local circumstances and voice become less relevant, even when those voices could offer alternative solutions to issues in public education. Not everything should be a financial decision made by people who do not understand the consequences for the real people, and in this case, the children, who are affected. The options of the Perrin's report will add to this problem, and will no doubt negatively affect rural and small schools in this province. Given that the electorate is smaller in these communities, it is only a matter of time before decisions will not fully consider the needs of the small communities on which this province was built. Instead, decision-making will lean towards satisfying the interests of larger groups in larger communities. I agree with the letter published by Dr. Murray Scharf and Dr. Herve Langlois on January 11, 2017 in the Star Phoenix who said the following: The delivery of education should be through a system of local jurisdictions established by the provincial government and functioning within a governance structure of locally-elected boards of education. The membership on the boards consisting of lay people should be elected from among the electors of the school division. We saw education as a public good, fundamental for good democratic citizenry, to be delivered through a partnership among parents, communities and the government.

Further, I am not convinced that the need for a complete restructuring of educational governance has been established in the report. The rationale that has been provided is for financial efficiency, which inevitably in this province has led to school closure of rural and small schools. Actually, it could be argued that of all public services in Saskatchewan, educational leadership and teaching groups have been the most willing to work together to create a system that is governed well on reduced budgets while maintaining meaningful services for children and youth who are diverse in culture, language, region of birth, religion, and economic circumstance. A move to centralization generally also goes hand in hand with a move to standardization, and this may not serve well the needs of an increasingly diverse student body who need diverse programs and services. Though there is always room for some standardized practice, there also needs to be room for local advocacy based on individual needs. Public schooling has also faced a large number of changes to its governance structure in the recent past that has had huge implications for service provision, yet educational groups remain committed to working together to improve. As Murray Mandryk noted in the Leader-Post on November 19, "teachers, trustees and education administrators have been delivering on change and cost-savings at a time when other Saskatchewan entities have felt no such need." In fact, a comment in this article made by former trustee Sandra Urban-Hall brings up the primary concern I have with this recent report: "what the government says it's doing in the guise of efficiencies may be little more than a further erosion of local education autonomy that will especially hurt rural Saskatchewan." A third point to be made is to question the extent to which amalgamations of any sort have ever led to significant savings. Although it is suggested that amalgamation leads to reductions in administrative costs, what is generally not mentioned are the huge costs of resources and time that get shifted to deal with the needs of serving huge geographical distances. The costs in time and resourcing of travelling specialists, division meetings, professional development services, transportation, extra-curricular opportunities, etc., also sky-rocket, so the reductions in some areas are generally offset by increases in others. Without a more thorough understanding of how costs and efficiencies will occur, a restructuring of this magnitude is not justifiable. Fourthly, the idea to utilize political appointments for governance rather than locally elected trustees is frightening. Government appointments are partisan. It would be highly unlikely that boards based on political appointments would make educational decisions outside of party politics. If some of the rationale for this option is based on the idea that trustees do not have the capacity to make wise decisions, then the answer lies in better trustee education for the public role they hold, and not in taking away the right to govern local jurisdictions by local people. Education is a public good, and not a political good to be used every four years for vote courting for provincial politics. Finally, the limited notice, the timing of the review, and lack of real investment in thoughtful discourse with local people suggests that the provincial government is not actually interested in what local people have to say; that the decisions have likely already been made; and that the invitation to respond is a superficial attempt to make the general public feel that they had the chance to provide input. The way this review has been handled (panel, the request for feedback, the formal meetings held only with powerful groups in the province, and the lack of attention to educating local parents and school community councils on what this report and its consequences might hold for educational governance in Saskatchewan) does not allow people to provide thoughtful critique for decisions that will be made on their behalf. It certainly cannot be said to be a thorough review of the public system, because it has not involved the general public whose children are in schools. Parents are now being asked to respond to a report that most of them were unaware was happening; to that end, many parents will not know how to respond to the report given that many of them may not understand educational governance and its politics thoroughly. That does not mean that they don't understand the educational needs of their children. That does not mean that they don't understand the importance of their local school to the educational and economic value they hold for their local communities. And that does not mean that they do not, or should not, have a voice in educational governance in a way that is responsive to the diverse needs of local communities. I am advocating for my children, my community, and the schools in Horizon School Division. I strongly oppose any decision to further centralize educational services in this province. The single motive of increasing financial efficiencies has not been realized in other centralizing restructuring of public services. There appears to be no thorough or research-based evidence of the consequences that this centralization would bring. These moves bring us further away from the consideration of education as a local public good governed by those who have the interests of local people firmly at the centre. Our rural communities will not survive if public services are governed by people far removed from those affected by their decisions, and whose interests are financial or political rather than the local public good.

Good Afternoon, I have been following the discussions on the possible upcoming changes. I am a parent of a child with a disability. My concerns come with losing our line of communication when we lose our local boards/Direct communication. My daughter will be transitioning into high school and I'm afraid that we will lose all those supports. I am a strong advocate for my daughter and her voice...Dont take those supports from us.

As a speech-language pathologist I have had the opportunity to work with a number of different school divisions and health regions. In my current role I support many schools in rural communities and have realized that every school and every community is very different, even those that are geographically close to one another, and as such they have very different needs. It takes time to get to know the needs of each school and establish rapport, and I feel this can only be achieved by spending time getting to know the people and the community. A move towards a larger provincial model is terrifying in these small communities that already often feel forgotten by the world around them and is very intimidating for the specialists supporting these communities who already feel there is not enough time to support our students in rural communities. Too often it seems that decisions are based on the bottom line, rather than using research and evidence to implement quality education for children. While it may seem simple to save a few dollars here and there with cuts to education, those cuts will be felt across the lifespan of the students affected and too often result in the need for increased spending in other sectors. Public education is one of the greatest gifts we offer our communities, but it seems to be more and more watered down with each passing year. As a professional, I believe this province has already cut too many corners, and as someone who hopes to raise a family in this province, I am worried for the future of their education. I don't see the changes proposed as being innovative or beneficial to students in Saskatchewan, but rather with great potential to be detrimental to student outcomes. Our community is begging you: - PLEASE do not further centralize education in the province - PLEASE don't close our rural schools - PLEASE don't cut funding to our students

I do support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). - It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! We do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. - I do not support any of the three models presented in the report. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support that change to governance or further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. - I have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold we are legislated by. - I need a permanent high school plan, including transportation, to accommodate the best interests of our students, their families, and our community. - Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in.

I would encourage the Government to make data driven amalgamation decisions with respect to previous amalgamations. When the province collapsed the 100+ smaller divisions in the previous round of amalgamations, with the intent of saving money, we saw quite the contrary. The growth in division size and subsequent responsibilities, resulted in more governing administration positions, more travel costs, especially with administrators travelling throughout their now vast divisions, the negotiation of higher wages, etc, etc. While not quantified, the proof is still in the pudding, given we saw no drastic cost savings after the previous amalgamation. Further consideration for amalgamation, without collecting a detailed data report reflecting the costs associated with the previous amalgamations, is simply irresponsible. A wiser decision would be to give more control back to divisions by removing the handicap of provincially set mill rates. As in past practice, this enabled communities to operate a fiscally responsible division that meets all the needs of their local students. Be it noted that I agree and support the position of our local board, and the STF in regards to the negative effects any further amalgamations will have on education in our province. I also encourage the government to treat Lloydminster, Canada's only border city, with the utmost respect for autonomy, given our unique situation. With ~65% of our funding coming from Alberta, governance of the funds for Alberta students needs to be local, and should not be distributed outside of our unique city and its seamless education.

I have grave concerns regarding the possibility of the Lloydminster Public School Division being required to amalgamate. All communities have their unique dynamics which require unique structures. I fear that a "one size fits all" model will drastically impact students, teachers and learning in negative ways by creating more focus on redesigning structures and less on student learning. Lloydminster specifically is unique being on the border with funding from Alberta and the fact that the city also has structures in place to create provincial equality for students in our border city. I worry that the change in all of these structures is not conducive to our community. Our two school boards work together to provide education structures with Calendar and other collaborations to suit our communities needs. I would hate to see this change and negatively impact our families in Lloydminster. Many families count on this consistency. I am in full support of LPSD maintaining it's own school board so that together the two Lloydminster School Divisions can continue to meet the particular demands of this dual province city.

I understand changes are being considered in our education system. Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support Saskatchewan school boards and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature. We need to keep our school boards locally elected; and, We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

I am very concerned over the proposals the government has put forward. We are a small school that underwent school closure and viability review 3 years ago. With our great support from our communities we managed to prove our existence was for the best interest in our students. What concerns me about your proposal to become 1 provincial board, 4 boards or smaller boards is that we won't have the representation of our local boards. You CANNOT enlarge the division's by amalgamating and appointing board members. This would be ridiculous. For instance how would someone as far away as Saskatoon possibly run school 3-4 hrs from them?! It's simple.....they can't. They don't know our concerns and don't care to know them. In order to cut funds and save maybe you should look at the CEOs, superintendents and other higher appointed positions. Cut their wages.....you CANNOT cut the teachers, freeze them or simply just short change the schools. Our children are the next generation to run this country. They need funding and support to be able to excel. With cuts to faculty you risk losing those in need of help. Currently every school is in need of educational associates.....yet they are not being provided with the numbers they need. These children are struggling and it will just continue to get worse if funding is cut. I understand that change is sometimes good.....but 10.5 years ago our divisions amalgamated into bigger ones that caused a huge ruckus. The staff and boards are finally feeling like they are making headway with the new curriculum, marking systems and funding.....if we amalgamate once again they will need to start over. It is not a 1-2 year process it's closer to 8-10 years before they are comfortable and before all the problems are working out and smooth. The cuts do not need to be made at our level....cuts need to be made at the provincial level.

After thoroughly reading the 34 page report, it is abundantly clear the only positive in this report is saving the government of Saskatchewan money. Many things need to be considered here. Especially that children in rural schools have a much different education than children in urban schools. Their needs and wants differ as well as the geography and their means of transportation. I see that an appointed board is only accountable to the government, and as such will have one main objective and that is to save money. Therefore, vital resources like teachers and educational assistants will likely be cut again. The future of this province lies within these children who will surely struggle and suffer if their new school division only counts dollars and cents and not the value of the children themselves. It is likely quite easy to sit up in an office where you do not know anyone and simply pluck the teachers, board members and EAs from their positions without thinking of any of the personal consequences that happen. Education is a long term goal and decisions regarding it should not be made in haste or taken lightly. The timeline between when Dan Perrins was asked to write this report and when it came out is also suspect. It would appear this was already in the works much before November 15 when he was "asked" to provide a report. And generally, feedback is usually given before these reports are made, not after. It is my assumption that the decision has already been made and this feedback will likely gauge just how many people are upset with the decision and how many people don't even know what is happening or don't care. Options 1 and 2 are absurd. They do not take into account actual care and knowledge of our children. They simply take into account the amount of money of school divisions are costing the government and where we can shave off some of these costs. The letter of transmittal basically states that everyone unanimously decided amalgamations are a bad idea but then the report basically contradicts itself and leads us to believe everyone is wrong and the amalgamations are pertinent. If we are trying to save so much money, why are we only looking at the amalgamation of the public school? Certainly the minority faith and francophone divisions should be considered in this? Is this deliberate as to not ruffle any feathers? It should all be done at the same time. This is discrimination on the rest of the province as it appears only public schools need to be amalgamated. Please explain why every other province has an elected board for each division and how they run with so many divisions but all of a sudden Saskatchewan must down-size? My guess is the billion dollar deficit which is of no fault of our children or their teachers or educational assistants. I have read that Saskatchewan has ranked last within the province for math, reading and science. I disagree with this somewhat. Our little school in Preeceville has received some very valuable scores here and one grade (3) has 92% of its kids reading at grade level or above. The entire elementary average is above 85% for this. I attribute this to our style of teaching in rural schools vs urban schools. They are taught more one on one here but because our population is much less than the city schools, these impressive numbers do not help our national and provincial averages. These numbers should be looked at. Just another reason you cannot group all rural and urban schools together in one division. Some of these rural divisions are very successful on their own. Please take the time to study this further. There are many unanswered questions here. I believe something so important as our children's education, should not be taken lightly and these decisions should not be made in haste just to save a few dollars. They are the future of this province.

As a parent with 2 young children currently attending a school in the RCSD, I strongly believe that the provincial School Divisions should all remain separate in regards to making decisions regarding their curriculums, finances, etc. However, I do strongly agree with moving with more P3A Models, it is the best of all worlds.

As a parent I will voice my opinion on the benefits I believe are wonderful as having a smaller school, for my child to attend. There is more one on one with the student, who benefits if that child is struggling in certain areas. Your child is actually a person to the teacher not just a number because the student to teacher ratio is ridiculous in bigger schools. The teacher actually cares about the students and the student feels more comfortable to talk to teacher as they know them. I'm not saying that big school teachers don't care but they don't necessarily know that child as good as a small town teacher does. Let talk about sports at least in a small school every child is given the opportunity to play and participate. In a big school if you are not a top athlete lets face it your screwed as there are tryouts and bigger schools want their names to be up on the top. So the best get on the teams, and the other kids who could improve by being on a team get pushed out the door. Then society says we are raising lazy kids, no our systems that think bigger is better is ruining our kids not the parents. Lets look at the schools the bigger ones already are filled to capacity we were told like nipawin tisdale etc, that was a few years back when we were under review. When parents asked the questioned what will you do with our kids, the head people said oh we will just build a bigger school in those places..Really!!doesnt make sense to me when our schools are having improvements to them etc. Do you ever think of the stress it puts on the children, who would ever say its in the childs best interest to ride on a bus for an hour to hour and half one way to school. Just so we can have a dozen big schools instead of many smaller schools.. I can certainly say that its not in the interest of the children its what looks good on paper. So lets talk about what looks good on paper for me as a parent and as a healthcare worker I want to see that there are enough lower paid people like the people who are actually doing the job to educate our kids like teachers, teacher aides, bus drivers, secretaries and librarians etc getting paid what they deserve and actually doing a job. Why should they be cut in hours, loose their job while we hear all the time this committee is being formed or we hired another higher up guy or girl making 6 digit salary that lives in bigger centres or cities how about decrease their pay. If we did that maybe our smaller schools could stay open with less upper management. Lots of these people live in bigger centres or cities have no clue about rural living. Yes we all choose where we would like to live, yes I choose to live on a farm in a small community so my children can be involved in the small town community where everyone knows you and you all mean something to everyone. My child gets a chance to play on teams, which makes them stronger because they have to prove to the bigger places we got what it takes to be a great team, just because we are small doesn't mean we are useless. school has had many teams hit the provincial levels throughout many years. Please consider this thought BIGGER is NOT always better, if you believe this at all as being on this board and reading all of the comments people send in be our voice and stand up for our smaller schools. WE did our part telling you what we think now its up to you to stand up for us and say NO we want smaller schools not bigger. Thank you

Do not change our school systems!

I believe it is very important that Saskatchewan has various local school divisions. The proximity of the divisions heads to the actual schools help focus the issues at hand and help address them in timely fashion with and understanding local community. The public perception on our role as educators is also highly important. I believe there is a disconnect to what we actually do and services we provide in a school, to what the general community believes we do on a daily basis. Tasks that general public may not be aware of include the social development of children, teaching social skills, health care assistance in many cases, counselling, extra curricular (volunteerism) on top of broad spectrum academic needs of each individual student. The juggling act is ongoing and it takes a great deal of patience and care. Thanks for taking time to listen to our voices!

As you work out the details of "transformational change," please consider the current successes we see in divisions around the province. Instead of slashing funding and asking divisions to save more on the salary payments negotiated by the province, consider taking the ideas, processes and programs that are working and find ways to implement them in other divisions. I attended school in the Regina Catholic School Division, and my children are there now. The gift of education is clear. The gift of Catholic education, not everyone understands. We don't pause learning for church. We use the two together. God is a part of every class, every conversation, and yes, every success. This division is incredibly successful, and I feel confident that this will only change if the government steps in with sweeping changes that will ultimately affect the classroom. What I want: local school boards, increases (NOT decreases) in funding, and a government that will manage funds better to allow for our education system to do its job. What I don't want: amalgamations that don't make sense (perhaps some small divisions could be absorbed by nearby divisions, but no school in Northern Saskatchewan should be controlled by a board in cushy offices in an urban centre.), continued decreases in funding, or political decisions that drop the potential for the success of my children. Above all else, I hold dear to my heart the gift of Catholic education. Please do NOT take that away. Yours,

School Boards should remain local and able to directly represent and respond to the parents and students they serve.

In responding to the Perrins report on educational governance I believe that it is vital to consider the current governance model in terms of both of efficiency and equity in the delivery of services to students across the province, while also considering the uniqueness of local jurisdictions that are served by Saskatchewan's schools. It is important to understand that while providing equity is an appropriate target, something that Saskatchewan schools already do well, this does not mean that each community should have identical provisions for teachers and students. Since there is such great diversity between communities in Saskatchewan providing opportunities for teachers and their employers to find an appropriate balance of preparation time, class size, class composition, and other local considerations is essential. Regardless of the option for school governance that is ultimately adopted, a pathway to continued LINC negotiations to address local employment concerns should be preserved. Complexity of change Perrins underscores the complexity of undergoing substantive change in the governance of the educational sector (Perrins, 2016). One element of this that is most relevant to teachers is the provision of local terms and conditions of employment provided through Locally Implemented and Negotiated Contracts (LINC). Within the report one of the themes that emerges from the analysis is that of standardization of experience for students and educators across the province. With respect to LINC agreements Perrins' report identified that there is the need within government to develop a better understanding of the current employment and benefits framework. "Given every school division has a number of locally negotiated employment contracts, a process to understand and review those contracts is a critical part of implementation for any changes (Perrins, 2016, p. 19)." Such analysis should also include consideration of local realities relating to the factors affecting the delivery of education including but not limited to population density, cultural diversity, and socio-economic factors. Perrins also identified that a shift in governance should be considered towards, "additional standardization of locally-bargained terms and conditions (p. 21)." In considering this, it is important to recognize that Saskatchewan is a diverse province in terms of geography, population density, culture, language, and the socio-economic status of its citizens. "Given the diversity of the schools in the province and the complexities associated with that diversity, a one-size-fits-all method of determining balance becomes unworkable in a practical sense (STF, 2012, p. 72)." Because such a broad range of communities exist, it is important that there is some degree of local autonomy to find solutions to unique challenges that schools and students face based on their location and community demographics. If changes to the current governance structure of education in the province are to be considered, a pathway should be maintained to allow for teachers and their employers to negotiate relevant workplace conditions at the local level. In its analysis of collective bargaining in Saskatchewan the STF identified three principles that support the need for a bi-level bargaining framework in the province that provides equity within the profession while addressing diverse local needs: Although the conditions at the local level cannot be equalized, the framework within which those conditions can be addressed will be supported by a set of principles established at the provincial level which will: (1) Honour and respect the needs at the local level while ensuring equitable opportunities for all students. (2) Attend to the diverse needs of each school while recognizing that the provision of appropriate resources to address those diverse needs must be contextual. (3) Establish that the decision-making authority for determining how to best create a balance between preparation time, class size and class composition most appropriately rests with those directly involved at the local level. (p. 72) From the local perspective, the provincial funding review currently underway should consider pathways to renew and support local bargaining. If LINC agreements are to continue, a set of principles that provide for opportunity for divisions to address local concerns including class size, composition, and preparation time are needed. An equitable model According to Dr. Pasi Sahlberg, the best way to address insufficient educational performance is not to raise standards or increase instruction time, but rather to make school more meaningful, interesting and enjoyable for all students. (Lee, 2016) This focus requires that school divisions and government must seek ways to further invest in student engagement through multiple subject areas and not just those that comprise core curriculums. If Saskatchewan is to remain one of the best places in Canada to live, work, and raise a family, its future prosperity will depend on highly diverse and vibrant communities both in terms of culture and economy. Within this framework the provincial education system should strive to provide a wide variety of opportunities for students to develop their talents, hone their skills and find their passions. Sir Ken Robinson (2011) has described the elements of an effective education system as personal, allowing for an individual to develop his or her talents and passions; cultural, passing on the traditions of the community and deepening a student's understanding of the world around them; and economic, which provides the skills needed to earn a living and contribute to the wellbeing of the community. Sahlberg emphasizes the importance of providing an equitable education system that provides opportunities for students from diverse backgrounds and social classes. Sahlberg states that, "sustainable improvement of education requires protecting and enhancement of equity and equality in education (Lee, 2016)." Sahlberg goes on to iterate that to attain higher levels of equity greater investment is needed to ensure that students who require additional supports such as access to Educational Assistants and Special Education programming have access to these resources. This

argument does not speak to the need for student parity in experience but rather that equity in opportunity requires differentiation based on student needs. Final thoughts In the final analysis, any change in the governance structure must put the interests of students in Saskatchewan's schools first. There is a practical need for local input, accountability, and participation in the decisions that affect schools across the province. Since there is such a wide range of diversity in the communities that are served by Saskatchewan's schools, to ensure the most equitable experience possible, local input into decisions that affect those schools is needed. While Perrins outlined the government's desire to provide the most efficient delivery of service there is also a need for local management to ensure that resources are effectively distributed in a way that best supports student's individual needs and experiences within local contexts (2016). An important component of local decision making should include a framework and provision for local bargaining with teachers. To maintain an effective and equitable educational experience for all students any changes to the governance structure should seek to balance the needs for efficiency with community expectations, school supports, and student needs.

Works Cited Lee, C. K. (2016, December 28). Why Finland's schools seem to be slipping. Retrieved January 3, 2017, from Gulf News: <http://gulfnews.com/culture/people/why-finland-s-schools-seem-to-be-slipping-1.1953014#.WGchyU-wQFx>.twitter Perrins, D. (2016). Educational Governance Review Report: Kindergarten to Grade 12. Regina, SK: Ministry of Education. Robinson, K. (2011). Out of our minds: Learning to be creative. Capstone. STF. (2012). Teacher Collective Bargaining in Saskatchewan Retrospection and Renewal. Saskatoon, SK.

Locally elected boards matter. The roots of Catholic education lie in the ability to make local decisions. Regina Catholic Schools is one of the highest achieving divisions in the Province of Saskatchewan. Amalgamating Catholic boards will distract our attention from our priorities. School division amalgamations are disruptive and time-consuming. Our School Division has been fiscally and financially efficient. Changing governance or amalgamating school divisions is not the answer to the financial challenges that the government is facing. We need to keep our focus on reading, math, writing, graduation and attendance – things that matter to students and families.

The government has the unenviable task of finding ways to reduce the impact of a massive provincial deficit. It has been put forward that one solution includes dissolving of school boards through amalgamations. Not only is it doubtful that this process would save any money, it would be detrimental to the success of our students, the future of our province. When we look back to the results of the last amalgamation, some good came out of the process, and some bad. Large geographic school divisions found that their levels of service and the cost of these services negatively impacted the division and the students. We see in Northern Saskatchewan a dangerous lack of personnel and resources needed to support the educational health of the students. Though we cannot directly link the amalgamations with the rapid growth in the rate of suicides, we can say that due to the large geographic range of the school boards, and the limited funding provided by the government, teachers are ill equipped to make a positive impact in this rate. Something must be done in the province it is true, but the elimination of local boards is not the answer. Rather than find areas of reductions in the education system, it would be more beneficial to continue to look for efficiencies, such as communal purchasing power and sharing of processes. The health of the province is predetermined by the level of education (see Hammond, Cathie What is it about education that makes us healthy? Exploring the education-health connection, Thornley, Allan; Williams, Jasmine Investing in society: health, education and development, or Cité librels there any connection between education and health?, etc) by looking for more cuts from an already depleted system, this government is only ensuring a negative outlook for students and higher costs in health for our province. I wish you luck. I hope you have the the province's best interest at heart, and the bottom line to that is a healthy well educated society.

I think that this is the wrong direction to take to "try". When I lived in Calgary they did not build big beautiful new schools - instead they utilized what infrastructure they had and bussed kids. We are still bussing but not to the same extent. Further, if French immersion kids are all bussed, as I hear they are, charge these parents a surcharge if there is another school without French immersion within walking distance. Also, if you decide to pursue this matter cuts need to be from the upper levels not teachers, janitors, front line staff. If you truly are concerned about our children's education and not so much about lining your pockets this should be an easy solution.

Keep it the way it is, with the multiple school divisions. I don't want to have to call someone in Regina or Saskatoon to talk about my child's school that is across the street.

Locally elected school board members matter: they make decisions based on our Catholic identity and are close enough to the community to understand its needs. Our school division is one of the highest achieving divisions in the Province of Saskatchewan. Changing or amalgamating school divisions is not the answer to saving money. Let local school boards govern their own resources. Regina Catholic School board has been fiscally and financially efficient -- so why do we need to amalgamate with other divisions?

Our family believes in the importance of a Catholic education and keeping our voice in the community. Having gone through the amalgamation 10 years ago we understand how difficult it will be for school divisions to understand the needs of their families. Amalgamation is costly and difficult on the students because the direction in their schools will be lost. Students need routine and an understanding of consistent values. If a new school division is formed those visions and values will be lost. The years it takes to get those unified values back will be extremely difficult on the staff and students. The current school divisions in Saskatchewan have worked hard over the last 10 years to develop a unified belief system which in turn helps the students. If this were to be lost again it would be traumatic for all those involved. Education is not a business and is not a make for profit organization. Education is about helping students feel safe with consistent routines and values in order they may grow educationally. Please leave our current system as is in order that the schools may focus on what is important, which is the education of our children.

Dear Honorary Brad Wall: I understand changes are being considered in our education system. As the Premier of our province, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community. Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support the NESD and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature: (1) We need to keep our school boards locally elected; and (2) We need to keep decisions close to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

Hello, we have gone through the public school system for our elementary years and have a grade nine student enrolled in a catholic high school. The lack of money for the particular school we use is ridiculous and we have a lot of immigrants and lower income families in our school there for are always nicked and dined through the school. The catholic school so far is maybe more expensive but give the costs up front and no surprises thus are able to sustain themselves to a better degree. There is no sense in putting the separate and public schools together we would then not have our freedom to choose we are pleased are eldest son is able to start his day with a prayer and be sent to church on occasion it is not fair to the Christian and others that believe in god to take that away. We are a democracy and to put the two together would be a tragedy. We want our schools separate we deserve a choice. The government is taking to many choices away and watering down to many public services and this is causing problems leave things the way they are

I have heard murmurs of government job cuts in the public sector and wages freezes and in some cases decreases. My concerns are 1- that there is no talk of government official taking a pay cut, which would put less stress on everyone else and 2. where does the government expect to create revenue with the creation of Privately owned LBS when the publically owned ones brought in millions of dollars a year? Clearly relying on potash, oil, gas and forestry is not panning out like this current government had hoped and now we are running a \$10 million deficit on top of it all. I am all for the amalgamation of school divisions as a means to cut costs, but I don't think that it would be beneficial to go to a single school board in Saskatchewan and think it would be as near sighted (see what the happened with the health region). This is a diverse province with many needs and aligning the divisions that are currently similar in demographics and clientele would make the most sense. However if the proposed changes (or "Transformational Change") means putting more unwarranted stress on the front line workers would not be beneficial to the students. It seems that all previous governments, including this current one, place very little value on education and see it as a "cost" to the tax payers instead of looking at it as an investment in the future of our province.

Please consider leaving the education governance regulations somewhat consistent to what is currently happening. If pushed to select a choice, we would lean towards one of the #3 options. Each and every school in Saskatchewan has it's own unique identity. To have one board regulate all schools in the province is unrealistic and unfair to students. The goal of this review is to ensure the least amount of disruption to the students and to only make changes that would benefit our students. Consider making changes to the boundaries but keep local boards making the decisions for our youth. We are all working towards the same goal for our children, but we are not all the same. We need to elect our own boards to make decisions for our children!!

My wife and I live out of town, but transport our students to _____ (at our own expense) because we value Catholic French Immersion education. It is important to us that we have freedom of choice in our educational decisions for our children. With respect to the Catholic nature of our child's education, it is important to us that our school is overseen by an elected board. We want a strong connection between our school and our local parish.

In no way do I think blending all school boards is a positive thing. I placed my daughter in this system because of our families beliefs. I don't want to lose what the separate system provides. By blending the systems whether you believe it or not will have consequences for all systems. We as parents do what we feel fits our family's needs. Don' take that away from us. We have the right to Choose! I strongly oppose what you are thinking or deciding whether to do or Not!,

The roots of Catholic education lie in the ability to make local decisions in areas unique to us - teaching and modelling the love Jesus has for his brothers and sisters; celebrating as a school family on feast days, applying WWJD on the playground, revitalizing the chapel at our high schools, looking at each student through God's eyes, kneeling together in prayer before activities. Over the years your board has remained vigilant in keeping faith a strong component in our schools (or other examples) and we want to continue to do so on your behalf - not as appointed by government. With appointed boards, decisions could now land at the government's doorstep and we will have no control over what matters to us as parents, grandparents or community members. Catholic Education is the star that shines brightly for every child's future. Our Board believes: Locally elected boards matter. Local school boards are the grassroots voice that matters in education. We live and work in your communities and our Board has worked hard to forge strong linkages with CSCCs so that the voice of parents and communities are heard at the Board table. Over the years, the Regina Catholic School Board and staff have made a commitment to help meet their full educational potential and nurture our students' faith journey. Regina Catholic Schools is one of the highest achieving divisions in the Province of Saskatchewan. The government's suggestion to amalgamate Catholic school divisions will hinder our work. The Province faces a serious financial challenge; we understand that the education, health and social services sectors are significant cost drivers and we are fully on board to address the challenges. The Regina Catholic School Division has attained \$1.2 M in financial efficiencies in the 2016-17 fiscal year. We will continue to work hard to make every dollar work for students and their families. We do not, however, believe that changing governance or amalgamating school divisions is the answer to the financial challenges that we face. School division amalgamations are disruptive and time-consuming. We need to keep our focus on reading, math, writing, graduation and attendance – things that matter to students and families. After reading the K-12 Education Governance Review Report, my thoughts on the options proposed are as follows: 1. Each division does something different from the next because each community is different from the next and has needs that aren't the same. As a teacher, I don't teach all of my students the same way because each child learns differently and if I taught them all the same way I would be failing them. I believe this to be similar to the province of Saskatchewan. If all the divisions amalgamated into the options provided we would be failing our communities and the specific needs that are required in that part of the province. 2. If the province was to amalgamate, I fear that I would have less say in how that child is being educated. Less say in my profession means that I have less control over what I am supposed to do as an educator. Education is about preparing our youth for the future of the province to be bright, excited and critical thinkers who are lifelong learners. That should be the governments focus when it comes to education in Saskatchewan-not taking away from it so that education can fix the provinces financial issues. 3. It takes a village to raise a child. If the province were to amalgamate into any other options the report has provided, that means a huge change/loss of relationships with parents, parishes, and community supports. 4. If we were to amalgamate, we would be losing all of our co-coordinators, counselors and experts in each subject field that help to guide teachers and bring the best resources and information forward to our students. 5. Amalgamations are time-consuming and take the attention away from what is important in Education. The everyday people that are making a difference (teachers, students, families) should be the focus. We are the future of this province and we should be able to keep working towards our goals.

I had no problems with Catholic School. I did not interfere with the Catholic school division as they ran their daily program. I had no reason to interfere in my child education. My child has been taught to show respect. My girl is 12 years old and in grade seven. She has two more years to attend I am gonna let her decide which High School she will attend. Thank you.

I believe that it is of utmost importance to keep locally elected school boards in place. Having people further away make decisions will not be helpful to myself, my colleagues, or our students. I will always support Catholic education. I have been a student and teacher in the for 33 years and would like Catholic education to be protected. The has been a high-achieving and fiscally responsible division. I believe that all divisions are capable of high achievement and responsible spending without amalgamations of school boards. The last time school boards were amalgamated in Saskatchewan, the Chinook school division reported that the amalgamations had a negative effect on students for five years. I would not want that to happen to my own daughter, who is in grade 8, or my students. I do not believe anybody else's child should be affected negatively by forced amalgamation either. Keep the focus of education in Saskatchewan on the learning of our kids!

The importance of local school boards goes beyond monetary perspectives. Local representation is essential in best representing our communities. With the deletion of admin positions will come an increase in pay of the remaining positions (the less boards the larger the increase due to larger responsibility held by those in the position). This small savings, relatively to our deficit, will not be worth the isolation and disengagement created through losing local power over ones own community.

I am against the amalgamation of our school divisions. I was a student in the Nipawin School Division, which amalgamated to become the North East School Division. At the time, the French Immersion program was cut without notifying those enrolled prior to the decision was made. It is disappointing that the amalgamations force school divisions to pare down their other educational options until basic public education is the only option for all those who live outside of major cities. All Saskatchewan students should have access to education with interests decided by their communities, not by a centralized institution that will treat education as a company. Students come to us from all walks of life, there is no telling what each child will specifically need to succeed in school. Children don't get to chose where they live and how much money their parents have. Every child deserves to be well taken care of from a system that cares. Cutting funding in education will only harm future generations of Saskatchewan people. Here is what is at stake; 1) Loss of effective and accountable public voice 2) Unintended consequences of amalgamations and appointed boards 3) Less say, control and input in your child's education 4) Loss of relationships with parents, parishes and community partners

Amalgamating school divisions and eliminating elected boards of education, and replacing them with government appointed boards, are not acceptable possibilities. Locally elected boards are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. They are important advocates for ensuring excellence in education. Who better to serve the needs of students—which are unique to each division, and even each school within divisions—than those elected by our community to represent our community?

I am against the change to the education sector for Saskatchewan. I feel that the proposed changes have nothing to do with improving the education for our children and that it has more to do with saving money. I don't understand how any of the recommendations will improve our children's education especially realigning boundaries. How can putting kids on buses for longer periods of time be a good thing - they have to get up earlier and get home later which is not beneficial for anyone. I also believe that the realigning boundaries is not only going to affect the school its going to affect a lot of communities in a negative way. I believe if some small schools are shut down then the existing businesses will also suffer from this such as cafes, financial institutions, grocery stores, gas stations and community rinks etc. I hope and pray that the proposed changes do NOT go through.

Many things have changed since I went to school some 11 years ago. With the budget cuts, less people taking teaching degree and the economy boom in the last 2 years in Regina things have changed. In my personal experience with my own children some changes have been good and some bad. I think its a great change to do school board election but teachers attitudes did not change that much since. From what I heard from family, prior co workers and friends many did not vote because they believe it would not change the school system or change anything for better(I voted). The school board officials elected are good people in my opinion but quite honestly regardless of that some teachers work for the paycheck instead of teaching for educating children in an engaging, learning environment. That being said those teachers who want the pay make teachers who want to work hard or who have been around teaching for a decade look bad. The school system is getting a bad reputation and sadly if they want to educate our kids you raise taxes and you must. Start firing teachers who are not being respectful. Hire teachers who want to see our kids graduate or alot more kids will end up in trouble or make bad choices into their adolescence through to adulthood. Change the cirriculum so young children in elementary have new classes and/or books to learn from within age and reason. To list-culinary cooking basics(with teacher help), tests on books by legendary authors for older grades (Hans Christian Anderson written works) are some in example of how children can learn and you must encourage physical activity instead of cutting back gym. There are changes that can be made and honestly teachers should be evaluated while on the job so the officials on the boards can see if they are worth keeping on staff. These changes must be made in order for our schools to have success 2017 and forward. If the Sask. teaching system lacks funding and cannot raise taxes in other provinces federal has helped. If the right people approach Trudeau it could happen though not saying it will. That is my response to the survey emailed. Thanks for taking time to read this.

I recognise the benefits of centralizing the board structure for the Catholic school system, but I am concerned that localized concerns such as busing, before and after school programs, lunch programs, ect will not be addressed as representative may not have an understanding of the school my children attend, and their specific needs. I also would have difficulty accepting the views and speaking points of a rep from outside my city. I would also struggle with a central board making budget decisions with my local tax dollars and where funding should be allocated. the move to centralised board has also led to decreased services as has occurred in several American states. thank you and please don't make cost cutting decisions based on short term gains when the long term future of our province (the children receiving these programs and swrvices) is at stake.

Dear Sir, I am against amalgamation and i don't believe that it would be cost effective. If larger school division is implemented there will be a loss of local representation which for me is the important.

I am a mother of two boys who are just entering the education system. I work in a Community School in North Battleford and can see on a daily basis, the importance of having needs met on a COMMUNITY basis. The demographic at our school is certainly unique, with a large portion of our students coming from poverty. Our school houses MANY INTEGRAL programs that support our families in getting their children to school everyday, feeding them through food programs, numerous after school programs, direct relationships with community partners like Public Health, the Boys and Girls Club, my list could go on and on. Do not mistake me for saying we are the ONLY school that does this. Our province is filled with special places like Connaught, and they only way that these Community Schools function, is by being supported by LOCAL boards who understand the unique needs of their communities. Having our Division Office within the SAME town or city allows our facility to run as EFFECIENTLY as possible. From the start of September until the end of June, EVERY YEAR we see the children in our facility grow because of the dedication of not only the front line workers directly in our school, but from the support of our LOCAL school boards. The people that know the individual needs of individual families. Further amalgamation is going to seriously injure this machine. Something that has been constantly reworked and fine tuned for many years is, after only a THREE WEEK study, going to be turned upside down? Education and Healthcare need to be FUNDED, NOT CUT. Imagine, parents, calling to Regina from Wilkie to see if your child's local bus is running...

I am a parent that is totally against the new motion to amalgamate Catholic School and Public School Boards together. There is no proof that is going to be a cost effective approach by doing this. This is what will happen if we go ahead with the change in how we school our children. 1) Loss of effective and accountable public voice 2) Unintended consequences of amalgamations and appointed boards 3) Less say, control and input in your child's education 4) Loss of relationships with parents, parishes and community partners I stand strong on the motion to deny going ahead with the change the government is trying to pass.

I am concerned about a number of key factors with respect to the school board amalgamation . I think that only those not covered by the STF and their associates, not managers, should be on the chopping block. Teachers and their aides do not deserve more of the same bullshit your government has handed them over the last contract. I hope they walk out in June.... and cancel graduation. I hope they do..... I am concerned about loss of communications channels between myself and my children's educators. I am concerned that there will be a loss of valuable relationships with parents, parishes and community partners.

As a parent I want to feel secure with knowing that I will have a opinion in my child's education and that there are members that are accountable and can justify reason for their actions. Why the need for amalgamations? Who is in charge of appointing the boards? Will these people share, respect and support the decision of the parents and have the child's best interests as a top priority.? Who will hold these people accountable? In the Catholic system it is extremely important that faith based education remains in the school and is strong, loud and proud. We should not have to conform our belief to appease the general public. Moving away from this will clearly result in a loss of personal relationships with parents, parishes and community partners to ensure that we provide the education and teaching that is so very critical in a child future,

Hello: I have my concerns after reading this report on the following: 1) Loss of effective and accountable public voice 2) Unintended consequences of amalgamations and appointed boards 3) Less say, control and input in my child's education 4) Loss of relationships with parents, parishes and community partners; Thank-you;

How will the increased distance (actual and perceived) between administration and ground level workers benefit the students? How will the different local agreements between school divisions be handled if they are amalgamated? How will the needs of different communities be attended to in an appropriate amount of time given that paraprofessionals will have more travel time? What will be the increased cost of travel time, accommodation and food for administration and paraprofessionals? Is this about dollars and cents to balance a budget or about the best interest of the students - which in turn is the future of our province?

The report is all well and good. However, after repeatedly asking about the inadequacy of band program I have still not gotten an answer except ask someone else. The instruction in rural Saskatchewan is way below what is provided in the cities, noting Saskatoon. When is this going to improve. My son is and has been at the top of his class and repeatedly received certificate of Distinguished musician or the like and will have received only minimum training in his high school education. He will have to work much harder at university instruction because of the lack so far. No or near to no theory which even his teacher said is much harder if you don't get the beginning in high school. He will be graduating this June so it will be too late to help him now

Relationships between parents, community and parish is really important for my kids.

I am a mother, volunteer and the local School Community Council (SCC) chairperson for _____ School. I understand that changes are being considered in our education system. I have seen you in Melfort and talked to you personally so I know you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community. Based on the past amalgamation that was brought forward to the North East School Division 10 years ago, we have just began to grasp and accept the new changes. Just like every child learns differently, every division has unique challenges as well. I feel that education is best when it belongs to the community and I want you to know that I support the North East School Division and ask you share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature: 1) We NEED to keep our school boards locally elected; and 2) We NEED to keep decisions close to our communities 3) We have been given very little information to even properly give feedback Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community!! Sincerely,

As someone that has gone through the Separate system with my three siblings and now have my own three children in the system I unanimously agree with Perrin's recommendations and these are some of reasons. I was raised Catholic and believe in a faith based education by amalgamated public and catholic that would be lost. The school is a valuable place for my children to learn about faith a their peers and teachers become more influences in their lives then just my husband and I, especially as they age. I want my children to learn about God Jesus and the written word as their are more people hearing the same message. With social media becoming great influences this will assist in hearing some of the same messages a school then just a mother and father. I have voted in very municipal, federal and provincial election and I trust in the democratic process but often trust and honesty is broken in government. By have trustees that are from the voted public ensures that my voice is heard and upheld. I have phoned Robert Bresciani a number of times in the last 4 yrs and ever single time he has called me and represented my thoughts and opinions to the director incharge. This is very unlike the situation where I have called my MLA, Laura Ross countless times and she only called me back once and did nothing to resolve my issue. If the government appoints trustees you have broken all faith in the democratic process and I will seek legal council. Ones voting rights must not be taken away. Also the cost of amalgimating health centres will cost us tax payers enough money in makeingup new documents, processes and improvements etc. Already in LA loch there is a 2nd instance of violence by all these amalgamation the rural individuals will have the greatest loss. Just look at the Atlantic provinces it is costing them more than it ever saved. I would rather the government look at other avenues of saving money by reducing the wage gap between union and management across all government sectors including crown corps and consultants. There is approx a 30, 000 wage difference between a union employee and a 1st level manager. Many union employees with more than 5 yrs do not need a direct report if they are working in the same area. Most VP receive large salaries with bonuses just to go to meetings. They deligate the work and actually and the union employee that does the majority of the work gets paid the least. This needs to change. Also the government should do away with their full pension after only being in government for 5 years. No other individuals other than government MLAs and those retired have such a pension. The government needs to realize that health and education should be the top priorities not the bottom. Focusing on a health and educated individuals will only assist in contributing to growing our province by curtailing it will as a result lead to more problems and exodis of our brightest will begin and they will never look back.

As a parent and member of my school's CSCC I strongly feel that locally elected boards matter. Local school boards are the grassroots voice that matters in education. The Regina Catholic School Board and staff have made a commitment to help meet our children's full educational potential and nurture their faith journey. Regina Catholic Schools is one of the highest achieving divisions in the Province of Saskatchewan. The government's suggestion to amalgamate Catholic school divisions will hinder this work. I understand the serious financial challenges faced by the Province. The Regina Catholic School Division has attained \$1.2 M in financial efficiencies in the 2016-17 fiscal year. I believe they are responsible stewards of public funds and are continually being asked to do more with less. Please do not add to this burden. I do not believe that changing governance or amalgamating school divisions is the answer to the financial challenges faced by the Province.

I would like have more of a say and control over my children's education. I don't think this move is the best interest for the schools, parents/teachers/parishes.

I feel that there is a great deal to be lost if we go ahead with the plan to have one large school board for the entire province. The right to Separate Schools, which in this province means a Catholic school system is guaranteed in the Constitution. As a separate entity, a Catholic school system has the right to govern itself as it deems necessary and desirable for all involved: parents, students and teachers. I am against having everything amalgamated into one large system where local voices cannot have a say in the education system

We homeschool two children. The school gets funding and my children don't set foot in it. More money for homeschool family for their students. Two school divisions, North and South.

I am against the amalgamation of the school boards into one board or large boards. I am also against appointed boards. I feel that elected boards and smaller school divisions are more in tune with local needs. I have experienced nothing but problems with the federal government shared services mandate. There is no one to speak to face to face when there is a problem, and it is too hard to try and solve issues by email or phone - face to face is always better. Please do not amalgamate the school divisions and keep our school boards local and elected. thank you

Our family would like to keep the Catholic school boards separate from the public school boards. This provides diversity and choice in education.

I am not a parent, not a teacher. I don't have immediate involvement with the schools, but I value education. I am concerned about the quality of education in our province and about the faith-based education available in Catholic schools. I believe that the government of Saskatchewan has already interfered too much in the administration of our schools. Both public and separate systems will thrive when local communities have input into the leadership and programs offered in the schools. Volunteerism is an essential element in the schools, particularly for after-school programs and other special programming. Centralizing administration will kill the community spirit of schools. Instead, we need to find ways for the schools to develop their distinctive characters. We need to give community groups a role in supporting the students and teachers in a holistic educational environment. It is an essential principle of Catholic education that parents have a right to determine the nature and form of their children's education. Not just Catholic parents, all parents. As such we will continue to advocate for community-based learning at all levels. If the government of Saskatchewan wants to save money on schools, it should not centralize administration. The best way to save on school costs is to increase educational standards so that our citizens thrive.

Some of these changes are going to go widen the already large gap that schools and communities have created. Please do listen to the community we are the voice that cry for help.

I believe for our children to have the best education possible we need to ensure they have all the necessary tools to learn. Having less teachers and larger classroom sizes is doing more harm than good. The continuous cuts to the number of teachers and support staff is impeding the learning of our children. Those that need a little more help aren't getting it and those falling behind are falling through the cracks of this broken system of do more with less. The children are the ones suffering. The government's mismanagement of funds should not fall on our children's education to make up for the shortfall.

I believe further amalgamation is not in the best interest of our rural students and communities. Instead of amalgamating schools centralization of procurement and payroll would help reduce administration costs. Locally elected boards matter, I value the access I have to my board member and the fact that he has a vested interest in our division. If any change is made it should be standardizing the expectations of our Boards. In all of the options provided in the report it appears that educational legislation will be changed and that the legislation protecting Rural School Threshold may be removed. This legislation protects small schools from closure. What happens to communities if they loose their school? What guarantee do we have that our school will remain open? If schools are amalgamated or closed, who will determine what the appropriate ride times are for our children? What is an acceptable length of time for children to be on the bus everyday and what risk are they being put in if they have to travel on highways everyday because their school was deemed to be too small? I fully support finding cost saving systems, strengthening our educational outcomes and standardizing expectations of our Boards, but I cannot support the wide sweeping changes as proposed in the Educational Governance Review Report. I feel that any change should be made with the best interest of our children in mind.

There are 4 concerns below that are very troubling for our family. They are: 1) Loss of effective and accountable public voice 2) Unintended consequences of amalgamations and appointed boards 3) Less say, control and input in your child's education 4) Loss of relationships with parents, parishes and community partners

I have read the document and agree with the recommendations however the dismantling of the elected boards and the shuttling of children around in buses is not even humane. There has been no thought to the human cost, the time and energy wasted and culture and customs lost. I am truly upset at the thought of communities losing their schools and their voice in the children's education.

I do not agree with one board. The reason why I chose to support the separate school system is so that my child will get an education that is directly involved with the church. The unity of my daughters community as a Christian is dependent on her education that is administered by the Catholic School Board. One Board across is too large to administer at the same level currently. Not enough detailed consideration for the areas involved to make informed decisions.

Review and set new borders for school divisions. Consolidate divisions based on student numbers and manageable geography. School Boards MUST remain elected, not appointed. A single school board or even a regional "four school board" structure is a bad idea.

I greatly appreciate Mr. Perrin's work on the report. I am strongly in support of maintaining elected trustees. Boards have cited numerous reasons to retain the existing political structure. Boards are and still the most effective means to connect governance models. If the government want to address inefficiencies in governance structures then they should tackle the rural municipalities that dot this province. The government's own credibility is at stake when you look at the bigger picture of government and its expenditures across a number of sectors. The broader issue of citizenship and voter engagement is a bigger problem for government that a few boards having a few people acclaimed. Education is being cherry picked for failing to have people vote. Same could be said for elections in rural municipalities and urban areas. Education has been responsive to the government's efforts in meeting the ESSP targets. Catholic Boards, while not directly targeted, in the Perrin's report are certainly aware and sensitive to the issue about governance. I believe Catholic boards will make decisions that will discuss a restructuring of boundaries and reducing the number of Boards. I find it distasteful that PISA reports were referenced in the Perrins Report as a concern. If the Ministry wants educator to do better on PISA then they need to make this a public priority and explain how this will help create more effective citizens. PISA is a OECD creation to compare performance of selected 15 years olds. Educator know that this is not a level playing field. The government itself needs to be more transparent about its overall operations and decisions.

I wholeheartedly disagree with any proposed changes. Local school boards have given us a voice in our children's education. The teachers and support staff at our school go above and beyond for all students and I would hate to see that change for any reason. Thank You

Thanks for the opportunity to share my feedback. I have to admit it was difficult for me to understand the initial request here. If you're asking for my choice of options, I pick option 2. But I'm not sure if this is a vote. I understand the need for transparency and how important it is to share the full report. However, the ask of parents in this should be clear. I doubt many will read a 33 page report. Therefore, it will be difficult for many to fully absorb the info and provide meaningful feedback. If there are sections of the report that need to be focused on, please consider presenting them in a different way than a PDF of the entire document for people to sift through and figure out what they need to do. Engagement on this could be easier (and higher), and therefore way more effective in the long run. Thanks and I appreciate the focus on improving our education system!

I am very concerned the manner in which the government is approaching "transformational change". The most effective way to approach change in the educational system is not a commercial and monetary one. Rather, an approach which focuses on the needs of the students is most beneficial. Education is about people, our young students of Saskatchewan who deserve all the opportunities to succeed. There is not a one size fits all solution in the support of our children. I implore you to use the strategy of subsidiarity and to allow the democratic process to continue with members of the community electing representation to the boards of education. This process allows for the public to make informed decisions for its constituents and best serves the needs of our students and educational system.

K-12 Education Governance Review Advisory Panel, After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report, we offer the following feedback: We do support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! We do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. We do not support any of the three models presented in the report. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support that change to governance or further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. We have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold we are legislated by. We need a permanent high school plan, including transportation, to accommodate the best interests of our students, their families, and our community. - Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in

It is very important for Catholic and Public school systems to stay separate. I appreciate the fact that my children can attend a Catholic school and learn about their Catholic distinctiveness not just at church or from me but at school as well. I find it very frustrating that the people making decisions about the future of education have nothing at stake. They are rarely educators themselves. They do not fully understand what it takes to be an efficient and effective teacher trying to meet all the needs of the students. I would like the people involved in the direction that education goes to listen to the people involved - teachers, parents and students. Take their concerns and advice when making such important decisions about our future generations.

I wish to express how very concerned I am regarding the potential for further amalgamation. I understand the economics dictate all of us to be frugal. However, this is a very short sighted idea that will most definitely be to the detriment of the students and local communities. These cost cutting measures are going to hurt students. Isn't that the group of people you are supposed to be working for? Economies of scale make sense to a point. Enough already. Saskatchewan students are falling behind as evidenced by recent rankings. What future do we have if the concern is not on the students. Perhaps you need to re-direct the focus. This further amalgamation appears to be a way to distract from the real issue and that is educating our students better. Centralizing or amalgamating will not help students. It will end up taking resources out of the classroom and push local schools and teachers to take on more administrative functions. Students and families deserve a local voice. Has the Sask Party forgotten their roots.? Also, recognize that local taxpayers pay the largest portion directly via local mill rates vs what is doled out by the province. You have been entrusted with our funds during boom years, and what did you do to save and plan for todays reality? The boom years were squandered. That should not come at the expense of the future. Sounds cliché' but the future is our students and local community. You are proposing to damage both. I am deeply saddened by this proposal. I have been a supporter of the Sask Party for years, but I can promise you this will change if you go ahead with this plan. Do the right thing please.

There is such discussion these days about diversity in schools and providing that to our children. I think by amalgamating the Separate School board into a public board takes away that diversity. The Catholic School division is there to provide that diversity to many Catholic and non-Catholic students. A Catholic education is not simply a religion class. It is about the daily prayer that the whole school participates in at assembly, it is teaching discipleship to the children, it is about having excellent role models for our Catholic children in the Saints the schools are named after and we can find their pictures and statues in our schools. These things remind our Catholic children that God is always with us and ordinary people can become and strive to be like our Saints. If it were about a religion class rather than the whole atmosphere of the school most parents would send their kids to school and take them to Mass. Catholic schools promote and support the Catholic life that parents strive to teach at home. Public schools would not and can not do that. The Catholic faith would become just another class rather than away of life. If the schools boards were to amalgamate the Catholic identity would be lost. There are other ways to save money rather than amalgamate into one public entity. I for one find it atrocious that within the same week our government has asked our schools and other essential services to find ways to cap salaries and reduce compensation, they give themselves a raise a mighty hefty raise in fact. Maybe the cost cutting could start there or in other ways rather than hitting our schools. I am very ashamed that I voted for the Wall government this time around given what they have done to our teachers and schools in this province since they started their second term. Education is the future of this province and if the Wall government continues to decimate the education system there is no future.

In a small town your school is one of the most important assets. It will draw families to your community for housing, shopping, recreation and volunteerism for your organizations. I have worked in the CU for 30 years, always been apart of the school either with funds or just lending a hand to functions there. Please don't take anymore away from us. Our local community councils are working hard to make the best environment for our students. The people that live, work and volunteer in their communities know what that facility needs, not someone coming from a larger center. We need our schools, we need our kids to stay in small town Saskatchewan so don't do anything to jeopardize that. Bigger is not always better. I know what it is like to run by a budget and efficiencies are important but not more important then the well being of a whole community and its school. Let us keep our boards and let us make our decisions, that is what is best for us. Thank-you.

I would like the middle management and upper management down sized in the school region. I would like to see smarter decisions made with the schools infrastructure money (maintenance, upkeep and repairs). A big mistake was redoing all of the boilers in the schools without realizing that the corresponding piping would need to be replaced as well. The board office did not need to be renovated twice, with new furniture in such a short period of time. All of the savings that could have been put towards the front line personal and support personal who actually interact with our children day to day. Custodians need the proper equipment and supplies to keep the schools safe and clean. This is an area that should not be compromised as schools can be a highly infectious area. When custodians cannot get rags, brooms, shovels and other cleaning supplies because they cannot afford it who ultimately pays the price. Sick faculty and kids. I believe the boards should amalgamate into smaller boards with less CEO's, board members, VP's and other middle management. Put the money where it belongs, the school facilities, staff, and support staff. Benefit the kids not the members of the board.

Will either of the 3 suggested models place more teachers, TA's, tutors, and make available more/better resources for students? Will the trustees be elected or appointed because if another round of patronage begins - public thought once again loses an arena.

We as the SCC for _____ in Martensville have a number of concerns about the upcoming transformational change in Education. As The Perrin report refers to Parental participation in new, larger school divisions, he says one of the challenges will be, "Participation in governance will be a challenge and parents and families in the public system would have different access to board members than in the separate and francophone system." This is a concern to us as we truly appreciate our access to our elected members when we have suggestions and or concerns. Our feeling is that as boards (elected or appointed) get larger, our voice will become but a whisper. A second concern is the extended implementation time that such changes will take. Our children are in the schools now and will be effected by these changes either physically or through the effects and stresses that such changes will take on teaching staffs for years to come. As Perrin says "There will be disruption at the school division and local community and school level through organizational changes." We are more than happy with the education our children are currently receiving and are worried that drastic upheaval will have negative effects on not only our children but the school and our community as a whole. Thirdly we are not convinced that these changes are, as Minister Morgan has said, "In the best interest of students" but more an attempt at cost cutting to our children's detriment. Our school staff are currently stretched to the limit and we are truly concerned that larger division's or a single division will take away from the Student Centered feeling and change to Survival Mode and that will not be healthy or positive for anyone. Lastly we would like to point out the tremendous things our division has done as one of the highest performing school divisions in the province. Our graduation rates, both aboriginal and non-aboriginal, are well above the provincial average at the same time as having one of the provinces highest pupil to teacher ratio. All four of the suggested options have PSSD being either swallowed up by another division or split up, having different borders and we fear the things that make us great, may be lost in the transition. We are very proud of our students and staff and want nothing but the best for them. We feel that any of the proposed changes that are suggested will take it's toll on them leading to a much less successful and positive school experience for everyone involved.

As a teacher and resident of Lloydminster I want to express my confusion and worry facing this situation. I believe our leaders should make decision keeping our students their main focus and not a budget line. I believe that the dual border situation of Lloydminster makes it a unique case and that for that reason it should not be amalgamate to a school board that won't realize the challenges and the specific reality of our city. School-centred planning and decision making regarding the educational program is the most effective way to address the learning needs of students and build support for public schools. Collaborative decision making at the school level is one of the best avenues to involve parents and caregivers in decisions affecting the education of their children. School-centred planning and decision making also recognizes the central leadership role that principals provide to support the teaching and learning environment. Provided with the appropriate resources, the principal is a team leader who works alongside his or her teacher colleagues in order to lead positive change for students and the community. As a Saskatchewan teacher, I believe that: (1) The school serves as a central hub of community activity and support to students, families and communities; (2) School-centred planning and service delivery improves teaching and learning where it will have the most impact – at the school and community level; (3) School-centred planning enhances teacher agency and professionalism, and allows schools and teachers to work in tandem with their communities to meet the needs of students in their particular social context; (4) A school-centred education sector should aim for individual student growth as the ultimate measure of scholastic success; (5) The principal is a key agent of instructional leadership at the school level. However, their foremost role is facilitating teaching and learning excellence in the school, not tending to management responsibilities that are best delegated or overseen by others. I pray that our leaders make decision with keeping the students and the professionals working for them their main focus.

As an educator and parent of school age children I am most concerned that the suggested changes will result in: 1) Loss of effective and accountable public voice 2) Unintended consequences of amalgamations and appointed boards 3) Less say, control and input in your child's education 4) Loss of relationships with parents, parishes and community partners In reading the report, I am not in favour of any of the options really. But if forced to choose it would be for Option 3A or Option 3B.

I want to keep all school boards, including public, as elected as there is more accountability with elected boards. I see the need for the amalgamation of Englefeld, Creighton and Ile A La Crosse as they are very small. The rest of the school divisions are quite large. Any amalgamation of these larger divisions would make them too large for effective administration.

I think you should ask the teachers what they need to help teach and reach all children they can help decide what is best to mandate efficiency as this sounds like the lean crap that did nothing for frontline healthcare workers

Recent waste in our school system was due to the policy which allowed students/parents to choose schools regardless of school location. The resultant waves of enrollment in some schools over others caused many schools to close and others to be rebuilt. The reversal of this policy has helped. Students again must attend schools based on where they live. Our school boards failed us with that poor decision. This waste was caused by trustees elected by an unreasonable public demanding complete freedom of choice. That being said, Money is not going to be saved by amalgamating school boards. We need common sense, not major change. Two systems has worked well for decades. Some choice of schools is beneficial to students and society. Making one system for everyone will ultimately result in more "micro systems" and more home schooling. Please give the people of Saskatchewan the ability to provide educational choices without being wasteful. I believe in "fail safe" legislation to prevent waste in our school system. I am not in favour of amalgamation as it will not benefit students, nor save money.

Do what you must with teaching staff, administrators, but leave the lowest wage earners, the ea's, the custodians, librarians, secretaries, etc. alone. If there is further amalgamation focus on cutting back on administrative staff, travel, vehicle fleets, etc. Make use of the technology that is readily available to communicate. Cut back on needles costs like large screen tv's in the hallways, solid oak furniture in the board office, etc. Buy more economical vehicles for the maintenance fleet. Just some thoughts.

Leave the school divisions alone. You did not run on this platform during the last election.

As the parent of a thirteen month old, I am very concerned with the possible repercussions that implementation of any of the recommendations of the Perrin Report would have on the future education of my child. I am concerned that resources will not be allocated appropriately. I am concerned that principals, teachers, and support staff will have less support. Our staffs do remarkable work with students, and deserve better than one (or four) divisions treating them as a number, not an asset. I am concerned that the individual concerns and needs of communities will be lost. I am concerned that the good work that has been accomplished by many of the school divisions will be lost. I am concerned that divisions are already quite large, and that schools, staffs, SCCs, students and communities already have to work very hard to fight a sense of disconnect with divisions. I am concerned that in "cost cutting" will end up costing more than retaining the current structure. I am concerned that government has become tone deaf to the voice of the "common man". Should some small fine tuning be required, so be it. That said, I believe that the vast majority of the citizens of Saskatchewan would prefer to see school divisions, and elected boards of education, remain the norm. If the government would like to have the public's true thoughts on this, may I suggest a binding plebiscite? Education is far too important to leave to politicians and lobbyists. Allow all the citizens of Saskatchewan to voice their opinion at the polls. In closing, please leave the current structure alone. It simply does not need to be changed. Thank you.

The education system like so many other government operated entities has become top heavy with people who have big job titles, big wages and very little contribution toward front line service. Often the wages drawn by these upper managers could pay to hire 3 or more front line service people. The province needs to move away from appointing people into management jobs that provide little to no support to the public or people who rely on the service. I'm afraid no matter how many comments or opinions are gathered here, Brad Wall has an agenda appoint big titles, big wages and take way from front line employees. It's unfortunate our education system is on his agenda. Our education system is taxed as it currently sits. Parents are expected to teach their kids at home to supplement what the teachers teach during the day. Most Parents don't have the resources to teach. Therefore our kids are being pushed through without regard for the future. Moving to a single school board will reduce accountability to parents and students as well as limit opportunity for growth and discussion for the future. Saskatchewan is currently on hard economic times, reducing the number of people working WILL NOT function to stimulate the economy.

First off the administration of the RCS seems to support a bully mentality.

I want to keep the option to send my children to a Catholic school. I had the opportunity to attend a catholic school and feel that it gave me an advantage in life. The school board is fiscally responsible and is a wonderful school system.

Bigger is not better. Children that need extra help will slide through the cracks. The children will suffer because the guy doing the budget forgot to go to math class. That should tell you how important a education is.

My family and I feel that local school boards are in the best situation to know what is necessary to educate children in their area. People in our area pay a lot of money in school taxes and we feel that schools and students nearby should benefit from that money. Rural voices will not be heard the same way if there is an amalgamation. Schools are very important to the welfare of rural communities. Children that live in rural communities should not be penalized by not having the education and sport activity and leadership opportunities that are available in larger centres. There were issues the last time that the school boards were changed. We are not the type that hate all change. The proposed changes may eliminate certain inefficiencies that are of concern today, however I feel strongly that other inefficiencies would come to light. Excess travel is bad for the environment and is costly in terms of wasted time and fuel and vehicle costs. Fuel costs are only going to increase. A centralize school board would likely necessitate increased travelling within the province.

To whom it may concern: As a very concerned rural parent of 2 school age children I am very worried about the plan for education! First of all I think you may be masking a problem with something that is working just fine. There are less school division in Saskatchewan than in most provinces. The 2 provinces that only have 1 school division are not happy in most levels and it is not in the best interest of what is most important the children! (2) Without all the different sections of the school divisions, the catholic, francophone and First Nations all becoming one I think you are still dealing with the same issues anyway! These are all public funded 2 by provincial and 1 by federal and I feel without the same for everyone the plan doesn't make a solution! (3) It is very hard for the people sitting at their desks in Regina to know how our rural communities and school function and what the needs are. In St Breix alone they have a Philippine community that makes for ESL a important thing which in the city or your community might not be an issue! Our principals are educators that teach in the classroom. They are not managers and their roll should not be! (4) Lastly by taking away locally elected boards where is our voice. We feel our board member is a great voice for our community and being voted in by the people he is in the pockets of no one where appointed people usually are! If I had a vote it would be to let us be! If it was as easy as you think it is don't you think it would have been done already! Please for the love of children in Saskatchewan leave our education alone!

It is sad to hear Chinook Board say that the 2006 amalgamations negatively impacted students for about five years. There is no data to support this. In fact, any data that I have seen from the division would indicate otherwise. Amalgamations would be fiscally and strategically responsible for our province. The people worried are those that would be impacted - high paid central office and board members. We want consistency in our province. It's a tough decision as Boards are out there trying to tell people how horrible it would be. It will be great though!

We need teacher prep time to be a priority. Taking it away will cripple extra curr. As teachers will not be involved as they are now.

We are writing to you on behalf of SCC in Moose Jaw in response to the Perrins Report. We are concerned at the prospect of the elimination of local boards. Our boards have been Democratically elected and these people are our voice. They understand the diverse needs of the schools in our division. Locally, our board has supported unique initiatives such as LLI (Reading intervention program), which has given us some of the best reading scores in the province (for grades 1-3), and our board has supported a low student to teacher ratio in the primary grades which allows us to address the many special needs we are experiencing in young children. Our SCC currently works very closely with our school in order to reach our goals in terms of reading, math, and sense of belonging. We are able to do this by focusing our efforts solely on these items. We also have great support from our local board in terms of assisting us with our operating concerns and questions. Amalgamations will result in a decreased efficiency of our SCC. How can we retain this efficiency and great working relationship we have with our board, if our board is "significantly removed from the community and the school" (page 23)? We are ground level people volunteering to directly benefit our school. It seems common sense that our schools work better with a locally elected board who understand the needs of our community, our families, our schools, our students, and our staff. As a rural school division, we implore you to carefully consider our specific needs as you move forward with changes to educational governance.

Dear Don Morgan: I understand changes are being considered in our education system. As the MLA who represents our area, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community. Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support Saskatchewan school boards and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature. We need to keep our school boards locally elected; and, We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

K-12 Education Governance Review Advisory Panel, After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report I would offer the following feedback: - We do not support any of the models presented in the report and ultimately we wish to remain a part of Prairie Valley School Division. We do support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). Currently under the direction of the Prairie Valley School Division we celebrate some of the highest performance scores in Reading and Math as well as extraordinary High School graduation rates. What guarantee is there that these standards of excellence will be maintained through provincial amalgamations? It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! We do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. Our current Prairie Valley School Division board member is very visible in our schools and community. Provincially appointed board members will not be as accessible, nor will they know their communities' needs. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support the change to governance or how further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. We have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold. Rural communities thrive, grow, and revolve around their schools. Closing schools will "close" small town Saskatchewan. Nearby schools are at maximum capacity and there are great concerns for distance, safety, and time spent on buses for rural children. We need a permanent high school plan to accommodate the best interests of our students, their families, and our community, as well as a permanent high school transportation plan. We would rather our students be part of a smaller school, than being in overcrowded classrooms in larger centers. This is one of the reasons people choose to reside in rural areas. Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in. - In Mr. Perrin's report the opening letter to Minister Morgan states that ALL stakeholders who approached Mr. Perrin for conversation UNANIMOUSLY support elected boards and NO more amalgamations! WHY would we continue with pursuing drastic changes?

As a parent and as a Saskatchewan educator, I believe that: (1) The school serves as a central hub of community activity and support to students, families and communities. (2) School-centred planning and service delivery improves teaching and learning where it will have the most impact – at the school and community level. (3) School-centred planning enhances teacher agency and professionalism, and allows schools and teachers to work in tandem with their communities to meet the needs of students in their particular social context. (4) A school-centred education sector should aim for individual student growth as the ultimate measure of scholastic success. I acknowledge that the provincial government has the responsibility to meet the public's expectations by setting common goals and standards, and by fully funding an education system that supports the achievement of said goals and standards. I ask that members of the panel and of the government recognize that given the appropriate resources, teachers have the professional knowledge, skills and judgment to bridge the gap between the educational goals expressed in curriculum and students who have widely varying needs, abilities and backgrounds. It is critical that the heart of the education system is the teaching and learning relationship. Everything in the system exists to support this relationship and the instructional process. The teaching and learning relationship is central to a successful education system. Improvement to the teaching and learning relationship must be the main justification for enacting any major governance or administrative changes to the sector. The best decisions about education are made as close as possible to the teaching and learning environment. Teachers in Saskatchewan can play a positive role in supporting change that will: 1. Foster inter- and intra-organizational relationships that best meet the needs of each individual student. 2. Improve the teaching and learning relationship. 3. Create opportunities for the engagement of students, parents and community members around school-centred planning. 4. Enhance the professional status and responsibilities of teachers and improve the teaching and learning relationship. 5. Redirect more resources toward the improvement of teaching and learning. As a Saskatchewan teacher, I would trust that: 1. All local agreements will be respected and honoured. 2. Meaningful consultation will occur prior to the contemplation or adoption of any changes to the collective bargaining legislation, structures or processes. 3. Any alternatives or changes to local collective agreements should occur only after respectful and meaningful consultation processes and through direct negotiations. I would respectfully request that more time and deliberation are dedicated to fully examine any proposed changes to the education sector in order to identify any and all intended and unintended consequences that would impact our children, our students, and our schools.

As a newcomer here in Canada, I'm happy and satisfied with St. Michael School. My kids are enjoying their stay in school with lots of activities and nice teachers and school heads. I'm thankful for the opportunity to have a free school fees for my kids.

Education needs to stay local. Changing this to provincial is only going to cause delays in every aspect and cause frustration for all involved, to say the least. Please leave the divisions as is.

A consolidation of school boards is hardly the best way to ensure accountability and efficiencies. The example of health region consolidation has been one of increased waste and a lack of immediate or local accountability. It is expecting quite a bit too much of even the remarkably dedicated public servants we have if we ask them to exercise oversight over larger and larger areas. Education, much like health, is a fundamentally local thing and as such benefits from local oversight.

I believe that we need to keep our school boards locally elected and keep decisions closer to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

Our SCC would like to see a more consistent and efficient way to govern education. What we have now is not consistent - even within a school division. Schools benefit when the board member is local and lose out when the board member is from another community. We are tired of central office staff coming for photo shoots at the schools. Amalgamate and have consistency and put the money towards students.

My kids have all graduated from school however I do have an interest in those that are in school. Over the years I have seen 3 changes in amalgamations with school boards. Each time getting more schools in each division and fewer divisions. I agree to have larger divisions to help with sharing the costs but I do not think that one large division or 4 regional public boards would be the answer. Staying at the Division model with the 18 divisions would be the best. Anything more would take away from the local school boards and the input from being local. The local boards live in the communities and they know what is best for each of the schools within their division. I don't think that someone from the north part of the province would know what is going on in our division and vice versa. The province is just too big to be one school division. Keep it the way it is. If it is necessary to change some boundaries to work better for traffic patterns or health care then that can be done but don't do any more than that.

I am greatly concerned in regards to the suggestion of reducing Saskatchewan school boards even further than has already been done. Our province already has the smallest number of school boards across the prairies, but covers a vast amount of land and cultures. To reduce the school boards even further than was done in 2006 would mean less local representation for students, parents, teachers and administrators. The savings yielded would be relatively minimal, especially when considering the upheaval that it would create, and the number of months or years that the process would take to have 'the bumps smoothed out' so to speak. I am especially concerned about the suggestion that there be ONE appointed school board to replace all of the present boards. This would remove most to all of the public and local accountability for the decisions made, and leave us rural residents with very little support. I do not expect that a government appointee on such a board would have the ability to empathize or understand how the decisions they made that would impact our unique communities and regions without coming from that area, and thus having an intimate knowledge of our homes and needs. The local school board system does already currently provide that, and does so very well.

I feel that amalgamation is not the answer, I have been through 3 amalgamation and we are finally at a good place with our division. I feel our division is big enough now if it gets any bigger the small communities will lose out, not mention how our students will suffer in the long run.

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report I would offer the following feedback: I do not support any of the three models presented in the report. As a teacher, I support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). Currently under the direction of the Prairie Valley School Division we celebrate some of the highest performance scores in Reading and Math as well as extraordinary High School graduation rates. What guarantee is there that these standards of excellence will be maintained through provincial amalgamations? It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! I cannot support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. Our current Prairie Valley School Division board member is very visible in our schools and community. Provincially appointed board members will not be as accessible, nor will they know their communities' needs. There has not been any budgetary evidence provided to support the change to governance or how further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. I have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold. Rural communities thrive, grow, and revolve around their schools. Closing schools will "close" small town Saskatchewan. Nearby schools are at maximum capacity and there are great concerns for distance, safety, and time spent on buses for rural children. We need a permanent high school plan to accommodate the best interests of our students, their families, and our community, as well as a permanent high school transportation plan. I would rather our students be part of a smaller school, than being in overcrowded classrooms in larger centers. This is one of the reasons people choose to reside in rural areas. Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live

in. In Mr. Perrin's report the opening letter to Minister Morgan states that ALL stakeholders who approached Mr. Perrin for conversation UNANIMOUSLY support elected boards and NO more amalgamations! WHY would we continue with pursuing drastic changes? PLEASE do not take this decision lightly. Mr. Wall was elected by small town, rural area voters. He has earned my deep respect and I have never doubted his leadership. However, if decisions are made to take away small schools and personally elected board members Mr. Wall will surely lose out on the next round of elections, simply because small towns will die off and rural areas will no longer exist. Saskatchewan is a community of learners that spans from four corners of the province. They are all unique in their needs. Lumping students together into large divisions will not meet these needs. Student will suffer and gaps that already exist will only grow larger. Do not dismiss the voices you must certainly be hearing from. Our Education System needs your integrity and wise decision making now more than ever before. This is a pivotal time in defining the future of our children, the future of our province. Thank you. Below is a letter that our School Council, along with myself, prepared and submitted to your consultation board last week. While I agree with everything in here I would like to also add that we, the tax payers, small town residents, were the ones that helped to achieve a majority government for Mr. Wall. I have ALWAYS supported the Sask Party since its' inception, and have had a great deal of respect for Mr. Wall. I have boasted of his integrity, honesty and genuine compassion for his home province, when relatives have told me how sweet life has been in other areas of this country. My concern is that should he listen to ANY of the recommendations listed in Mr. Perrin's report he will lose those very communities of voters that elected him to power, and NOT simply because they are saddened by his choices, but because there will no longer be RURAL voters living in these small towns where their schools are located!!! It is, most certainly, a tough time with oil prices and cuts in our province, but saving a few million dollars on a HUGE billion dollar deficit at the cost of education seems to be sending a message that the government is not Building OUR Future! Amalgamation WILL NOT "Keep Saskatchewan Strong!" It will divide us and divide the very future of the children who will someday try to lead the way of this beautiful province we live in! Please consider our little ones, their families, and their communities when you make your decision! Thank you in advance,

K-12 Education Governance Review Advisory Panel: After review of Mr. Dan Perrin's Educational Governance Review Report we would offer the following feedback: We do not support any of the three models presented in the report and ultimately we wish to remain a part of Prairie Valley School Division. We do support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). Currently under the direction of the Prairie Valley School Division we celebrate some of the highest performance scores in Reading and Math as well as extraordinary High School graduation rates. What guarantee is there that these standards of excellence will be maintained through provincial amalgamations? It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! We do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. Our current Prairie Valley School Division board member is very visible in our schools and community. Provincially appointed board members will not be as accessible, nor will they know their communities' needs. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support the change to governance or how further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. We have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold. Rural communities thrive, grow, and revolve around their schools. Closing schools will "close" small town Saskatchewan. Nearby schools are at maximum capacity and there are great concerns for distance, safety, and time spent on buses for rural children. We need a permanent high school plan to accommodate the best interests of our students, their families, and our community, as well as a permanent high school transportation plan. We would rather our students be part of a smaller school, than being in overcrowded classrooms in larger centers. This is one of the reasons people choose to reside in rural areas. Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in. In Mr. Perrin's report the opening letter to Minister Morgan states that ALL stakeholders who approached Mr. Perrin for conversation UNANIMOUSLY support elected boards and NO more amalgamations! WHY would we continue with pursuing drastic changes?

To whom it may concern: I am writing to express some grave concerns that I have about the roll out and implementation of the upcoming possible amalgamation. I fear the loss of elected school board trustees and therefore the loss of local representation is not worth any potential cost savings. There has been inadequate information supporting the need for change. Perhaps if I knew why these changes were being proposed, you might receive my buy-in. Please give more information on why change is needed and I might actually support transformational change but until then, I feel the students in our division and our community will suffer greatly.

We cannot lose our regional school at Vibank . If this government, which I've voted for in every election, goes with this they'll be out in the next election.

I appreciate this difficult decision that you must make. But I feel that having one board overseeing everything in the province might present some challenges in regards to providing appropriate resources/decisions/input with each and every school division. I feel Having one board will make things generic and standard and not unique to each of the specific needs. And our children need their specific needs addressed, as they are our future! Please reconsider your decision to have one board overseeing the province. Thank you for reading my thoughts. Have a good day!

I would support option #2. I agree with reducing costs through less administration and more streamlined service but I think option #1 will be too far removed from remote First Nations, Northern and Rural needs. Saskatchewan is diverse and having regional representation would best serve our students.

After reading Mr. Perrins report, I see that all of the options for modifying educational governance involve having less local voice in educational decision making. I am very concerned with centralization of governance that moves further and further away from the communities in which the educational relationships between teachers, students and parents operate. Schools must reflect the communities in which they exist, all the while, looking to the wider world and learning about it. I am also very concerned with the talk of appointed rather than elected school boards. A decision of this nature cuts to the core of democracy, a value that public education, by it's vey nature, has sought to uphold and protect.

I love having the separate school division. We thought about putting our kids in the public school division but loved the atmosphere in the Catholic system. There is something nostalgic and heartwarming about having our children educated with the word of God, and not having it be so off-putting as a charismatic Christian school. the values the children learn are similar to those Canada was settled on with an awareness of First Nations culture - a large part of our family's heritage. I worry that this excellence will be mute if the boards amalgamate and that there will be less excellence in the school system as a whole. If this is just about budgets, I think we need to find a better way than amalgamation. There is a reason Catholic is separate.

Though I think that the current school boards can be shrunk down, I do not think we should loose the local voice to make sure all the needs of rural, ethnic, etc are heard. I don't believe you can amalgamate everything into one school board...but I do think efficencies can be made by making fewer and streamlining processes. Interested to know how you are making changes

I have grave concerns about the suggestions of amalgamation of public school boards. I currently work in a pre-k to 12 rural school, where about 80% of the student population is bused in from surrounding farms and smaller communities. As the situation currently stands the school is about a 2 hour drive from the local board office. With this distance at times it can be tricky to have school division staff to come and work with the students to increase student achievements. I fear with a provincial board or a regional board modal, specialized staff needed from central office would have to journey even further to get to rural schools like mine to provide key interventions. School board amalgamations hurt rural schools the most and cut the services available needed for rural students. The status quo is not a perfect system but I believe is the best way to achieve the targets launched in 2014 in the ESSP.

I love that we have both the option to homeschool and to have faith-based Catholic education. I attended Catholic school and, although I homeschool some of my children, my other children attend Catholic school and I have been overall very pleased with their education. However, I think there are places where the school tries to be everything to everyone. For example, some schools provide food and meals to kids. Although I understand the rationale for this, I do not feel that this is the school's place. If there is a need within the community, hunger in the school should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis within the community, not within the schools. Also, in the past 40 years, there seems to be a ballooning of support staff and admin. My aunt worked at a small town school that employed 5 teachers (one half time as principle) and 1 admin. Now that same school has 5 teachers and 5 non-teachers. So again, schools have become a "catch-all" for all kids. I am not sure why this is exactly, is it that the children themselves actually require more support service? Regardless, I think there is a need to refocus on the FAMILY as the primary educator and the schools as the ancillary (although very important component). Nothing will be accomplished if the family is sidelined. Regarding homeschooling specifically, I agree with the statement by SHBE/HSLDA. I have also heard that Alberta has a special provincial school board for homeschoolers, which seems to be a way to deal with the more particular concerns of homeschoolers. (Although my experience with Regina Separate has been nothing but positive and the administration there has been just excellent overall. However, in talking to other moms, I realize that Regina Separate is the exception and not the norm.)

I am concerned that if consolidating all public schools boards with government appointed members will impact the student directly. Decisions need to be made at a local level by those who live in and are connected to the community.

It is time to take a true look at education and the various boards across the province. If public education is funded the right way it would look at the elimination of the Catholic boards by having a referendum to change the education act. Since that is not happening, reduce the public boards to 4 boards and the Catholic. (1) Boards are too top heavy. More superintendents than necessary, directors salaries too high. The province should set a cap on salaries for upper management. Also director salaries should be public since it is public money that is utilized to pay them. All the coaches that divisions have for teachers is not necessary. Put those individuals back in the classroom.

I am writing because I am concerned about the proposed changes. I think the divisions and legislation re: school divisions should stay the same. If the changes are made this will not benefit our children and future generations to come. Regards

I think this amalgamation is foolish. This will not save any money. Start investing in education because all you are doing is selling out the province's future. When people aren't educated properly we'll have major crime and social issues because of the funding cuts to teachers' salaries and the school system. Why is a nurse worth so much more than a teacher? A nurse merely treats symptoms of existing problems. Teachers proactively prevent other socio-economic issues. Where's the forethought and strategy on this?

Hello, We are concerned parents and home educators. We live minutes south of Regina, Saskatchewan and have been apart of the Regina Public, Regina Separate and Prairie Valley School Division. We request that request: (1) That SHBE and HSLDA be counted as stakeholders in these discussions; (2) That the Province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students; and (3) that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators.

Class sizes should not be more than 20 anywhere. A good teacher can teach with a higher number of students but the effectiveness and efficiency decrease as the numbers of students in a classroom go up. The education system needs people and resources 'on the ground level'. Students need teachers and EAs to help guide their learning. In a technological world every school in the province should be 1:1 or 2:1, but we're not even there yet and it's the year 2017. The ministry of education needs to look closely and honestly at their staff. If there are staff that are not directly having an impact on student learning then those jobs need to be cut. The same goes with school divisions as well.

I work hard to be an elected official! Besides I have been the only
Aboriginal elected in an urban setting, if I was not on the school board, the trustees
would not know indigenous issues like I know First Nation issues. I do my best as a lone minority to share teachings to my peers, and to the admin. we are not broken, no need to fix.

I am opposed to the amalgamation of the school divisions. Please keep our boards local with locally elected representation.

I have three children that have all been a part of the Regina Catholic School system.
I am very concerned with the proposal to amalgamate the school
boards across the province. The benefit of having a local school board allows for the board to responsive the individual needs of the community that it serves. I have witnessed first hand how parents in the community have had input on proposals of the school board which directly affect their children and participated in such discussions. I do not see how any significant funds will be saved by having one school board and all needs addressed in all the school communities across this province with specific and diverse needs. The education system is stretched to the limit as it stands now. I am deeply concerned about the quality of education my youngest will receive as she enters high school and for the children coming into the system. Education should be a priority in this province and careful consideration of any changes is required. Long term planning is necessary rather than a short term "solution" in an attempt to show that the government is cutting spending to pander to voters in advance of the next election cycle. I am extremely disappointed that prior to the previous election no budget was released and discussion of this type of enormous structural change was not presented. Please look to other jurisdictions instead of repeating mistakes that have already been made elsewhere. Thank you.

Thank - you for reaching out to the front line professionals. As an educator with 20 years of experience, as well as a parent of grown children I know the importance of positive relationships with parents, parish personnel and parent organizations to meaningful, spiritual and successful education of the children of Saskatchewan! It has been documented in the report submitted by Dan Perrins that in fact there are no benefits seen with the amalgamation of school divisions. Mr. Perrins was selected for his professional expertise which I believe needs to be valued. I am uncertain as to why an advisory board has been set up given the information within the Perrins report. Opportunity appreciated,

Please do not amalgamate school boards.

Dear Sir/Ma'am I understand changes are being considered in our education system. As someone who represents our area, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community. Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support Saskatchewan school boards and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature. We need to keep our school boards locally elected and we need to keep decisions closer to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community. Sincerely yours,

We write this letter in support of not reducing the existing school boards. As you well know our province is very diverse. In order to best serve that diversity we need to have each of these diverse school district areas well represented so that the representatives in each of these areas carries forward the needs of each region. As in everything else in life sometimes we need to have the fortitude to see down the road a long way. Limiting, restricting or reducing the input in our youth's education is not the answer. All we need to do is look at the social problems now in our society and the ever increasing cost to the general public. As educators, parents, professionals, and members of the community we understand the essence in early, well planned, developed education and the difference it does make on a child/youth long before he or she reaches adulthood.

I feel that any more funding cuts, resources taken away, and job losses in our education system would only lead to the students to suffer. We need to be able to provide a safe and equitable learning environment to our children, so why would we be taking away the funding that allows us to do that. Every person involved in our schooling and education systems play a vital role to providing this to our kids.

As a teacher and parent, I am concerned with the lack of information provided in the Perrins report regarding ways in which any of the options benefit students. As a voter and tax payer, I feel that the report does not adequately outline the economic benefits of any of the options for me to provide an informed opinion. As a business owner, I am concerned with the loss of jobs within my small community. I am concerned with the loss of local voice in decision making that will happen with elected boards representing even larger geographic areas than what we already have considering the very diverse needs within the area. I am deeply concerned with the lack of time that the Sask party is taking to make important "transformational" decisions for our communities and for our students. Please consider taking more time to research and share the important information regarding the economic impact and, most importantly, the impact on students before making drastic decisions.

Schools and Education belong to their communities. The elected board is a representation of the diversity and uniqueness of the communities that make up Saskatchewan. These children are our future and their education will directly determine their future. Saskatchewan can't afford to save money at their expense. We are a province that has long been defined by its small community way of life. Please don't take a hammer and chisel to our education system and our way of life.

I would like to congratulate the government in reviewing the current school boards as they exist. I believe amalgamating further is a step in the right direction in order to make the cost more efficient and save money. I am amazed at the actions and comments by the leaders within the current school divisions. I think that they are truly afraid of a forensic audit that should be done and that the truths will be outlined and revealed, as is the public's right to know. The truths of monies being spent in administration and duplication of services without accountability in the director's knowledge but boards have been gagged and bullied to not reveal what the truths are. I am honestly so happy to see that need based opportunity for every child would be a reality under the governance of one school board and school division. Thank you,

I very much oppose the notion of appointed school board members. I appreciate having locally elected members who have kids in our schools, recognize the needs and wants from our staff and students and whom else come out and volunteer and support events and activities in our schools. Parents, students and teachers are in continuous change mode - it's time to slow things down and let everyone just do their jobs for the best of our students and our schools. Too many changes too often make it impossible to keep up and adapt to.

I wish the school system to stay as it is for

Hello Elected and Appointed Officials, I am writing this email to beg for you and your committee to reconsider removing Lloydminster Public School Division from restructuring. As over 60% of our division receives funding from out of the Saskatchewan coffers a vetted interest keeping money in the boundaries of Lloydminster is pretty plain to see. We are a unique community that has come together over the last many decades and for this government to divide our community would be a mistake. Our community is growing quickly and we need stable and reliable education for our almost 5000 children. Please support us as we have long supported the Sask.party seat in the Saskatchewan government.

On behalf of a concerned parent regarding the education changes being brought forward by our sask government I would like to voice my thoughts. First of all the reasoning behind this change remains unclear to WHY and how this would benefit our children and their education and us as a tax payer. Without these questions being answered it is hard to see the government's perspective on why the change would benefit anyone and has the government thought this through enough to see the whole picture without little disruption to the system. As a parent I believe our education system is meeting all levels of expectations being set out from our government and that stats have been released to show these levels. I do believe that with these changes our division would see a huge loss as to where and what our dollars need to be spent on properly to keep meeting these goals. As well we would lose our right to vote our local boards in who are our voices. These board members are not there because of a paycheck but there because of their passion for education and making a difference in a child's education. I do think that someone in Saskatoon or Regina would not understand our needs or challenges that we face here in northern Saskatchewan and that we would lose out or should I say our children would be the losers. I'm a very strong believer in education being a golden ticket to a successful life and I'm worried my children will lose this ticket if these changes are being made without any reasoning to why...as the saying goes "you can't fix something if you don't know what is broken " same goes to education how can our division make changes or fix things if everyone is unclear to why this needs to happen and what does this actually prove. Maybe our government really needs to look at their constituents and see if they can slim down their numbers to save money. Maybe cut back to 40 and see if they can juggle it and still be as productive. I guess I am asking them to look at the big picture and see all pros and cons to doing this without answering to the public as to WHY they are taking this approach. Changes are and can be great as long as there is some logical reasoning to the big question WHY which lacks here? In order to move forward as a productive province we need to make sure we are doing the best thing for our citizens and I do strongly believe this would not move us forward in the education sector but only make our children suffer greatly in their right to a better education. Sincerely,

To whom it may concern, I will begin by stating I appreciate the invitation for public input in this process of change. I am a parent of two children, both of whom are/have attended Prairie Valley School Division. I am also currently employed as with Prairie Valley School Division. I have a vested interest in what the future holds for education in our province ~ as a tax payer, community member, employee and parent. I have read the report composed by Dan Perrins. In a short time-frame he has presented three recommendations to steer education planning for Saskatchewan. Since the end of December I have been thinking about the three recommendations from all the lenses I mentioned above that I view through. I have consulted with family members, friends who work in different school divisions and colleagues, both in education and in other sectors. This was the "hot topic" at 2016 Christmas dinner. Everyone cares deeply about education in Saskatchewan. I believe that I feel most confident in recommendation #3B Division Model with Realigning Boundaries. All of the benefits that Mr. Perrins cites in his report are strong indicators of why this option may be the "best transformational change" for Saskatchewan. Allowing the local voice to still be heard and ensuring that students receive maximum benefits in the classroom are two indicators that speak loudly to me. I would like to add that if there is a school division that could currently be used as an "exemplary" model of effective and efficient I would suggest that Prairie Valley School Division would be the one to guide the province. Yes, I know the reader will suggest my bias discredits my point of view. However, I wholeheartedly believe that Prairie Valley is a leader with a strong vision for the classroom and that education sector targets are leading the work being done daily in Prairie Valley School Division. Thank you.

Keep education local!

At present school boards are set up to meet the needs of their students, families and staff. Throughout the province these Boards are fully aware of the needs within their communities because they are also members of that community and are chosen by those communities. Appointing government officials to oversee the Educational needs of the very diverse communities within our province will take away the say of the people of this province. It is not the way to go! One model does not fit all. Budget cutting and amalgamation should not come at the expense of the education of children. And it most definitely will damage the ability of school boards and staffs to meet the many needs of the families we serve. It will not be an improvement!

I have a few thoughts that I would like to have taken into account in your K-12 Education Governance Review. 1) I would love to have SHBE and HSLDA be counted as stakeholders in these discussions. 2) It would be wonderful if the province were to appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students. 3) Lastly, I believe strongly that any governance model should be transparent and include the participation of home educators. Thank you for your time and consideration! Sincerely,

I believe that we need to make a decision that will save money and improve education across our province. Removing local boards will definitely have an impact that will not sit well with the rural communities. If their local member is removed, they will feel like they have lost their voice in the education system. The report does not outline which option will save the most money for the government, nor does it highlight how much compensation will be needed to pay to people that have lost their jobs. This plan needs evidence that it will save money or there is no point in doing it at all and at this point in time it seems that there is no evidence. Other provinces have taken this move and it has not saved them money. Please do not allow a political view to outweigh the quality of our education system.

As a Saskatchewan resident of Lloydminster I would like to voice my grave concerns about the changes to our school division boundaries and board models. I strongly feel that these changes would gravely effect students of Lloydminster because of our unique situation on the border of Alberta. I believe the voice of even Saskatchewan students will be greatly affected if we were part of a larger entity. Our voices would be small, weak and unheard. I also believe that City of Lloydminster has done a fantastic job, over the course of 80 plus years to deliver seamless education to both Saskatchewan and Alberta residents. A drastic change like presented in this report would change how our system can even deliver education to our students who receive funding from Saskatchewan and Alberta. Lloydminster Public School Division, and the City of Lloydminster have gone to great lengths to use their resources to deliver education, and having a larger entity try to govern and understand the differences would not save money, time or create a positive education for our students. As an individual with three children who have been a part of this system for over 13 years I know the challenges that face teachers and administration face as educators. I would hate to see a change like this make it even harder for teachers and students, an outcome that supports education needs to be considered as a primary focus for the future of all Saskatchewan residents. I would strongly suggest that consideration be given to Lloydminster to run their own school board as it stands now because we offer a unique dynamic in our province. But I also implore you to consider how larger divisions would also effect the rest of the province negatively. Smaller rural schools have different difficulties they face, compared to a larger centre like Saskatoon, Regina, Moose Jaw, Lloydminster and I would hate to see them get lost in the shuffle and their needs and desires be dismissed over time. Thank you for your time considering other avenues to get the results that the government desires to achieve a resolution that can benefit many, and not just benefit a few. Regards,

My biggest concerns are lack of funding and the future of distance education in rural Saskatchewan. Will our voices be heard if it is one large unit rather than several smaller units. Each school division is unique and should justly be treated that way. We are losing .25 of a teacher every year and it is affecting my child's education negatively. Our playground is falling apart and funding for special needs students has lapsed. If we do continue as one solid unit, will we be held to the same standards as city schools? Will we see band and drama programs reassurrected in our school again? I am very upset at the secrecy of this change and the short amount of time given to respond. I only became knowledgeable of this change today and am certain that my community is unaware of this situation.

Due to past experiences, I originally wasn't planning on sounding my voice around the potential amalgamations in Saskatchewan. Often it has appeared that my voice doesn't matter and that by the time I hear about changes, the government has already made the decisions. In this situation, it appears that consultation and voice aren't valued. In January I find out that a report was initiated in November, released in December, and public consultation has to be completed by January. If this report was about something minimal I could possibly understand but finding out that the decisions being considered impact the very fabric of how education is delivered, sustained and structured is mind blowing. As the issues at hand are so critical, I am voicing my thoughts and I truly hope they are considered. Short version, please reconsider the options laid out in Perrins report. As the report is laid out, I am not confident about: (1) the specific issues being addressed by restructuring; (2) the ability of the three options outlined to address the issues facing the province. As well as (3) how specifically Lloydminster as a unique community was considered in the outlined options to ensure we are strengthened as a community rather than weakened or harmed. Any model the does any of the following should be considered deficient, harmful and counterproductive: A) Creates division - as an educator, a coach and a former clergy member I am very aware that even the slightest perception of disparity and inequality can incite people to make rash decisions. The fact that there is a public and a private division plus two provinces represented in our community means that the models you have outlined have an increased chance of creating real and/or division and disparity. If you amalgamate the public system so Lloyd Public encompasses many other communities while the Catholic division remains untouched, that will be enough to cause real division in our community. Considering the amount of work that has been done in the past to ensure that this doesn't happen, this would be a real step backwards. Just look at the backlash and confusion caused by a few cents tax on one side of our community on carbon while the

other side was left alone. It created real division, panic and frustration. I have already heard parents talking about moving their kids to the Catholic division if amalgamations take place and real anger about making sure their Alberta tax dollars stay where they belong. In this economic downturn all of Lloydminster has rallied together to try to move forward. Imagine the problems we will face if we are divided along educational lines. B) Lowers standards - I am not saying our division or the current model is perfect. However, the options outlined are highly disruptive, they involve a complete rethinking/redistribution of power and funding structures, and they will require significant time and resources to implement. If your intent is to improve education (which wasn't a focus or a clear consideration in the report), this type of rushed restructuring will likely create significant and sustained chaos and shifted focus over several years. Is that a climate that is conducive to decision makers, educators, parents and students maintaining let alone improving educational success? C) Increases the gap between decision makers and the people they serve - Regardless of whether you are talking about reconciliation with First Nations communities, reaching out to youth at risk, or convincing a whole border community to unite around an issue, keeping the distance between the people and the people in power small is critical. The examples I listed above are complex, unique and deeply rooted in history just like Lloydminster is. If you choose a model that removes all significant local representation to another distant community, regardless whether it is large or small, you are committing harm to our community. Thanks to our current model, the community can and does hold our leadership to account. Our local board members are woven into the very fabric of our community and therefore understand Lloydminster and its complexities and genuinely keep the community's interests at heart. Our kids/community members on both sides of the border and in both public and separate school systems have the right to meaningful, effective, and accessible representation. Having our representation for half of our student population come from a place hundreds of kilometers away while the other half just has to swing by Tim Horton's is inviting conflict, inefficiencies, mistrust, and ultimately a weaker educational community which I hope is the exact opposite of what you are trying to achieve. Please reconsider to amalgamations you are posing. If they are the best options for the rest of the province but they are significantly problematic for a unique community of 30 000 people, then look at other options for our community. Honour previous charters which created a unified Lloydminster. Look at leaving us unique and separate from amalgamations. Look at other options such as legislative changes. Do anything except move ahead with a one size fits all mentality when Lloydminster has always been a community that by design lives outside the mold. Thank you for your consideration. I am trusting that both Saskatchewan and Alberta governments will work together and advocate for the best of our community.

Quality Christ-centered academic learning is a priority for our grandchildren whom we are guardians of. Where there is religious teachings and acknowledgement of God within the daily curriculum children benefit greatly. There is less bullying in these schools and when there is a problem the issues are handled effectively. Our educational system should support any and all incentives to continue to deliver these services to our community. This support and strengthening of that support includes adequate teacher-student ratio, support staff and special needs teachers and therapists for integrating children with special needs as they are doing now.

The business of education is to give the children of our province an equitable, accessible, current, responsive and vibrant education. At the heart of education is the teaching and learning relationship and the success of the education system relies on this relationship's success. All decisions made for and regarding education should reflect a desire and a goal to improve this system and its goals. After reviewing the three options outlined in the report, I cannot see how any of them will benefit our education system and our students, especially in the unique and complex bi-provincial nature of Lloydminster. I have concerns that our children's right to equitable and accessible education will be in danger. The equity principle in Lloydminster, between two funding provinces, has always been a local challenge. This challenge is one that has been solved and executed for many years, though, that no matter which side of the border you reside or go to school, your access and quality of education remains equitable. Amalgamation not only threatens our charter rights to local and elected voices for our students, but also the efficient and effective way that education is being provided in our unique city. The options outlined in the report, distract and undermine energy and funding from the important work that our education system does; teaching our children. Please take time to find alternative ways to solve government efficiency problems that does not involve creating more problems for our students, teachers, school and communities. Transformations can be small but mighty; this coming from a mom and a first grade teacher. Be creative with your problem solving; something that our schools have been doing amazing at, as we provide excellent, equitable and vibrant education to all students, with less and less funding. Be thoughtful, efficient and effective with decisions that will benefit Saskatchewan's most important asset – our children.

I don't think we have been presented with enough information for this amalgamation. There are a lot of unanswered questions yet.

Its makes sense that the government continually looks at the educational system of SK and looks for ways to make it better. Nevertheless, I as a mother and practicing Catholic also fear that the government might be trying to have more control over faith-based educational framework of Christian schools as a whole. Other provinces have done this and the results have been a source of serious concern for Christian/Catholic parents and students alike, especially in the subject of sex education. I am just hoping that the intentions of SK's Ministry of Education and its appointee will not be tainted by lobbyists who think that having a belief system (especially Christianity) is passé and not in line with modern schooling. I hope the government knows that the multiculturalism, including various religious practices of Canadians help make this province stronger; and being able to practice your beliefs in good faith and solidarity is a huge part of democracy.

Please accept this as my written submission to pledge my support for governance of education being left within our local community. Lloydminster is a very unique city in terms of having students residing in both Alberta and Saskatchewan. For many years, both of our local school divisions have done an incredible job of providing seamless delivery to all students within the city, regardless of which province they reside in. Locally elected school boards have allowed both of our local divisions to make decisions with the unique needs of our city in mind. We have very unique funding and governance structures due to having students from both provinces attending our city schools. As a parent with three children enrolled in one of our city high schools, I truly feel it is in the best interest of my childrens' education to keep the governance of education within our community. Sincerely,

I don't believe amalgamation of school boards is the answer. The Catholic School Board Trustees are constantly present in the community such as attending school functions, talking and listening to kids and parents in the community and being part of a parish community. It is so important as a teacher, parent, a child or anyone in the community to have their trustee visible to them to answer any questions or concerns. We would lose the ability to vote for our school board trustees and to keep our faith-based education.

please protect our children's rights to a quality CATHOLIC education!

I feel this was a quick decision and it will affect the children by pushing back their education in a province that already says we are behind. I feel if we go through with this, our voices will be lost in the shuffle and it won't matter. We have a tough time getting parent volunteers as it is on our SCC and this will make it worse. We went through an amalgamation 10 years ago and just in the past few years have seen parents, teachers and students comfortable and confident again. The children in our division and all the children in our province deserve to have an education with purpose and leaders that will guide them through the K-12 process. We have that right now. Lead by example please. Don't let them down again. I am suggesting asking divisions to look through their own stuff and make cuts on their own first before a decision is made. Why are there trade people on the payroll when there are local small businesses that could potentially do the jobs for cheaper? This could affect our whole community. I really hope you consider changing your mind in this amalgamation and try something else. There is that saying, "it takes a community", and my 7 year old son would say "we are a family". Please keep it that way.

we still need trustees so our voice can be heard.we don't need ceo to run school boards.

I believe that it will be an important consideration to keep the public and catholic/separate school systems separate allowing for choice between the two systems. I also feel that there should always be at least a portion of a school board being elected by the constituents versus appointed by the government

To move to a single, provincially run school board leaves me to believe that a small school, such as ours, will be lost within the system. Through the past few years, our division has run on a deficit and our EA's and libraries have been impacted. While the provincial government states that education of our youth is paramount, having the cuts that we have had to make have made educating our youth a challenge. More and more we are seeing a decrease in the extra help needed to maintain consistency within the classroom. Children that are needing extra help are not getting it due to cuts in staffing. Not being able to have the library open and accessible to the students all day, every day is affecting everyone. Teachers are now being asked to be librarians for certain times during the day when they should be focused on helping our students. With this being said, I am all for streamlining the school system. I am all for cutting costs. But to what expense. The Educational Governance Review Report seems to be biased in the direction of what the government wants to do as opposed to what is actually best for our youth. I think there should be more accountability at the higher management levels of government. With the last round of division amalgamations were there any cost savings? This is something that needs to be addressed before we change the system yet again. Please do not rush into changing an already flawed system. Focus on making it better. Remember always that education is about our youth and they need to come first. This can't all be about dollars and cents, it needs to be about keeping our youth smart and strong.

Hey Decision Makers, I tell everyone that your proposed changes could actually make things better, but I am often met with skepticism. We all know there are expenditures that irk the rank and file and offer poor return on investment: (1) Principals: In 2017, Why do schools like Uranium City with 4 students (1 of which is the teacher's) need a teacher, EA, and a principal allowance? (2) Why aren't schools with 1 teacher under the principal of another area school or someone in the division office? (3) Why aren't the 2 regular children studying under the EA's supervision online through the quality K-12 distance courses available that offer more electives than city schools? How can a teacher prep and instruct all courses adequately for multiple grades? (4) In addition, if the teacher has a family of 5, it requires 4 x 5 round trip tickets per year and other northern allowances on expensive airways, and the teacher should not be his/her own principal for accountability's sake. (5) The return on investment for these students is low, as they could be getting quality online courses with their own subject area specialist teachers. (6) Upper administration: why do we need so many, and how do they get ludicrous expenses approved that do not benefit students, when positions like front-line IT techs who keep the system going are understaffed? Upper administrator's wages could fund more than 1 tech's wages. (7) Peripheral Staff: Why do we need teaching coaches when teachers are already trained 4 years minimum for their position? (8) Expenses like meals reimbursement requiring receipts rather than a lower flat allowance when travelling. Those bringing a healthful lunch get nothing, while those paying inflated prices in restaurants for less healthful food get reimbursement. Why not encourage health and save money with a lower flat allowance to those travelling to encourage them to pack lunches or hit the local grocery store for fruit and veggies? Please focus your money on front line teachers and techs. Trim upper administration, and put the schools with less than 3 teachers under an umbrella principal, for accountability and cost savings. Trim pretty positions like teacher coaches or run a help line from the ministry. Technology allows teachers access to incredible amounts of resources. It should be creating time and dollar return on investments. Why can't some PD be done via teleconferencing instead of the expense of relocating teachers for it? After the video-delivered speakers, teachers can focus in house on what was presented. Use technology to deliver courses with specialized teachers to schools with micro-enrollment and provide an EA for supervision and support for the online delivery. That's just my two cents. Make good decisions focused on expenditures that directly benefit students in class, not the teachers and administrators. Thanks for the voice,

I believe that we should keep regionally elected school boards, as research shows that locally elected school boards matter. It is important to remember that teaching is not a business that is designed to generate income. We are educating the young of our province, and this takes money. We may not see the rewards of our efforts for several years, but a good education for our children will make our province stronger. School boards have been working on becoming more efficient, and they can continue to do so. Having a locally elected school board gives a voice to each shareholder, and ensures that the needs of the students are met.

I like that I know people on the school board, and feel comfortable approaching them with my concerns. This would not necessarily be the case if they were appointed. My experience is school board reps are responsive to parent concerns. They are representing the needs of the children and the parents in their communities, which appointed boards may or may not do. The needs of the various schools throughout the province are incredibly diverse, so have a locally elected board is important to make sure these needs are brought forward and addressed.

I support Catholic schools should not being amalgamated with public schools. As it upholds the culture and the faith of this country. It helps in building a good foundation for our children the future generation and the hope of this society and country in general. Pls I'm appealing thanks Catholic school board stand on its own. Thanks

Since the Wall government took power they have been eroding the Saskatchewan education system, first with taking over the budgets and most recently with refusing to fund the teacher wage increase even though it was his own government that negotiated that very increase. Saskatchewan students and families take the brunt of these cuts with larger class room populations, less staff and services, and aging facilities. And that is without considering educators and parents are also taxpayers. Now Mr. Wall threatens teachers and support staff alike with wage freezes, rollbacks and further staff reduction. By reducing Board numbers provincially Mr. Wall is setting up a further scenario for poor communication between all parties, more red tape to get ANYTHING done, and more stress in the classrooms for both staff and students. Even though separate school boards are not forced to follow the public board reductions (should that come to pass) they most likely will. How are students expected to learn and excel in a global community when Mr. Wall's government is systematically destroying our excellent education system? Mr. Wall should not expect Saskatchewan educators and parents to bail his government out of the mess it has created with its poor fiscal management since 2007.

Urban and rural school divisions have very different needs. Should amalgamation take place, please be cognizant of the needs of all people that require education supports. Thank you.

Hello panel When making decisions for affected groups, it appears the most important factor should be whether there is the best understanding of the group's needs. If this is applied to education and the students involved, a simple deduction would be to involve the people within that demographic. Although educated adults could surmise what might be best for a district, unless you live there you don't have a full understanding of all the components involved and those most necessary for the best education of the children. Saskatchewan should be known for it's best investment, the children, the future of our province!

I don't believe amalgamation is the answer to improving education.

Hello: As a former students, parents, and now grandparents of students within our education system I wish to express confidence in our elected school board system. When you live within the area involved, there is more of an effort to understand the people and what is truly needed for the best education. We can't all be fit into textbook cases. If you involve someone who knows nothing of the needs except on a theoretical basis you take away the personal understanding of the most effective policies. Thank you

I think we need to keep our school boards elected and local. Appointing a school board takes away choice and accountability. Bigger school boards or one big school board would not be as efficient in determining and meeting needs in schools. I don't see a need for change. I believe doing this will not benefit our students.

I understand that the government is going to be looking at making changes in education. I am concerned that looking to try and make changes in education to save money is a quick and rash decision due to the poor fiscal economy in Saskatchewan. I don't believe that money will be saved but rather this kind of decision regarding education and the children that are the future of Saskatchewan will be negatively affected by this kind of knee jerk decision making!! "We have a budget that exceeds \$2 billion, so we need to look everywhere we can for savings, efficiencies and the most effective way we can to deliver service," said Minister Don Morgan. I don't believe that making drastic changes to education is the best way to look for savings as there are many other areas that should be looked at and considered before we start to mess around with student wellbeing. I know that the ministry will claim that this will not have an impact on students; however, as soon as you start creating stress among people working in education, there will be an impact!! Also, on the Letter of Transmittal written to Minister Morgan from Dan Perrins on December 10th, Dan Perrins states that there was "unanimous support for no more amalgamation noting that the 2006 amalgamations have created school divisions that are large enough to achieve all significant economies of scale; additional outcomes will not improve student outcomes or result in other savings...Agreement that further progress on the sector plan would be lost due to the transfer of energy required to reorganize". I don't understand why then, that Dan Perrins, the Minister and the government of Saskatchewan seems to completely be ignoring what Dan Perrins said to have heard from 32 stakeholders who know and understand education and what will impact student learning and will not save anything (more specifically not enough to even make a difference or an impact of the deficit we have under this current government)!! In a news article that I recently read, the education minister said it's a possibility the status quo could be retained and therefore my opinion is that we continue with Status Quo in education at least until 2020 when the ESSP ends. I hope that you strongly take into consideration my support of the summary that Dan Perrins submitted to Minister Morgan on December 10, 2016 in the Letter of Transmittal attached as the front page of the Educational Governance Review Report. Thank you!!

I feel that I should have a say, we all should have a say, and more importantly a CHOICE in our children's education. It is and always has been our choice where and how our children are educated in this province. I don't agree with amalgamation, I don't agree with being told where and with whom my children should be educated. I don't believe this is in government's realm to dictate these very individual and important decisions.

I worry about my children lagging behind in a world perspective. I see our country falling behind in education and our ability to deal with social issues like bullying. Instead of re-writing our own 'play book' could we not take a few pages from those who have improved their systems like the Scandinavians? I see students in Europe and Russia that learn computer programming and our system offers nothing. My son in grade 5 is just starting long division!!!!!! My other son in grade 7 just spent time with the principle describing how a grade 3 child is being mistreated by his class daily. I believe you have a large issue ahead of you but to quote Margaret Mead, "the highest measure of a civilization lies in how it cares for its children."

Parents and caregivers need to continue to be offered the opportunity to give their children a Catholic education in Saskatchewan. Students in Catholic schools develop values which help them make a positive contribution to our society and the world.

I believe that this would definately hurt our rural schools!

I would love to keep local representatives on all our school boards. The kids are the ones affected by all the cut backs in school, and every schools needs are different. As a local member of the SCC, as well as a mom I was shocked my all the not included costs in our school system. Changes to the curriculum aside I think our education system needs some work. Sincerely,

Hello, I am very concerned over the future of education in Saskatchewan. As we have an ever-changing world, our schools and education system should reflect that. When I hear talk of "transformational" change I get scared as from what I have seen this talk is not about improving the quality or making the curriculum current, but blind-cost cutting. I am not saying don't make cuts or ignoring the reality of the provinces current economic situation. What I am saying is especially when we see how volatile dependency on natural resources has been for our economy we need to invest in education and innovation. We need a diverse economy and invest in the students of Saskatchewan to become our next leaders and innovators. I have been closely watching the ministry of education for some time starting with the 2020 target of higher graduation rates (Student First). I have seen very little has actually been done to address the bigger concerns outside of a classroom that challenge a student's ability to be successful and allow them to graduate. Tragically, we have seen increases in suicides (especially in our Northern schools), more youths going through the legal system, issues with child welfare and widespread addiction. These are just the most obvious as I have seen a frightening increase in student anxiety and depression. All of these issues that are preventing students from being successful and areas outside of a classroom's teacher's expertise. In order to move forward, we need to acknowledge these issues and find ways to help students (and adults) dealing with them or the cycle will continue. As for the education system itself, it worries me that we have had pauses on the curriculum and lack of goals provincially for the quality of education. I teach in a system where I feel they have done great jobs in settings academic goals and real targets that address the quality of the education (Regina Catholic Schools). The message they are getting from the ministry with the "2020" directive is basically to push kids through to graduation. This is an over-simplification, but essentially the focus is on pushing kids above a 50% and getting them to move on. I am by no means saying we should hold kids back, but we should be looking at that "2020" goal and asking ourselves "what can we do to support student learning to allow them to be successful and make the content more meaningful?". I feel we need to do more to engage every student to make the content and classes more meaningful, which will naturally increase graduation rates and allow us to hit the targets set by Student First. I feel strong curriculum development and supports for implementation will allow this to happen. I have seen new pressures occurring that have affected a school's ability to service their students. A few years ago there were massive cuts to instructional assistants. I work in a school with a FIAP program and it is not fair or just to not properly support the educational needs of those students. These are just the students who are considered "high cost" and not the students who are "high need" who don't get the support they need either. We have had a huge influx of immigrants. This is wonderful and provides our province with so much, but these new Canadians need extra-supports in language and other areas in order to to be successful. Successful students will enter the workforce, pay taxes and in general contribute to a better society and Saskatchewan. This is my opinion, but morale within the teaching community is very low as I feel not appreciated or valued by our current government. This does not necessarily refer to salary, but more to our value as what we provide. It is discouraging as teachers like me work hard to meet all of the challenges I mentioned and yet it seems to go unvalued by the ministry. We are the front lines and I can say in all honesty that my colleagues are fantastic and go above and beyond to support student learning in all they do in and out of the classroom. I also acknowledge throwing more money at me does into solve the problem either. Cutting teachers would be wrong as class sizes are already too high for my liking and makes addressing individual student needs more challenging as it is. I would like to see more supports given to areas I mentioned, which will allow me to better reach my students to help them be successful. As a parent, I want the best for my kids and all of the students in Saskatchewan. I want an education system where their personalities, values and opinions are valued. I want a system where creativity is nurtured. It is said that 75% of the jobs that will be in demand 10 years from now do not currently exist. We need to invest in arts programs, social studies, ELA and other classes where creativity, nurturing compassion and empathy are developed in order to meet the challenges that our kids will face. Literacy and numeracy are important, but giving them more time by cutting the classes I mentioned is not the answer. These are complex questions and issues which will require great thought and possibly resources. Blindly cutting budgets and moving forward with changes without carefully looking at the consequences would be a mistake. In order to make Saskatchewan prosperous and ready for a changing future we need to invest in our students, educators, curriculum and schools. I am more than happy to be a part of the solution and be a part of consultations. I have a degree in education and recently completed my master's in education (curriculum and instruction). Sincerely,

I am a member of the Student Community Council. I would like to express my concerns with the options provided in the Educational Governance Review Report. I value the connection we have with our elected Board member and do not feel a move to appointed boards would benefit our remote community. I fear loss of our local voice will negatively impact our students experience and performance may suffer as a result. Our school division currently ranks in the top of provincial results. I feel this document and the options provided are merely cost saving options and do not take into account the accountability and efficiencies PVSD has found since the last amalgamation. The document options clearly acknowledge that changes to the current system may compromise student outcomes, reduce accountability, reduce community communication and access to decision makers, put more work on SCC's and disrupt our schools. The negatives far out way the positives as we read through the options proposed. I fully support finding cost saving systems, strengthening our educational outcomes and standardizing expectations of our Boards, but I and many others cannot support the sweeping changes as proposed in the document. I implore your department to consider the thoughts of those that you represent, and that the primary concern should be the interests of the students. There are ways to be more efficient. Cutting school divisions will result in loss of schools, creating over crowding. The department must keep in mind the student teacher ratio when any changes are made. I would like to see more advancement with First Nations and their education system. Cutting school divisions cannot help that. This will lead to a reduction in staff, which will ultimately mean a loss of resources for remote and rural communities.

I am strongly opposed to amalgamating school divisions and eliminating local, elected boards of education. I believe that local representation in education is critical in a democratic society. Locally elected boards are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. They are important advocates for excellence in education. No government bureaucrat, based in Regina, will serve the needs of students —which are unique to each division, and even each school—better than individuals elected by each community to represent that community. Furthermore, previous school board amalgamations in Saskatchewan resulted in virtually no cost savings, while being disruptive and time consuming for boards, teachers, parents and school communities. The provincial government could find far more useful ways of saving money in this province than once again attacking the education system, which is doing an admirable job while being already stretched to the limit.

Changes required in Education governance: 1. Change our view of children from liability to asset. 2. Change our view of educators from service liability to service asset. 3. Change our view of education facilities from liability to asset. 4. Develop a first class education plan which will provide our students with first class outcomes by the end of their education experience. 5. Calculate the costs of the plan. 6. Dedicate funds to achieve this plan. 7. Protect the funds from the ebb and flow of economic cycles. 8. Look to Finland's Education governance as a guide for creating the Saskatchewan Education governance that is equal to or better than the one in Finland.

Hi, I wanted to write and express my opinions about these governance options that are up for discussion. My first thought and instinct would be to leave it the way it is! Yes there are are always things that need to be tweaked or fixed but this is not the way! We need to keep our boards local and elected in order to keep relationships between the schools and parents/teachers effective and efficient. Due to the restrictions within the charter, it would be difficult if not impossible, to provide a seamless delivery of service across an expanded division. Challenges in the Educational Governance review Report can all be met effectively through amendments to legislation, regulations and policy. I think this would be considerably less disruptive to continue with elected boards working under new mandates, regulations and expectations. Just like everything else keep it local!! Our children's futures depend on it! Thank you,

As a teacher and a parent to school age children I believe strongly that maintaing divisions which have elected boards is extremely important. The individual boards allow parents to have a voice within their school division. If the province chooses to move to a large division the community voice will be lost.

I have a few questions regarding the elimination of school boards. Is there a representative moving forward for the southwest area? Have the previous elected trustees been paid to perform this function? Is this a cost savings, or just a transfer of control? I would be interested in hearing how this new model would be beneficial to the children of southwest Saskatchewan. I appreciate your time to help me understand, so that I can use my democratic responsibility to protect the children and future of our province. Sincerely,

Dear Members of the Panel; I would like to propose that there is, in addition to the Partners in Education listed in the Governance Review Report, another Partner in Education which should be listed; that is the SHBE members and home educating parents of Saskatchewan. We are quite a large contingent and thus should be counted among the determining voice. In the Report there is not mention made of Home Education. Input from all concerned should be sought out.

A provincial role model for k-12 education is definitely NOT a model to be adopting! I believe that one large division will leave the far reaching rural communities and needs to be forgotten and or not addressed in a way that will be a benefit for the students, staffing, and needs of the individual communities. Schools and education are the backbone of our entire communities and structures and forcing Saskatchewan to become one whole unit because of "numbers" and "dollars" does not address the needs if individuality. Thoughts basing this model because of numbers do not make sense to me. Very large cities/centers that are used to make decisions to not cover the same geographical area that Saskatchewan has. The preferred choice would be the division model, which continues to cause me concern. Although creating larger divisions that was recently done may have provided access to larger dollars to use throughout the division, centres that are far reaching from a central office continue to suffer because of geographics. When employees and students need to travel 2 hours or more to attend divisional activities (professional or educational) it creates many,many hours of extra time that these people are required to put in on their own time with any compensation. Does it make sense for students to travel a total of 5 hours or more to attend a 2 hour informational session? We need to keep less disruption in the school day/year to continue to provide the best consistent education for our students. Students first, not government dollars on unnecessary change!

I urge the Saskatchewan government to cease any efforts to further centralize education in our province. With both the proposed provincial option and regional option, proper implementation will be a lengthy and expensive process that will disrupt students, teachers, parents, and communities. To make matters worse, there will be vast inequity as parents and community members will have less access to school board members. Furthermore, as the Catholic school system is to remain untouched, this will create addition inequity between parents of public versus Catholic children. Unfortunately, with both the provincial and regional option, the school board(s) will become separate and very far removed from the communities in which they should be serving. The public will lose its access to those making the decisions regarding the education of their children. Both urban and rural communities have a unique sets of needs and interests, when it comes to education, and these must be affirmed and protected. Lastly, any efforts to move from elected school boards to appointed school boards must be stopped immediately. Parents and communities must continue to have a strong voice in the education of their children. Appointed school boards are undemocratic, and stifle the voice of entire communities. The only acceptable option given in Dan Perrin's report is option 3B which seeks to realigning boundaries. This is the only option that maintains community voice, and attempts to prioritise the needs and interests of students, teachers, parents, and communities. The other three options only seek to meet the government's needs and interests.

After reading about the possible changes that may be put into place with regards to school divisions and their boards across Saskatchewan I am sad to say that the Government, once again, has lost touch with the needs of this provinces' children and educators. One Government Run School Division with appointed board members does not serve the needs of this Province and its' children. Let me give you this analogy; if you desire that we as teachers teach children in an inclusive and differentiated environment should you not extend that same courtesy to the differing schools, the divisions and ultimately the communities that they serve. It is hypocritical of you as Government officials to expect that we as teachers should differentiate and include but you are unwilling to do the same. There is not a ONE SIZE FITS ALL curriculum anymore than there is a ONE SIZE FITS ALL school division. Please consider that what you are proposing is the exact opposite of the direction in which you expect teachers to follow. That in itself is a huge conflict. Sincerely,
Proudly Serving my community and students in Regina Catholic Schools!

Our children's education and their futures should be the focus of the government. Large class sizes do not benefit children, nor does cutting funding to education. Teachers are already being stretched to the breaking point because of increased class sizes, fewer available instructional assistants, inadequate funding for resources, and the demands of ever-changing subjects, technology and projects rolled out by the Ministry of Education. The pressure of "voluntary" activities for which teachers do not receive monetary compensation adds to this overall stress. Making these kinds of changes as this government has suggested will only fuel the frustration that the teaching community is already experiencing.

"A large percentage of the funding for education still comes from local property taxes. While the Province sets the taxation rate, the local taxpayers still pay the toll. Taxpayers deserve local representation for education. This is different from Health where all funding except portions of capital come from the general revenue fund of the Provincial budget. Locally elected boards are responsible for placing student needs first when making decisions, and are accountable to their electorate. They are responsible for ensuring all students within their jurisdiction have equal opportunities to reach their maximum potential. This may be lost with larger elected boards or appointed boards who may be more influenced by politics because they are responsible to the government who appointed them.

Dear Minister Morgan, I understand changes are being considered in our education system. As the MLA who represents our area, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community. Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support Saskatchewan school boards and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature. We need to keep our school boards locally elected; and, We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

Closing small schools is not the answer to saving money. Children will be on school buses for hours every day. Classrooms will be so crowded that children will not get a good education. Also closing schools will also finish small towns as people will have to move to bigger cities.

Our students are the most important members of society. They're going to be our next innovators, scientists, plumbers, engineers, doctors, nurses, and electricians. In order to ensure that they receive the best education possible, we need to make sure that our teachers have the necessary tools at their disposal - and that includes local boards that provide the support our educators and learners. Also, further amalgamations to make larger school boards does the opposite of what we want; if we want our students to achieve the goals in reading and math that the province has laid out, school boards that are made up of members who understand the needs of each of the schools that they serve are extremely important.

My background: I am a retired teacher who taught for

My comments: Over the years, I found that the organization itself of the Board of Education in the _____ area is questionable. For instance, each board member has an equal voice in terms of voting and decision-making and yet the

_____ They meet for a few days each month. Over the years, the amount of committee work has greatly increased and a check of the public documents will show that there has a lot of money expended on "meeting". There is also money set aside for the board for education and training opportunities

_____ There seems to be no one willing or able to tell these folks that these dollars set aside for Board members should really be spent for education and training for Division students...or even Division teachers who will then use what they've learned in their classrooms. There are numerous examples of questionable spending on themselves that no one could call into question. It seems like the government of Saskatchewan should be minding these expenditures but governments of all political stripes have feared saying anything to offend this board,

_____ One would think that an elected Division Board is a good thing. Originally in Saskatchewan, farmers, business persons, and housewives...those with children in school...took time out of their daily lives, to involve themselves in the education of their children. In the north over the past 30 years, the role of "board member" has become a career in itself, and a quick look at the amount of money most of these folks pull in shows it to be a lucrative one. Over the years, members on this board also sat on other boards as well, such as _____ and others, increasing their "take-home pay". When I neared retirement age, people urged me to get involved and run for a position on the _____ Board of Education. I really considered it, as a person with a lot of experience in education in this Division. However, when the opportunity arose, I wondered if I could possibly have an impact, with the way the Board makes its decisions. In the end, I decided that I did not want to attach my name to this "system" which I believe is broken. I personally would be in favour of the dissolution of this system and its replacement with a system where the decision makers and the dollars are focused on the education of children. This isn't to say that the government's choices for these boards would be perfect either...the government could very well choose those they know would "toe" the Ministry and therefore Party line. But a good first step would be to cut the enormous cost of division boards of education and the little "kingdoms" that have been set up in each division office. These offices are over-stuffed with employees of "the Board". These division offices can surely be pared back. Surely each division doesn't need all of these positions? Board member remuneration, the salaries of superfluous directors, superintendents, and consultants and their staffs can surely be better spent directly in schools on teaching and learning. Yours in education,

To keep the catholic board and catholic school which is beneficiary in both education and spiritual.

We would like the catholic board increasing in spiritual activity during school time and even at the week ends.

Keep locally elect boards! Our kids' education belongs in our communities.

Dear Panel Members: I understand changes are being considered in our education system. As a representative of the people of Saskatchewan, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community. The speed with which the government is moving, the lack of consultation and consideration and the possibility of forced amalgamations threatens rural communities and puts rural education at risk. Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support the Chinook School Division and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature: (1) We need to keep our school boards locally elected. (2) We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. (3) Amalgamations and major restructuring will set back learning and educational goals for many years. With amalgamations or major restructuring, the focus is removed from students and refocused on creating a new model under new boards. (4) This would be the second time that forced amalgamation excluded Separate School Boards. (Separate school boards each have 7-10 members for lower numbers of schools and students). (5) If forced to choose an option in the Educational Governance Review, we would choose Option 3B, to keep the School Divisions as they are (with some minor adjustments to a few borders that need some correction). Provided that you do this with consultation as is stated in the report. This will have the least disruption to the system and will allow the School Divisions to get the focus back on the provincial educational goals almost immediately. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community. Sincerely,

After reading the report and talking with others, I have a few thoughts about the Transformational process: (1) This will provide minimal savings within the education sector. (2) Very large divisions or regions will prove a further disconnect between the Ministry and local communities. (3) This has the potential to create an even larger impersonal bureaucracy in a personal and student focused environment. Students are not widgets and learning does not fit neatly into timed slots of progress. (4) Any change in education should first look at the benefits to the learning of the students and the working conditions within the school setting. (5) The Ministry already oversees education through curriculum, and guidance with local boards and Directors. (6) While education is a right, the responsibilities for education are local and personal. It starts with the learner and moves out. The proposals put forth turn that around and put the emphasis at the top.

I have no problem with further amalgamation of school boards as long as it is going to save money at the top end in order to expand services and educational opportunities at the student level. I don't think many people could name the people on their school board - even though they are elected. There is no public forum that I know of and I know from talking to others that a lot of people elected to school boards no longer even have children in the system. I think the fact that my kids, because we live in a rural district, have not a lot of choice when it comes to classes and teachers makes it hard to really support the school they attend. I think an investment in language education at an earlier grade would be an option that a lot of parents would appreciate. Offering French at Grade 10 is useless. With today's technology and language learning software I think that offering at least that option right from Kindergarten would really benefit our kids as the economy they live in becomes ever more global.

To whom it may concern: I am writing to express my concern regarding the Governance Options as presented in the Educational Governance Review Report prior to Christmas of 2016. I am a resident of Lloydminster, SK and currently a within Lloydminster Public School Division. Our school division prides itself on the ability to offer our students the best possible education through collaborative efforts of our teachers, and a focus on what impacts the citizens of our community locally. It is the decision making of our local school board that supports and enhances the quality education of our students here in Lloydminster. The inability to have decisions made based on our local pressures, needs and economy through a local school board and local division office would be detrimental to the citizens and future children of Lloydminster. From a parent perspective I have a number of concerns: 1) Should a child have an issue that is unresolved in a building, contacting a city 200+ km away and speaking with administration that does not know our staff and students is concerning. 2) The inability for quick access to local supports such as senior administration/technology, speech etc. will add pressures to staff and students and their wellness. 3) I am concerned there will be inequities between schools on both sides of the border due to the current seamless delivery model currently in place for the past 84 years. Thank you for your time.

The big issue for me lies in why ANY public money is used to fund the separate school system. I believe that NO PUBLIC MONEY should be used to support any schools affiliated with religion. All public money should be used for public schools. I also believe that there should be greater standardization in processes and procedures across school divisions. I should expect the same level of service in all school divisions across the province.

We need to slow down this decision and really think about the consequences. A lot of smaller schools and areas will be lost in the shuffle. Decisions being made by people who may not even know where these schools are located or any of the dynamics.

Moving to this "super" school division cannot be any worse of a situation than PVSD is already in. The morals, values and ethics of the school division and "professional" staff has reached unprecedented levels in a negative way.

The point being, perhaps PVSD should do some of their own housekeeping BEFORE we move to these larger school divisions. PVSD is lacking in so many areas and it is known by many who have children attending and upon conversation with many other parents of children in other schools, there clearly seems to show a systemic issue within PVSD.

Honestly, not sure the larger school divisions could be worse than what PVSD already has????

I feel that this would be disastrous for our Rural Schools and Students. Although we are all from the same province, our students needs are much different. Already there are many times that we feel as though we are just a number. This would not help that feeling out, it would absolutely strengthen the feeling of being unnoticed. There are obvious differences between city and rural students and staff. Very often rural schools are running on smaller staff and are trying their best to meet the needs of students. Would they have the support that is necessary when it would become a bigger division once again. Through the last amalgamation there was a lot of personalization lost. I feel that it would become none existent.

I have never been opposed to mainstreaming administrative processes, so in that regard, a LEAN approach is not a bad idea for administrations of schools. However, in reality, the LEAN money savings is always passed down to the teachers and unavoidably, the students (which I am opposed to). Our schools are vastly under-funded. I see this on a consistent basis as we are constantly fundraising for student needs that used to be covered by the government (supplies, learning tools, etc.). In regards to the report, I believe that it would be unrealistic to consolidate school divisions to administer more than 5,000 children (even now, in my view, we could use a splitting in Saskatoon, as the East and West tend to have differing needs). It will also be important to maintain a regional division. For example, one provincial administration to cover all children in the province could never effectively manage different regional needs. In my view, one (or even 4) divisions would, under a LEAN approach, attempt to mainstream and treat all children and regions (within the main region) in a like manner, regardless of necessary regional differing that is required. So, in a sense, with some tweaking, the present model is one that I think would best satisfy needs, however, it does need some work in increasing efficiency of the administration (without passing costs of such downward), and possibly some splitting of present school districts to have them administer a more optimal number of children. Representatives should be elected and not appointed, UNLESS a system of appointed could be created that didn't promote political favour appointments (less be honest, that is impossible). Additionally, appointed representatives would demand far more remuneration for their work than an elected official. (Again, cost-saving in an area that is not trickled down to the teachers and children).

By amalgamating the schools and potentially shutting down the school my children will be attending starting next year you make it so that they will have to possibly travel hours by bus just to get to school. I moved to a small town so that my kids could go to a smaller school where the teachers all know who my kids are and who i am. The teachers will know my children better and they won't be just a number in a large class if they had to go to a city school. I went to a very large city school in Winnipeg and I will tell you right now that I was just one of two hundred and some kids in that grade, whereas my husband who went to a small town school knew all his classmates if not the entire school as well as he knew all the teachers very well and are still in contact with most of them. Putting kids from rural schools on buses for hours to go to city schools is not going to do the kids any good. In the community that I live in we are a farming community and a lot of kids help out with seeding and harvest and that will make it impossible if they are traveling for hours on buses just to get to school and back. Small town schools make it possible for families to make a living doing what they have been doing for generations. If you take away our school a lot of people will have to make a big decision about what to do in regards to staying in the community or moving closer to where their child will be going to school.

In regards to the K-12 Education Governance Review, I feel our children would be best served by implementing a plan that keeps the governance of those programs as close to the children as possible. There are always efficiencies to be created in an organization and while the amalgamation of the current divisions would reduce the administration costs associated with our current structure, the very important voice of the people would be completely lost. Status quo is no longer applicable in today's business because change is inevitable however, the stakeholders that are directly affected by these changes would no longer have a chance to voice concern. Each division must be asked to create their own efficiencies while still representing what is in the best interest of the children. There is no room in this system for an appointed board. A regional board would be too far removed. Making slight border changes to the current divisions would be acceptable if the intent is to better align services for the children. Any changes that are made must be done by an elected board that has representatives that represent families and children in the areas that these children attend school. The current system is reflective of this.

I agree with option 3D in realigning boundaries. It is important to keep divisions smaller in order to address local community needs. It is also important that local accountability for decisions takes place, and that those making the decisions are highly aware of local issues. There are vast differences in communities across Saskatchewan with highly varying needs, I cannot see how this would be adequately addressed without many school divisions and divisions boundaries based on local needs. Regards

I have watched the school system go downhill from when our Daughter started in 2010. Kindergarten was structured and they learned how to read, write, and learn about how school was structured. Then in 2011, when our son started it was somewhat the same but they did not learn as much about reading and writing, but still learned a good amount. Then in 2012, when our last son started it all went out the window with this new curriculum of "play and learn" with no structured learning. No learning to read and write, nothing just play all day long. Our son who is now 8 and in grade 3, has struggled with reading and writing, because this group of kids was never taught the basics that should have been taught in Kindergarten. I had a discussion with the school and kindergarten teacher about it and was told that this is the curriculum and their hands were tied. They were not allowed to teach writing and reading, anymore. It had to be a play and learn class room, with no desks or tables or writing assignments or reading assignments. They children were the ones that had to tell what they wanted to learn about.

I think the government needs to check up on their systems in the schools as well as the teachers. And look at those who are just there to make a pay check instead of making our children educated and ready for the world. Yes, I get that teaching is a very challenging job, and that most of the teachers are awesome at what they do. But just like any other job, there are ones that shouldn't be there. And should be weeded out and make room for those teachers that want to teach and make a difference in a child's life. For the last three years our school has been growing and our class room sizes are big, 26 to 30+ kids in classes k to 5, and we have no room for anything. But they say we will not get portable class rooms, because of the other schools in _____ not being full. This is wrong! There is nothing we can do to up the totals at the other schools while our school and teachers suffer with over capacity. And having nowhere to go. I also think that with all the medical and things that could happen it should be a must that there is people on staff that have CPR and first aid training there at all times. There is Adults with life threatening medical issues and many children with them as well. Our teachers are there day in and day out, working to educate the world children, to grow up to be Lawyers, Dr's, Paramedics, Teachers, and some Government like the Premier. If the Premier did not have excellent teachers/schools when he was a child he would not be where he is today.

Dear Minister Morgan: I see as the only viable option for ensuring appropriate supports to our children in Northern Saskatchewan to amalgamate the three school divisions in the North into one Northern school division. The resources and finances saved should then be funneled into student support services for providing additional mental health and special education supports to the schools who should partner in this area with health. Splitting Northern lights School Division would bring undue hardship to many of our educators and students for many reasons. One of those reasons would be the fear that many of the excellent student support services that we have in place would disappear to other student needs. Best regards,

Dear Sir/Madame, I am sending this letter with the deepest feelings of indignation and offense at the Educational Governance Report that was produced by Dan Perrins. Its motives being targeted at students' achievement improvement and cost savings do not stand a test of a few simple questions and context that surrounds it. First of all, the timelines in which this initiative is being attempted to be executed. No self-respecting governing body starts something as significant as this on December 21 and expects to receive a feedback in a month from a million of people who were peacefully enjoying winter holidays and then settling back into their routines. At the very least, it's very disrespectful towards the people who were blissfully unaware that something like this is being planned to be done so quickly. Something that effects no more nor less than their children. Directly. It creates an impression of the ministry trying to hide their true motives behind this initiative and hoping to execute their surreptitious plans before anyone had a chance to realize what is going on. I would also like to point out, yet again, that this is not just about something secondary, this is about our children. Every civilized society puts their children above anything else. And this government is using them as pawns in their sneaky exercise of budgetary cuts!!! Secondly, if this is such a marvelous plan that will ensure student achievement improvement and financial efficiencies, why are Separate divisions exempt from enjoying the benefits of it? Do they not deserve to improve student achievement? Why public schools are the chosen ones? The pretext was a meaningless phrase that they were "constitutionally" protected. So, the question arises, protected from what? Is this initiative an existential threat to their schools? In that case, a question is being begged to be asked: and public schools are not constitutionally protected? Protected against what and against who? Is this not just a governance adjustment, not an existential question? There is no reason for them to be exempt then. Unless this is a poorly hidden excuse to apply this punitive measure against specifically public school boards over hassle with the Theodor Case? The final judgment is due to be released in the spring, and perhaps government just does not want to deal with appeals and further proceedings in the case that points to gross manipulation of Section 93 to fit less than honourable goals of certain separate divisions competing for student enrollments with the public system? Let's not forget that Human Rights Committee condemned Canadian Government two times for special treatment of Catholic and Protestant denominations of Christianity as opposed to every other faith. Does this provincial government not realize that by drawing this kind of line between two basically public school systems, they provoke questions that put Separate divisions in a very uncomfortable position? Pretty soon Separate schools will turn into something elitist and prestigious, with more funds, with locally elected boards as opposed to poor public system with a provincial, possibly appointed board? If they were true Faith based schools, that would make a bit more sense, but in most cases they are not. They accept everyone. Therefore, why do we need both? This is a gross manipulation of Constitution and perhaps it's time to start a movement to amend section 93 like it was done in other provinces and establish linguistically based schools instead of faith based. Thirdly, there is not one single dollar mentioned in that report as far as cost savings go. Anyone could have written that up. It has no credibility whatsoever, "words, words, words". What is being mentioned repeatedly in the benefits section, it is "more transparency at the ministry level". So, this is about power and control of public divisions specifically? Why? This is highly undemocratic, this is about choking out local electorate, local voice. This is the move that needs to be condemned, loudly and clearly. And most importantly to me, as being a resident of Lloydminster, this initiative will drastically and dramatically undermine what this city is about: equitable delivery of education services to all the children in the city regardless of which side of the border they live on. This initiative offends me as a resident of Alberta because I have no means of reaching the governing province, Saskatchewan, when it comes to something as crucial to our society as education. Alberta's opinion is not being asked nor considered, Alberta simply pays the tab silently. This is an assault on Alberta government, because money saved in reserves from Alberta grants can go to where it is not meant to go in the first place. This is an assault on democracy and is an example of pure exercise in power by using the most sacred that people have: their children. This is an assault on Lloydminster Charter that protects equality and equity of bi-provincial city. This government can reach results of equitable funding and student achievement by making adjustments in the legislation, regulation and policy without lowly manipulations demonstrated in the report and by the report. In my eyes, this government has discredited itself immeasurably by using children to fulfill their goals with ethically questionable motives.

, Alberta Resident, City of Lloydminster

I am concerned and hope Dan Perrins and Minister Don Morgan take into account the following when reviewing and making decisions with regard to school boards in our province. First, as part of the Canadian Constitution, Catholic education is a right and as such, it is important to maintain independence with regard to decision making around Catholic education. Therefore, I would not want to see public and Catholic school divisions amalgamated. Finally, I feel it is important there is some level of democratic involvement and input from the community (teachers, other professionals, community members and parents) to ensure our children's education is the best it can be.

Change for the sake of change is ridiculous! Changing the setup of our education system for the sake of saving \$... EVEN WORSE! We need to invest in our education system, not make cut backs! These proposed changes may look good from a simple accounting point of view, but that's about it! Increasing class sizes and reducing the student/teacher ratio negatively effects our children's education. Closing schools and bussing students further, puts added stress on family's and increases the safety risks involved. I sure hope families are aware of the stupid ideas involved in some of these new proposals and how poorly they will impact so many lives. The best interests of the students are being overlooked in these new proposals! There are zero positive influences to the actual students in the towns/city's and it's even worse for the rural families. I for one am proud of Saskatchewan's rural roots and feel we should do what we can to keep our rural educational programs at a top level. They need to be supported and pushed to grow, not just to survive but to thrive! Yet in fact, this is the exact opposite of what this government proposal suggests. 2 thumbs down from me.

Under the following conditions would I be able to support amalgamation of the existing School Divisions, in any capacity:

1. No front-line losses: maintain all teachers, E.A.'s, and additional support staff.
2. Make the cuts at the top. We have FOUR (4) Superintendents just in our school division - never mind deputies and administrative staffing. They are not elected, nor are they accountable. Last year they rammed through a policy which blatantly contravenes the fundamental freedoms enshrined in the Canadian Charter without duly consulting and promoting discussion - but this year, as they may lose their jobs, they suddenly can put flyers in every mailbox, produce radio ads, etc. All while they cannot afford to buy new sports equipment for our local school!
3. Elected Superintendents for sub-divisions enabling and requiring local input and accountability.
4. If you're going to have one giant super division, ensure that there is open and forthright communication to all schools and School Community Councils, local representation, and a feedback mechanism from invested parties (i.e. students, parents, teachers, schools, and communities) that is easily navigated and follow-up is a requirement.
5. DON'T CLOSE SCHOOLS!!!
6. Get rid of the wasteful, unproductive, glut of upper management types. They aren't invested in education, they seek to establish a self-justified system of social reform in accordance with their beliefs. Our kids don't learn handwriting, they have "chapter books" read to them in grade 9 because they haven't been effectively taught and the school can't afford multiple copies of the books, they don't do spelling tests anymore because phones "autocorrect", and a whole assortment of other system-wide failures because we have over populated the desks in an office building that doesn't care about student success in life merely social promotion based graduation statistics.
7. Ensure education dollars are spent on education, not policy production and insipid meetings that don't actually result in elevating the understanding and comprehension of our students. I realize that #2 and #6 are very similar...there is a problem in our education system. It begins at the top and, inevitably, the resolution is sought by cutting at the bottom. We can no longer afford to have our students falling behind educationally because management needs another raise. Return to a meritocracy in education. If you work hard and study hard, you succeed. You don't work, you fail. Stop the social justice warriors from ruining the next generation. Thank you for your time.

I am a parent who believes in and has a strong relationship established with my child's teacher and administrators at the school he attends. I am very appreciative of their 'open door' policy as well as their diligence in communications. Without these day-to-day updates, discussions, suggestions and resolutions, my child's learning along with fellow students would severely be affected. I also know that appointed trustees are hand-picked and are usually, without accountability to the parents or students. A democratic vote of the people they would represent within their local district is the only fair way to put a person in this capacity to overseeing their schools. Taken from the Saskatchewan School Board's Association's '2016 SASKATCHEWAN SCHOOL BOARD ELECTIONS; ROLE OF A SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER' page: 'In order to continue Saskatchewan's tradition of education excellence, boards of education need the ideas, energy and commitment of women and men who want to do their best for students and their communities. Locally elected school boards have a vital role in serving Saskatchewan's publicly-funded education system. The longest lasting and most fundamental responsibility of schools boards has been to bring the voice of the public to publicly-funded education.' Quote: "Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it's the only thing that ever has." -Margaret Mead Also: 'A SUCCESSFUL SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER IS . . . COMMITTED Successful school board members, or trustees, put the needs of the student first all of the time. Trustees run for office because they are committed to making things better for Saskatchewan students.' These statements MUST remain true in order for students to obtain high academic scoring; to becoming caring contributors to our society and to be able to achieve all of this in safe buildings, stimulating surroundings, by having access to programs and opportunities, and with committed, caring and dedicated teachers who are willing to deliver to our children in a way that is needed for each individual student. It is my heart-felt hope that considering amalgamation is NOT the best for our children, students; but instead a new, re-focused approach to supporting the existing individualized school boards. Thank you for reading my response.

K-12 Education Governance Review Advisory Panel, After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report we would offer the following feedback: We do not support any of the three models presented in the report and ultimately we wish to remain a part of Prairie Valley School Division. We do support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). Currently under the direction of the Prairie Valley School Division we celebrate some of the highest performance scores in Reading and Math as well as extraordinary High School graduation rates. What guarantee is there that these standards of excellence will be maintained through provincial amalgamations? It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! We do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. Our current Prairie Valley School Division board member is very visible in our schools and community. Provincially appointed board members will not be as accessible, nor will they know their communities' needs. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support the change to governance or how further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. We have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold. Rural communities thrive, grow, and revolve around their schools. Closing schools will "close" small town Saskatchewan. Nearby schools are at maximum capacity and there are great concerns for distance, safety, and time spent on buses for rural children. We need a permanent high school plan to accommodate the best interests of our students, their families, and our community, as well as a permanent high school transportation plan. We would rather our students be part of a smaller school, than being in overcrowded classrooms in larger centers. This is one of the reasons people choose to reside in rural areas. Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in. In Mr. Perrin's report the opening letter to Minister Morgan states that ALL stakeholders who approached Mr. Perrin for conversation UNANIMOUSLY support elected boards and NO more amalgamations! WHY would we continue with pursuing drastic changes?

I strongly disagree with combing the divisions. We as tax payers have the right to decide who will represent our and our children's needs at a local level. We have the right to have input into our children's education. Someone who is not a part of our community does not understand the specific needs of it, just as I don't understand the needs of others and shouldn't make decisions for them. They will not have time to build the necessary relationships needed at each local level to successfully run programs, implement the correct changes and understand each community needs.

I believe that the direction this report promotes is entirely wrong, we should be doing the precise opposite and breaking apart the larger school districts into smaller ones to allow more democratic control over local institutions by people at the local community level. Anything that further separates the community, especially parents, from any part of the decision making process will result in schools that are even less responsive to communities and kids growing up with even fewer basic skills they should have learned in school.

To Whom it May Concern: I understand changes are being considered in our education system. As the Advisory Panel who represents our interests as citizens and taxpayers, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community. Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support the Chinook School Division and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues: (1) Local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities; (2) Consolidation will set back the advancements that have been made in literacy and numeracy for years; (3) The NDP promoted consolidation held back education for at least 5 years and cost money rather than saving money; (4) This would be the second time that forced amalgamation excluded Seperate School Boards, firstly in the NDP action and now in the Sask Party proposal; (5) It took at least 5 years for the Boards, formed only 10 years ago, to become accepted as the community's school system. Significant improvement in learning is just beginning to be achieved in the last couple of years, (6) A large percentage of the funding for education comes from local property taxes still. While the Province sets the taxation rate, the local taxpayers still pay the toll. This is different from Health where all funding except portions of capital come from the Provincial budget. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from their community. Sincerely,

I like Democracy. So I would like to continue with the opportunity to elect the officials that oversee my children's education. As opposed to another government appointed board that has no real connection to my community or has a vested interest in my opinion.

I have been a memeber of the SCC for 7 years and have appreciated the participation of PSSD board members at the SCC meetings. It has been important to have the members act as our information link - both from and to the board- and as our advocates.

Dear Government of Saskatchewan, I believe that it is important to keep locally elected boards of education. The Government of Saskatchewan is conducting a governance review for kindergarten to Grade 12 education—part of the “transformational change” to education we have been hearing about since June’s provincial budget. Deputy Premier and Minister of Education Don Morgan has stated that amalgamating school divisions and eliminating elected boards of education, and replacing them with government appointed boards, are possibilities. Locally elected boards are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. They are important advocates for ensuring excellence in education. Who better to serve the needs of students—which are unique to each division, and even each school within divisions—than those elected by our community to represent our community? The government has recently cut health region cuts, and I fear that the education system is going to take a big hit this year as well. There were already heavy layoffs earlier for staff in the school divisions in 2016. This is frustrating as a parent and a tax payer that after several years of the Brad Wall government telling us that Saskatchewan is in a boom, and now we have a deficit of \$ Billion!! The places that he is pulling funding primarily from are healthcare, education and social programs. It is likely that all people in the province will require these important services many times throughout their lifetimes. These are important institutions, and while it is important that they run efficiently, it is also important to remember that one size does not fit all. Do not go to amalgamating school divisions and eliminating elected boards of education, and replacing them with government appointed boards. This decision would greatly decrease the quality of education in this province. Also, heavily laying off staff in the school divisions will not help the economy, but continue to pull it down.

Regards,

Local elected leadership of our school division is extremely important to a well-managed and accountable school division.

The following is my personal submission to the governance panel. I will deal with each section of page 20 / 21 before commenting on the four options presented in this report. The sections directly quoted from the Perrins report will be in italics. Shifts in Governance: To address the key challenges articulated earlier, and regardless of the structural option selected from those described below, the following shifts in governance should occur for the system as a whole (public, separate and francophone) to address the key challenges: 1. Strategic Direction and Accountability: a. redefine the roles of the Minister in the legislation and regulations to enhance the ability to provide direction in relation to outcomes and standards and to assess the extent to which they are achieved; i. The role and powers of the Minister do not need to be redefined; the ones that are present need to be used. One of the major challenges experienced by school divisions across the province is the vacuum that presently sits in the ministry with regard to curriculum, data, and leadership. The Minister / Ministry has the power in legislation to lead and support in all these areas but due to the lack of use of that power those roles have been forced down to the school divisions. This has created a lack of control and accountability. As that push down of responsibility occurred school divisions had to hire staff to do those roles thereby expanding board offices. b. examine the number of members per board for public and separate systems; i. No examination necessary. The number of board members should be capped at 7 with allowance for an indigenous representative if no such representation exists on the board elected. c. standardize expectations of boards in relation to required competencies of board members; require mandatory board training. i. I agree with mandatory board training to meet required competencies, not appointing them to meet it. One of the challenges though is to determine what those required competencies are. 2. Effectiveness: a. renew and strengthen the emphasis on education outcomes through an ongoing focus on the ESSP and consideration of an Education Quality Council with responsibility for monitoring system performance. i. This creates nothing more than an extra layer of bureaucracy. We have three ADM’s, a DM, and a Minister. Do we need another layer? Each year we are required to present an annual report to the government on these various issues. Would we then present to the EQC, the Cabinet, the Minister, the Ministry, the Board and to our students? We will spend more time reporting than doing. A single data and achievement system would solve this and make all results transparent to all levels. 3. Efficiency: a. enhance the focus on lowering the cost curve, creating enhanced value in the system, and improving services to students through efficiency, shared services and continuous improvement initiatives in keeping with the work already underway in the PLT (centralize business functions such as central IT, financial, HR, payroll, procurement and purchasing). i. Yes to this for some of those issues but we need to add another. Curriculum ii. Central IT: this can work for software purchases, student data, a provincial student email system, central payroll and financial. I do not mean for this section the actual work of a payroll clerk or other workers, what I mean is centralized servers and data bases. Why this has not been in place already is a point of contention as I have been advocating this to the Ministry for 8 years and it is within their present legislative power to do so. When a teacher moves from division to division it should be seamless. More importantly, when a student moves from division to division it should be seamless. The data does not belong to the school division; it belongs to the province and to the student. Even though this ownership exists the Ministry has yet to enact a standardized student data system it has not been done.

Once a single student data system is in place then use that information to build a standard email system for all students that would follow them as well. (we have a provincial Microsoft license to do this already). In each division we have burgeoning IT and data empires. Each division develops their own (not needed) authentication systems, data transfer systems and server farms because they are filling the space left unfilled by our Ministry. We need educational technology at the division level, not business technology. The business technology could easily be centralized at the Ministry level. A single student data / email system would also allow for seamless information transfer from division to division, school to school, teacher to teacher. At present a student may arrive at a school and remain undiagnosed for learning issues until as much as two months later when a cum folder arrives. A single email system would allow student work to transfer with the student seamlessly. iii. Financial / HR / Payroll: This is also very possible up to a point. School Boards do need to make budget decisions to fully impact local needs but the mechanics of all these functions could be centralized iv. Procurement / Purchasing: This can be done to an extent but in some areas such as technology hardware it wouldn't allow for the individual teacher to really be inventive when teaching. If a certain device was the only one on the approved list it limits their ability to practice the art of teaching, not just the science of it. v. Curriculum: This is not mentioned as an efficiency that is not mentioned and yet could be the one that would produce the most economic savings and along the way give us a true boost in student learning. Fifteen years ago there was no need for curriculum coordinators, coaches, or superintendents. As the ministry abdicated its work in this area that offload created a need within divisions to take up that work. This in turns creates 28 different curriculum teams all either replicating or inventing the actual curriculum. Please just go buy well developed curriculum from Alberta or Manitoba that has curriculum, open source resources, unit plans and assessments included. A teacher should be able to walk into a course and customize it for their students, not reinvent it, or use a coordinator to help them with it etc. This would also solve a huge aspect of the teacher time / workload issue. We have people in divisions spending resources and time on developing blended instruction, common assessments, achievement data reporting and a myriad of other curricular tasks. Please centralize curriculum development and do it well. 4. Consistency/Standardization: a. standardize governance costs, including remuneration rates, annual maximum remuneration for board members and rates for travel and sustenance (taking into account northern areas), professional development, and maximum number of board meetings; i. Yes to all of the above b. standardize administrative costs, including consideration of a provincial pay grid for out-of-scope positions and standards for the number of central office staff in relation to school-based staff; i. This has to be decided by the local board with respect to their belief what might be needed by the local community. The requirements for Central Office staff will vary based on need; LaLoche is a perfect example, North Lights has to have more resources built in to deal with those issues. LEADS personnel levels are already standardized as part of the provincial collective bargaining agreement and pay is usually based on being above a principal level plus whatever extra time is incorporated into the contract. c. consider additional standardization of locally-bargained terms and conditions. i. Preparation time should be part of the provincial collective agreement. We should move to an 8:00 am to 5 pm workday for teachers with student time between 9:00 am and 3:30 pm. Prep time would be given as part of the beginning and the end of the day. The resultant savings over 5 years with attrition would be massive and some of that funding then could be moved to pay teachers to do extracurricular. At 20% prep time at a high school of 40 staff in Saskatoon it requires an extra 10 teachers to cover off prep time. At an average division cost of 85,000 per teacher this results in \$850,000 in one school going to cover prep time. Think of the savings at that point. 5. Participation: a. reinforce the value of school community councils; and, i. Yes b. enable First Nation representation on boards. i. Yes As to the four options presented by Mr. Perrin I have but one comment. None of those options address the pressing needs of education, either financial or educational. Even if we wanted one school division it is not possible cleanly until we develop some commonalities in the underpinning of education such as student data, teacher data, curriculum, a provincial k – 12 report card, and common contracts between all the school divisions with respect to support staff contracts. Given that these things are not in place I cannot support either of the four options. School divisions across the province have built IT and Curriculum empires, not governance ones. Centralize and take leadership in those two areas and you can start to look at adjusting the cost curve. The argument will be made that this can be accomplished after amalgamation. I argue that it must be in place before amalgamation even is contemplated. You cannot build a building if the foundation is not in place to make that successful. Mr. Perrin consistently refers to levels of disruption in and of the option. These can be minimized if curriculum, data, and assessment are in place first.

I think making such large changes that drastically affect our children just to cover a deficit is really unfair. Children should be the most important thing. Not reduced to budget cuts that will affect their education and wellbeing. Do not let this go through.

Hi, I plead with you to please not go forward with this plan. When we became chinook school division it was not beneficial for us. I wish we could go back to how it used to be our school was running so much more efficiently then compared to now so if we do it again it will be even worse. People making decisions for our schools need to be always at our schools to know what is needed. If any changes happen wages in the higher ups should be reduced. We are already short on teachers and education assistants. These are the people teaching our children who are the most important in my eyes. The whole point should be quality education for our children, the future of our world. Let's put them first and not amalgamate. Thank you,

Dear Honourable Brad Wall; I understand changes are being considered in our education system. As the Premier of our province, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community. Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support the North East School Division and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature: 1) We need to keep our school boards locally, and 2) We need to keep decisions close to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

After having read the Perrins report I would like to forward some of my concerns/ thoughts. They are as follows: (1) Local democratically elected school boards are best for our community and province. Local trustees ensure the local voice is heard as they are connected to the community and have local knowledge that appointed boards will lack. Local democratically elected boards will best represent rural Saskatchewan. The report mentions a matrix could be used to have the appropriate skill sets on an appointed board. I feel democratically elected boards are often the leaders from various communities they represent and they come with a very strong skill set. Looking at the board I feel we have a very strong board with a very diverse skill set. Professional development opportunities to improve board member skill sets are available through the SSBA and are being conducted internally by our central office staff. I have taken ,and so have many of our board members ,the Brown Governance training and I feel it is important all board members should have some governance training and this should be mandatory to sit on a school board; (2) The forced amalgamations in 2006 were extremely difficult on students, teachers and support staff. It was a time of uncertainty, lack of trust and fear. For the first five or six years after amalgamation a lot of time, energy and money was spent on operational matters, team building and culture building. It has been compared by some colleagues to going through a nasty divorce or building a plane as you are flying it. The forced amalgamations impacted the students negatively for at least five years. It has just been the last five years where the focus has been put back on the students and we have been seeing improved student outcomes as a result of this focus. I worry that further amalgamations will once again impact students negatively. (3) The 2006 amalgamation affected only the public school divisions. I understand that the Separate school divisions are constitutionally protected under the Saskatchewan Act but I question how fair is it that once again students in the public sector will be the ones affected by amalgamation. I believe if forced amalgamations occur again we will be seeing more separate school divisions suddenly appearing in the province. (4) I support, with the exception of forming an Education Quality Council, the recommendations made on pages 20 and 21. This can be done by existing school boards. (5) In the last couple years school boards have been working internally and as a group to find ways to be more financially efficient. I believe the existing school boards are in the best position to find further savings. (6) I have worked with SCC boards and they can be a terrific asset for a school. I found it was often very difficult to get parents/ community members to step forward to serve on a SCC board. They tend to want to be involved in the school but not too much. The level of commitment to an SCC board is not the same as a democratically elected board member is willing to commit. As an example, in a December an SCC meeting was cancelled at a school I represent and rescheduled for today. Yesterday I received an email to say it is now rescheduled to February as there wouldn't be enough attending for a quorum. Principals also play a huge role in how successful a SCC board will be and not all principals value them the same way. These are some of my thoughts around the Perrins report. Thank you for taking the time to serve on this very important panel. trustee.

is not in favour of their school tax dollars going to another or one large school division. employs 25 employees who live in and around the communities of Spalding/Naicam. The employees have children that attend school in Naicam.

At this time we can't support any kind of change to our current education system! The government has not been clear enough on the proposed changes and how it will affect our children at the school level. We have no idea on how the new system will work. Our current school board and Naicam school have achieved a lot of success for our students. If amalgamation would go through at any level, our admin staff, but more importantly our school principal and teachers would be bogged down with extra paperwork. This is time taken away from work on programming for our students! Not Good! Let the teachers do what they do best!

Please do not amalgamate the school divisions within Lloydminster. We do not want change, we, on behalf of all parents and students in Lloydminster, love and enjoy the way the schools are currently ran and do not want to see any changes. Please take this into consideration. Locally elected boards are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government accountable (which is absolutely necessary!). They are important advocates for ensuring excellence in education. Under the current structure of locally elected boards, LPSD's trustees are able to provide the necessary resources to determine program and service levels to respond to community needs and interests for the students of Lloydminster. Please do not take the seamless and personified school systems that we currently have away from Lloydminster, NO BODY WANTS THAT. Thank you and please take these things into account. OUR MLA's need to stand by our side and fight for Lloydminster. Ensure funding remains within the City of Lloydminster.

Ensuring our children in rural Saskatchewan receive a strong K-12 education that will allow them to become active and productive members in society needs to be our number one priority. Change is inevitable, but change should not just happen for the sake of change. Our children's future and the rate payer's tax dollars are too valuable for activities that do not focus primarily on a positive impact on the front line education in addition to ensuring fiscal responsibility. Best practices among school divisions need to be shared and implemented to gain efficiencies. A local voice is of utmost importance to our rural area. I believe that the elected board is a superior option to an appointed board to ensure that local voice is heard. We have elected a strong provincial government through our democratic right, please ensure that in the future we can look back and say that the changes made in 2017 were made with solid justification and that the outcomes made our education system superior then it was in the past.

As a member of the SCC for _____ I have a number of concerns about the upcoming Transformational Change in Education. As The Perrin report refers to parental participation in new, larger school divisions, he says, "Participation in governance will be a challenge and parents and families in the public system would have different access to board members than in the separate and francophone system." This is a concern to me as I truly appreciate our access to our elected members and division staff when I have suggestions and or concerns. I feel that as boards (elected or appointed) get larger, my voice will become but a whisper. A second concern is the extended implementation time that such changes will take. My children are in the schools now and will be impacted by these changes either physically or through the effects and stresses that such changes will take on teaching staff for years to come. Mr. Perrin says "There will be disruption at the school division and local community and school level through organizational changes,....." In spite of the low funding provided by the Government of Saskatchewan I have been impressed with the work done in our school and am concerned that a drastic upheaval you have planned will have further negative effects on not only my children, but the school and our community as a whole? I am not convinced that these changes are "In the best interest of students" but more an attempt at cost cutting. My children have already been a victim of your current funding measures and I feel these changes will further impact their quality of education and future education endeavors. Our school staff is currently stretched to the limit. In 2012 my child was diagnosed with a _____ and due to funding shortfalls she was not able to receive the additional assistance and support needed. Our school had to focus on those students with more serious issues than my child. I am truly concerned that larger divisions or a single division will make this problem even worse. Our family has used our own resources to support our child. This does not match the idea of a public education system that considers the unique needs of individual students. The plans outlined in Mr. Perrin's report further take away from the student centered feeling our school is struggling to maintain and move us closer to survival mode. This will not be healthy or positive for anyone. I am very proud of my children, the students and staff at our school and want nothing but the best for them. I feel that any of the proposed changes will take a toll on them and my family. This will result in a much less successful and positive school experience for everyone involved.

As a trustee for the past 15 years in the west-central part of the province, and a strong parent advocate for 10 years previous to that, I remain firm in my belief that locally elected trustees for school boards remain the best option for educating our students. Having local input about our children's education is part of the fabric of Saskatchewan and remains critical to student success. I agree that we must always strive to improve our educational practices, but I think that will happen most effectively within our current governance structure. As part of the Sun West Board of Education, I can say we are very proud of the innovations in education that we are promoting in our small rural schools, and of the national accolades that our innovation has generated. I believe that the results the government is looking for are most likely to be achieved through elected school boards.

We need to continue electing our own local school boards. We need to let local people have some ownership in their children's education. Too much has already been put into government (Department of Education) hands .

I understand that the following losses are at stake with the new report from Dan Perrins. Of course, none of these are acceptable to our family. We have three children that we are raising in Saskatchewan, and to date have been relatively pleased with our education experience. The below consequences of this initiative are not something my husband and I would support, and therefore I am advising as well that I will not support this government if such action is taken. 1) Loss of effective and accountable public voice 2) Unintended consequences of amalgamations and appointed boards 3) Less say, control and input in your child's education 4) Loss of relationships with parents, parishes and community partners

I feel having anything less than 10 school divisions takes away the parents/community ability to voice concerns and opinions. I am concerned about the children and their education. More significant changes would be devastating to the goals of your education Sector Strategic plan. The one goal of efficiencies and effectiveness may, slightly, gain some with more drastic centralization--but at the expense of the other four goals. I am scared you are taking the power from educators pursuing improvements in education to an accountant who looks at numbers, not kids. The parent council would be our only voice, which can be muted, ignored or legislated out of existence. There is no accountability to parents or teachers/principals/schools by the government.

The government must stop its efforts to centralize education in Saskatchewan. The provincial option and regional option both leave room for inequities to develop between communities. If one of these two options were to come to fruition, many members of the public will lose their access to school board members. Also, because the Catholic system will not be affected, there will also be inequities created between Catholic and public school students, parents and teachers. Educational needs vary immensely from school division to school division. We live in a very diverse province and the interests of rural and urban communities must be protected at all costs. In addition, the public's right to elected school boards must be affirmed. A move to appointed school boards would suppress the voice of the people. It is vitally important that parents continue to have a strong say in the education of their children, and maintain significant access to those making decisions which affect their community.

Elected versus appointed Board January 2016 (Revised comments) In a democratic society, we need to have our education boards elected. Locally elected boards have the interest of their people at heart. In this elected role they are accountable to their division and local communities. They communicate with their division and the government and therefore hold the provincial government to account on behalf of their communities. Appointed boards would erode our ability to govern what is important to us. Appointed boards have no personal investment in the issues of the local communities. Further amalgamations would further jeopardize the freedom of the people of Saskatchewan. This is a democratic society and we should not be at risk of losing our freedom.

I do not support any of your options as outlined in Mr. Perrins report. I am extremely concerned that all options appear to remove my children's school from the protection of the rural school closure thresholds. The removal of those thresholds will lead to my children's school being closed. I do support publicly elected boards. A strong Public education system is a pillar of Canadian society. Public voice (not government officials appointed to a position) is the foundation of a strong public education sector. This public voice holds government and educators to account and as such they have a critical role in the public education sector. Sincerely

I understand changes are being considered in our education system. I do not think the changes proposed will provide any financial benefit to the people of Saskatchewan or the government. Education I believe belongs to community and I want you to know that I support Saskatchewan school boards and strongly believe that the heart of education will be lost by following any of the 4 proposed changes and also our students will ultimately be the ones affected first, then the rural families that make Saskatchewan what it is. We need to keep our school boards locally elected and we need to keep decisions closer to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

As both a parent and a teacher in a public school, I am very concerned with the direction this government is taking in regards to restructuring educational governance. The first concern I have is that if the prospective changes do not make improvements on teaching and learning then they ought not to be considered. The proposed changes seem more to address the cost of education than the result of education or the goals of education. I think the majority of folks believe that education is expensive, but I also think the majority believe that it's well worth it. If we want to restructure education then let's focus on learning, not dollars. My second concern is that by further centralizing the governance of school divisions, the decision makers are moved farther and farther away from the parents and students those decisions affect. Clearly, this is not an ideal model. I, like others in my community, want decisions made regarding my children's education to be made locally, not by a board that sits half way across the province, or worse, by a central authority that reports directly to the minister of education. I am a parent and a teacher, and I don't agree with any of these proposals!

At one point long ago, it was decided that local representation and oversight was a good thing when it came to educational decision making. Notwithstanding the underlying rationale outlined in the Perrin report, these recommendations beg a few questions...at least. What has changed? How has the existing model demonstrated that is clearly does not work? What drives these recommendations to further consolidate or centralize education? Is it largely driven by an economic imperative or is there a general desire to further control and by extension, shape education at large, through creating a centralized administration? Having recently gone through amalgamation in “not-too-distant-past” terms, how fair is it to judge the effectiveness and efficiency local boards without providing adequate time for them to reach full expression? I will suggest that the report has an underlying agenda based on some form of deemed necessity to create change by pointing out that the status quo, with or without specific modifications or adaptations, is not among the options presented. Why was this option not explored? Perrin outlines two major targets for K-12 education in Saskatchewan followed by six subsidiary considerations at the beginning of his report. These targets and accompanying points are inarguably worthwhile. The central problem with this report is that there is no clear logical extension of reasoning to suggest that the range of recommendations offered are qualitatively better than the status quo in terms of their likelihood to ensure that education in the province arrives at desired targets - with perhaps the notable exception of select aspects of those points driven by an economic imperative. In terms of graduation rates - particularly as this relates to narrowing the gap between FNIM students and the student population at large, I completely fail to see how centralizing and generally up-ending local governance structures will help achieve this key target. A closer look at school division that have demonstrated great success in relation to this key target will reveal that they have achieved their success by establishing a culture of understanding driven by representative local governance structures that stress increased community involvement, with direct and authentic input into local decision making, program delivery and resource allocation. In short, local relationships have been built between local boards and communities. It could be argued that this could work more efficiently and effectively through a more centralized delivery system but it should be noted that the further one moves from local community realities (with stress on the word “local”), the more difficult it is to build relationships built on trust and understanding. Some would argue that centralization will only serve to harm these efforts and I would concur. The report points to a simple comparative analysis of educational outcomes for Saskatchewan students in comparison to their counterparts in other educational jurisdictions. It is important that we pay heed to these findings, as they are hard to ignore and deserve our focus and attention. But what is increasingly harder to come to terms with is the assumed corollary; that centralizing education in the province will prove to be the panacea for these outcomes. Educational outcomes are not the only social indicators or statistics where Saskatchewan has been lagging, suggesting that there are almost certainly underlying root causes driving not only educational outcomes but a host of other social indicators. This begs the question, how will further centralization benefit educational outcomes if the actual root causes for low student performance are driven by more complex factors? Without really examining these factors, how can one conclude that further centralization is the “right” thing to embark upon? On the basis of an economic/efficiency paradigm, what makes it necessary to further re-structure and centralize education in order to realize desired economic efficiencies – particularly in non-human resource terms? Economic efficiencies can be introduced through other administrative or regulatory means that do not necessarily involve total re-structuring. In human resource terms, I believe that clearly there is room to find efficiencies within current structures however; on the whole we have arrived at a fairly good balance in terms of service delivery models in post-amalgamation terms. Why overhaul the system when in reality, it only needs to be tweaked? One could look at curriculum as an example of where there is already a high degree of centralization and consistency with some, albeit limited but nonetheless critically important opportunity, for local expression. There are issues with curriculum delivery from place to place and time to time but re-structuring in an increasingly centralized sense will not solve these problems. I fail to see how curriculum delivery at the critical level of the classroom will change as a result of further centralization. I suggest that the opposite effect is more likely to occur. As the system becomes more “impersonal” and teachers make fewer and fewer professional and collegial connections with professional consultative and supervisory staff, opportunities for growth may suffer in the balance. In summary, and in a more philosophical sense I suppose, it seems that western society in broad terms has adopted a propensity for catering to imperatives driven by competition and economic efficiencies at the overshadowing, out-weighting and general expense of more socially or aesthetically driven motifs. Education does serve an important role in preparing students for contributing to and strengthening our future economy but at the same time, we must also work to ensure that the experiences our children gain through their formal education also serve to strengthen and nurture the collective and expressed soul of our community.

I support the North East School Division. I believe we need to keep our school boards locally elected and keep decisions close to our communities.

I do not support any of your options as outlined in Mr. Perrins report. I am extremely concerned that all options appear to remove my children's school from the protection of the rural school closure thresholds. The removal of those thresholds will lead to my children's school being closed. I do support publicly elected boards. A strong Public education system is a pillar of Canadian society. Public voice (not government officials appointed to a position) is the foundation of a strong public education sector. This public voice holds government and educators to account and as such they have a critical role in the public education sector. Sincerely,

I think any changes to the school division will be detrimental to the students. Smaller towns will be overlooked in the shuffle and so will smaller schools. I know gov't needs to make budget cuts but schooling is sacred to the future of our youth.

My children attend the Regina Catholic School Division & while we are not Catholic, we are Christian (Protestant), and I fully support having the choice to send my child to a Catholic School. Economies of scale can be achieved when volume dictates it, however only to a point, and then no further benefits can be gained by amalgamating boards or organizations. I have worked in the private sector & have seen how a company can grow & achieve economies of scale by eliminating duplication of services throughout that company, & I have also seen that same company grow to a point whereby no further economies of scale can be achieved, due to the sheer size of the company. In fact customer service aspects are compromised at times because of size of the company & the limitations of the staff - due to volume of transactions to handle & procedures to administer. Procedures that in fact hinder the delivery of the services to the customer. I believe that the current structure of our education system seems to be working relatively well; of course there is always room for improvement. Having a voice is the foundation of a democracy & I believe having less boards would result in voices not being heard. School community needs I believe would not be met if their voices are not heard / represented, as each one has unique needs based on various demographics, rural vs urban, inner city, etc. Furthermore, PA has differing needs than that of Regina & that of a rural community/school. Please don't make a choice that will have a negative impact long into the future of our children's education. While I support making tough decisions in difficult economic times - one such as this must be considered as much more than a financial decision & is of the utmost importance - we can't get this decision wrong. Please do not combine school divisions into any less than the 28 we already have, no real benefit can be derived from this. Sincerely,

I feel that an amalgamation will not help improve student learning. However, what I believe is needed is consistency and equity across the province. If money needs to be trimmed, I feel that no more cuts can be made that will affect our special needs students. Anyone who used to qualify for EA support as a result of difficulty accessing curriculum are no longer receiving the supports they used to receive unless the special education teacher can steal an EA from another class or find the time in the day to provide intervention. I think PSSD has done a fabulous job of maintaining smaller class sizes and making use of the LSS resources available yet the SLP, OT and ed psych. access is limited with over a year wait for assessments/consultations. The role of Learning Facilitator was a position that has been valuable yet not necessary. A smaller division (not amalgamating) is better able to identify the needs of their own division and adjust the budget accordingly.

Dear Hon. Minister Morgan: As parents of a student in the Northwest School Division #203, I would like to express my concerns about the proposed amalgamation. I do not have access to enough information to make an informed decision weather this is in the best interest for my child. Living in rural Saskatchewan, I am in support of having strong, local representation and do not believe that the possible changes are in alignment with this belief. I am exercising my voice as a taxpayer and hope that my concerns will be considered with due diligence. Sincerely,

I am much more concerned about no zero policies, not being able to mark participation in gym/ drama classes, no deterrent for handing items in late than I am over the governance system. Why did we stop teaching children to be accountable for their actions? As a former teacher who has become a stay at home mom, this is one of the major things affecting my decision as to whether or not I return to teaching once my children are school aged. School should teach students to succeed at life, where ever their life may take them, these skills are vital.

While the proposed changes are not affecting Catholic schools at this time it is important to note that local boards keep education decisions close to home which is where they belong. The government has made such a mess of the school divisions already with all their changes in the last years that I shudder to think what these newest proposed changes will be about. No fiscal savings have been gained by these changes. Government needs to look at amalgamating RM's to find some fiscal savings.

I feel that catholic education is such an important aspect to my children's education. Please keep Catholic education alive by keeping the public and catholic divisions separate from each other.

I know that Catholic Divisions are not being mandated to amalgamate in this round, but I feel it is important that educators stand as one no matter the division we teach in. I understand that this is a fiscally difficult year for Saskatchewan. I understand the logic behind cutting division offices with the highest paid employees through amalgamating. I do not understand how you believe this to be in the best interest of the children in Saskatchewan. It is not in the best interest of students or educators to have our superintendents live and work hours away from our schools. Should we be given a child with exceptional needs, how are we to get the necessary supports for them if our superintendent cannot come to our school for weeks or months at a time to approve or deny support? With the suggestion of amalgamation and previous cuts to EA support, I can only imagine fewer and fewer supports will become available to students. I understand the need to meet a budget and help the province get back on its feet. I do not understand why Education is always taking a hit in terms of funding. Our last pay increase was negligible and we know we will not be receiving one this year. As a province that had a steady decline in population for years, I am shocked that this is the way Saskatchewan is treating its teachers. Amalgamation can only make teaching conditions worse than they already are, as it undoubtedly means a decrease in support, something parents and teachers already feel there is not enough of. Changes like this will impact our careers negatively and it makes teaching and living in Saskatchewan much less desirable. Even though parents tell us how much we are appreciated, teachers do not feel the same appreciation or respect from the Saskatchewan Government. Amalgamation is yet another blow to our profession as we wait another year for more support. Another year for a pay increase. Another year for adequate supplies. And who knows how long we will wait until we are valued by our government. In a year such as this we as educators will be tightening our belts, only purchasing what is absolutely necessary and that will hurt the economy as well. I am a young teacher in the 3rd year of my career. When I hear things like mandatory amalgamation, roll back wages, wage freezes and layoffs, it makes me wonder if Saskatchewan is the right province for me to further my career. Thank you.

Upon review of Mr. Perrin's report on the options for education in this province, I was disappointed to see SK's poor scores regarding rates of achievement in the basics of education: reading, math and sciences. I am also concerned that despite massive efforts, the graduation rates have not improved and First Nation rates of educational achievement are minimal at best. This does not "keep SK strong" and does not support growth from within. The last amalgamation of school divisions was costly, not merely financially, but cost our students and teachers the benefit of locally developed and supported programming; it also cost the voice of these smaller schools when amalgamated with larger schools/urban schools who's numbers simply outweigh and overshadow those of rural SK. I have two children starting their education in the separate school system; we made a conscious decision to do this to pursue a French Immersion program which afforded our children exposure to their cultural heritage along with the Roman Catholic principles and values that we wish to instill in our children. We are strong supporters of local school boards and parental involvement in oversight of our son's school's program, infrastructure development and overall functioning. Any option to further reduce school divisions or worse, to combine the present system into a 'super-system' will result in a dis-economy of scale - too large to be functional, a loss of communication and an inability to achieve goals due to sheer size. The sheer size of our province is not conducive to this type of amalgamation; the diverse nature of our population will create further disparities in education between the south and the north should we falsely believe a "one system" approach will work. It is not possible and ultimately, disrespectful to the unique needs of the children in our province. SK does not need more government but school divisions require governance, provided democratically - to provide the voice and the needs of the citizens it serves. Please do not short change our children's opportunities for a quality education - we chose the educational path for our children based on research, exposure and maintaining our culture and supporting our family's values. This is what our province was built on, rather than the business values associated with efficiency and cost reductions.

Our schools will benefit from locally elected school boards, keep our school boards community based. All school board decisions need to be made by individuals affected by these decisions. Our goals should be providing better educational, our decisions should not be monetary based. I don't feel amalgamating our school divisions will be beneficial to either board.

I am not in favour of downsizing our current school board system. The smaller divisions will be lost compare to the bigger venters, which will result in a loss of adequate teachers and instruction being delivered to the students. If students are to be the centre of the education system this will not achieve that goal or promote that view. Each board/division needs to remain in charge of their facilities. The best practice for students, instructors and regions are to realign those boundaries which are already developed.

To Whom it May Concern, As a mother, teacher and administrator I am very concerned by the proposed school division amalgamations. We have been through one amalgamation already and felt the effects greatly. The Chinook School Division is already too large. The smaller communities have a very small voice that is often overlooked. Especially since our numbers are lower than the bigger centers. I ask that you consider leaving the school divisions the way they are and do not create an even bigger area. I fear my children and their peers will be lost in the throes of bureaucracy if we have larger geographical areas then already exist. We need to put the needs of our youth before the agenda of the almighty dollar. Please do not go forward with this plan! Very worried Mother.

Consolidation of our school decisions will only create more problems, and constrict the flow of educational progress. We need to keep our school decisions local and within our own communities.

I am concerned about amalgamating our school boards across the province. As a teacher, we're supposed to be growing, learning and changing, just like the students. There will be no chances for growth if we amalgamate because of the lack of assistance to help teachers. 1) Many consultants will lose their jobs and there will only be one or two of each in Southern Saskatchewan. Therefore, teachers will have extremely long wait times for any consultant help that they need. Teachers will likely wait so long, that they won't even bother proceeding with anything new to teach. They will stick to the same textbooks, the same worksheets and never teach outside the box because there will be no new opportunities to work with a consultant on new ideas. 2) Getting a hold of anyone at the school board will be next to impossible. In my school division, there are at least 500 teachers employed. On top of that, there are substitute teachers, EAs, office administrators, coaches, consultants, superintendents, etc. Our website says there are 1,100 of us altogether. Now, imagine if there is quadruple the amount of employees. If there was ever an issue at a school, a simple mistake made on a pay cheque, or even a question to ask, there would be no way a school board would be able to help. 1 person out of 4,400 people (sorry, I suppose I shouldn't say that high of a number since you'll likely be laying a lot of the consultants and EA's off, right?). At this moment, I could call almost anyone working for Regina Catholic Schools and get through to them directly and get virtually any assistance within a day or two. If the government amalgamates, each employee will be left to fend for themselves. Speaking as a teacher, I know that many others feel the same. We're not superheroes. We don't have all of the answers. We need help. You're taking that away from us and turning us into numbers. 3) THE STUDENTS. This whole thing should be about them. Right now, Regina Catholic Schools can only employ one person to oversee all of the EFAP teachers. The amount of children with special needs is growing by the day. I'm going to assume since the government doesn't want to pay for more employees, that all of Southern Saskatchewan will just continue to have one person to oversee all EFAP teachers. This means students with special needs may never get the help that they need to be successful. The same thing for EAL teachers. Same for programming. Same for sports. Are students really going to receive the help they need if they're being turned into numbers as well, same as the teachers? I highly recommend you reconsider an amalgamation and cut government spending elsewhere. Education is, and always will be, preparing children to achieve greatness in their adult lives. Every single person that works in the government would have had to have an education to be where they are. They all probably had that one favourite teacher too. I hope to be that teacher for someone, someday. But if we amalgamate, I'm not sure I can do the job that I love to its fullest. I need help. I need help from the government that I should be able to trust. Please be the help that we need.

I was under the impression this was a survey. Are we to read the 34 page report and comment on it? What are we to comment on? Although there is nothing more important to me than my children I think most parents do not have the time or understanding of what you are looking for from us. If you sent a survey I'd be more than happy and would have the time to understand it and submit it. Thank you kindly

Thank you for this opportunity to reflect my views in this survey. I feel the report submitted to the Ministry by Mr Dan Perrin is a very comprehensive and a well-researched document. There are some areas in the report that need further analysis. One point that has not been thoroughly thank you for the opportunity to express my views on this matter. The report From Mr. Perrins is comprehensive and well researched. Many efficiencies and options are offered. One of the items especially within school divisions regarding efficiencies has not thoroughly been examined One single model does not fill all what i mean by by this is that every school in every community has different challenges and different opportunities and funding does not reflect these realities. We are living in an ever changing world where for example in Prince Albert there are many different issues such poverty, hunger, addictions and many without homes or living accommodations. Understand every community have many of these issues but proportionately for population size and growth we are at the top or close to the top of these social challenges. As a school division we live with these circumstances every day and and feel the impact in the class room. The government's growth plan is to grow the population into well-educated and contributing members of Saskatchewan. We cannot look at the past we must move

forward and a big piece of the equation is and educated population Is key to our growth. Amalgamation and Appointed governance is a short term fix and will increase the loss of local voice and accountability and definitely have a negative impact on our children. Thank you

Changing the governance of school divisions across the province, in my opinion, is not an effective way to deliver "grassroots " education to serve the needs of our students in all districts. The government is obviously using this as a means to reduce costs in the most important asset that we have to secure a promising and rich future for all residents of Saskatchewan. It is my opinion that the administration of this province look into itself and reduce it's own operating costs before interfering in order children 's future and the futures of this province. I challenge your representatives to come into our schools and see what is happening before you decide to take such drastic cost-saving and ill thought out measures.

Even though the school does everything in their power I think that certain learning disabilities should be more acknowledged, for example dyslexia, so that students learn faster how to read better instead of it taking 5 years. It's not only frustrating for parents and teachers but for the kids it's even worse and it'll take the joy of learning away. Instead they will resent going to school.

I am writing this in concern with the review currently happening. In rural Saskatchewan we are very fortunate to have some of the hardest working teachers I have ever met. My children are receiving the best education because of these people. Changing the way we deliver education in this province would cause that to change and as a parent I feel my children's education will suffer. We live in a very small town and without our school here the town wouldn't be the same. Please reconsider any changes and think of the families, the teachers and most of all the students. Thank you

I feel some consideration needs to be thought out before any definite decisions are made and finalized. There needs to be consideration in what might get lost with any drastic changes that may be made. I go along with the theory that if something isn't broken then why try and fix it. If the current methods are working and nothing is wrong then why make all these changes. I think that parents should have say, control and input in their child's education and the relationships between parents, parishes and community partners is absolutely necessary in the growth of our children. Without those relationships we lose communication. I hope at the end of the day a right decision is made that allows everyone to sleep at night. The lives that will be affected by this need to be considered before a final decision is finalized.

After meeting with the SSBA and 19 school boards across the province Dan Perrins found, "unanimous support for no more amalgamation noting that the 2006 amalgamations have created school divisions that are large enough to achieve all significant economies of scale; additional outcomes will not improve student outcomes or result in other savings". This statement alone is reason enough for the Sask Party to stop pursuing the idea of amalgamating school boards in Saskatchewan. Perrins also notes there was agreement that "more can be done by the school divisions to find sector-wide efficiencies by working together". However there was also agreement that "further progress on the sector plan would be lost due to the transfer of energy required to reorganize". These three statements confirm what I already know - amalgamating school boards will be of no benefit to the students of Saskatchewan. If improving student outcomes, and as a result improving the lives of all Saskatchewan residents, are truly the goal of the Sask Party, and not savings, then they will reconsider the idea of amalgamation in any form.

I think a trans-formative change needs to go big. Tinkering with existing structures will keep more of the status quo. There is way too much inequity within the school divisions, including size and how decisions are made. Elected Boards are not necessary; the majorities of people are not that interested in these elections and likely know very little about who they vote for, although this may be different in small towns/districts. It is still not necessary. Areas can still have advisory committees/councils to have input and communication. Be bold form a Provincial School system, and then you can likely divide zones to match health areas. There are areas that would lend themselves to provincial services. We might be big in geography but we are still relatively small in people. We need to make the most of our resources for efficiency but also for effectiveness. Thank you

Please leave RCSD and our catholic school division as it is. It is important to our family that our children have the choice to attend a catholic school. Thank you.

Hello. My wife and I currently have a daughter in the school and my other daughter is in preschool in the community. My wife is the preschool teacher and enrolment there is 18 children ages 3 and 4. We moved 3 years ago and would not have without a school. I am in favour of the current model and believe that elected officials give us a voice that is heard. We need to keep our school boards locally elected. We do not support future amalgamations. We do not support changes to our subdivision boundaries. Thank you.

I have a number of concerns about the upcoming transformational change in Education. As The Perrin report refers to Parental participation in new, larger school divisions, he says one of the challenges will be, "Participation in governance will be a challenge and parents and families in the public system would have different access to board members than in the separate and francophone system." This is a concern to us as we truly appreciate our access to our elected members when we have suggestions and or concerns. Our feeling is that as boards (elected or appointed) get larger, our voice will become but a whisper. A second concern is the extended implementation time that such changes will take. Our children are in the schools now and will be effected by these changes either physically or through the effects and stresses that such changes will take on teaching staffs for years to come. As Perrin says "There will be disruption at the school division and local community and school level through organizational changes,.....". We are more than happy with the education our children are currently receiving and are worried that drastic upheaval will have negative effects on not only our children but the school and our community as a whole. Thirdly we are not convinced that these changes are, as Minister Morgan has said, "In the best interest of students" but more an attempt at cost cutting to our children's detriment. Our school staff are currently stretched to the limit and we are truly concerned that larger division's or a single division will take away from the Student Centered feeling and change to Survival Mode and that will not be healthy or positive for anyone. Lastly we would like to point out the tremendous things our division has done as one of the highest performing school divisions in the province. Our graduation rates, aboriginal and non-aboriginal, are well above the provincial average at the same time as having one of the provinces highest pupil to teacher ratio. All four of the suggested options have PSSD being either swallowed up by another division or split up, having different borders and we fear the things that make us great, may be lost in the transition. We are very proud of our students and staff and want nothing but the best for them. We feel that any of the proposed changes that are suggested will take it's toll on them leading to a much less successful and positive school experience for everyone involved.

To whom it may concern: My name is _____ and i am a member of the parent committee of the _____ and volunteer fire fighters in _____ Saskatchewan I'm writing on behalf of 30 members of the afore mentioned groups. We would like to voice our concern about the proposed amalgamation of the provincial school boards. We oppose any changes to any schools boards or school divisions as they currently stand. We do not see it as a benefit to change or enlarge or restructure the school divisions in any way. We also do not agree with having government appointed trustees over publicly elected trustees. We feel if the government appoints these positions that the rural communities will lose their voice. We are also concerned about losing our rural legislated status if changes are made by government through another amalgamation process. Yours sincerely,

Hello. I strongly believe that taking a broad brush and painting all schools the same is not to benefit the students. Every school, every division, city, town is different in what they need for education resources. How would people provinces away be able to even begin to understand what the students need. If we don't keep the decisions and choices to be made by our communities the system is going to become ashes and the ones that pay are our future world changers. I feel strongly that any further break down in our educational system is going to lead to a lot of drop outs. If the students aren't being taught in the way they feel they need to be taught why they would show up. Why would they respect a system that doesn't respect them? My heart hurts knowing that we as a country are not investing in our children's futures. Instead we are choosing to take away their best tools for becoming the best they can be. When someone who knows nothing about a particular school is telling that school you don't need art, you don't need a ELA, you don't need recess. It doesn't work in Regina so it won't work for Saskatoon. There goes all respect for the system. I pray the grown-ups make this decision on our children's future with ALL input from the teachers, the ones living it daily

I am at a complete loss as to why the provincial government continues to centralize whatever it can within the province. As far as I am concerned, the Prairie Valley School Division (PVSD) is a very efficient and well managed organization and has received much praise over the years since it was formed. What can the government hope to achieve by moving the responsibility for the PVSD to individuals who are not part of the local community? And to consider having a provincially appointed board(s) is unconscionable. I have almost 35 years employment with the federal government and have yet to see where a move to centralized services has ever improved services or saved the money that officials claim would result. In summary, I am absolutely against changing the structure of the PVSD. I see this process as a control measure not an efficiency measure and am more than a little shocked that the Saskatchewan Party would take such an action!

I understand there is a budget issue, but I don't feel that drastic action like a province wide amalgamation is the answer. I feel the government is rushing into this decision. I suggest the government firstly look at individual division spending and see where they can cut costs. Our School has already been through an amalgamation. It does not always save money. There is also a lot of time (years) spent on renegotiations of contracts, reorganization of systems and in this pricess the focus and time is taken away from what is important, educating our children.

Over the past number of years schools have gotten away from given marks to students and using a 1 - 4 range on how well a student is achieving in a subject. This may help the students that were struggling in school, however students that enjoy school and do good academically have nothing to strive for. We need to stop giving students rewards because they have participated in going to school and start challenging them again. Give them something to work for. My daughter is in grade 5 and used to love math and school in general, now I have a hard time trying to get her to go to school because she is bored. They keep working on the same things because students aren't catching on and she has been doing the same math for weeks. If a student is not catching on, maybe they should have been held back instead of having a no fail policy. The other problem is the size of classrooms, for the first few months there were almost 30 kids in her grade 5 class while a grade 1 class of 20 students was split in 2. I still don't understand how that was justified. I do understand that our education system goes in cycles and the leaders at the top don't seem to come up with new ideas for learning by cycle around to something that had been tried in the past (ie "New Math"), however I feel that it will be too late for my children who are in grade 5, 7, and 10. We always seem to go to extremes. When I was in school they had special learning for students that over achieved and made them feel like they were better than everyone else. Today we are so focused on the under achievers that we forgot about the strong students and expect them to fend for themselves. As for the talk about going to one school division for the province, I believe that is a big mistake.

in 1998 when Saskatchewan Rivers was created and it was going to cut costs because you would cut the number of directors from 3 to 1. Instead over the last almost 20 years you have created numerous administrative jobs and have taken the support and teachers out of the classroom. I don't believe you will find any cost savings because the same will happen if you go to one. You already taken teachers out of the communities that they teach in and this will do more of the same. Students used to get a chance to interact with teachers outside of the school and gained respect for them. Today, students and teachers don't know each other outside of school and we are seeing those results. Our education system has been going downhill over the past number of years and it is time to look back to see what the reasons are. I believe the larger mergers and getting away from giving students marks and something to strive for are two big reasons. Thank you for the opportunity to participate.

Dear Saskatchewan Board, Thanks for listening to us. As An SCC member I truly believe that we need to keep our school boards locally elected; and, We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. Our local board understands what is going through. People from outside would next understand The makeup of or any other small community. City issues are different that rural issues. We strongly urge and encourage you to keep our local board and trustee as well as our education stats quo as that is beneficial to our children. Our children are the main concern not the budget. Cutting from the budget usually means cutting services to the children who really needs the help. Thanks for listening to my concern,

I think that an 8 hour day of school is too long especially for younger grades....and summer holidays would be too long parents would have increase in day care due to school getting out in March vs June....as for the less divisions they won't be able to relate to each the school individual needs because they will be too many to handle...please leave the way it is.

My family moved to Saskatchewan last summer and my 10 year old daughter attends grade 4 at . I have been very impressed with the school and her progress. I worked as a teacher in public education for over 10 years in the US. I have worked in small school districts and large school districts. In the smaller districts, I received more support and the school board members were present in the schools on a regular basis. In the larger school districts, I rarely saw a member of the school board. I cannot imagine how a provincial or regional model would effectively meet the needs of students. Larger districts are more difficult to manage for a variety of reasons. The simple geography poses one problem. Saskatchewan has a great deal of land and communities are spread out. The needs of those communities vary and people who live in those communities are the ones who best understand those needs. With a provincial model, my fear is that the largest cities would be the focus since they serve more students and those in the rural areas would be overlooked. Children in the rural areas should have the same services and opportunities as those in urban areas. Even a regional model is still too broad. The Division model should stay in place and if boundaries need to be changed to support local community needs and interests, then that should be what happens. Control over the students' best interests should remain in the local school board.

I am NOT in support of the proposed changes Not one of the examples provides evidence of how own children's learning will be positively impacted. By potentially eliminating of the School Boards, you are eliminating our local voice and democracy itself. This is sure to lead to people losing jobs, even less teachers and EA's in the schools in which we have already had major cutbacks and a lower quality of education for our children. It means less extra-curricular activities, less diverse elective options and more split classes. Everything I see in this report is a cutback and in no way will help our kids

To whom it may concern: I am against the Government of Saskatchewan's undergoing process to potentially change Kindergarten to Grade 12 Governance. I do not want to see our province lose locally elected school boards and existing divisions amalgamated. Locally elected boards are accountable to the electorate. They are important advocates for ensuring excellence in education. Who better to serve the needs of students-which are unique to each division, and even each school within divisions-than those elected by our community to represent our community? For our self, our children and our grandchildren, locally elected school boards provide representation based on a relationship of trust, accountability and accessibility. Please keep our school boards as is. Government appointed boards are NO answer for the betterment of our Education system. Locally elected boards are crucial in a democratic society. They are important advocates for ensuring excellence in education. Who better to serve the needs of students who are unique to each division, and even each school within divisions-than those elected by our community to represent our community? Thank you for considering my input.

My thoughts to this Kindergarten to Grade 12 educational governance review is, as an aboriginal descendant and a teacher living in the north I am very upset that the government did not consult our people in the north as to how this report was being reviewed by people that do not live in the north. That the report was done in such a short time and has not given us time to comprehend the report. It feels to me that this type of report and government mandate is similar to colonization process as to what the Europeans did to us first nations. Coming into our lands and telling us how we should live or teach our kids, trying to assimilate our people by amalgamating us into one group to save money. It is similar to how treaty process was made to our people by saying we are all Indians that don't have different language, or belief systems. Being a northern person and Cree descent I feel that our current school division helps our people by understanding the issues that our students face living in the north. The school division we have helps our people by giving them a voice. As a Cree decent I feel that our education belongs to our school boards locally and decisions are made by our community members. I do not support the 4 options from this report review.

As an employee, parents and tax payer I would like to comment on the educational system. As far as I know the educational system is good to have a lot of divisions to control easily the administration and result of the education. so I strongly agree with the educational system which we have now. I know there is a lot of money but we will have better and quality results. "The more you pay the more you get."

I was involved in the school system for 19 years (local school board and division board) I believe the actual educating of our children/ future work force CANNOT be watered down anymore. It is bad enough that some classroom culture is the "One Room Schoolhouse from the 1950's. When one teacher has twenty students and is teaching maybe 7 different levels of knowledge/abilities. Also, our teachers are doing more than teaching now - mother, father, friend, nurse, councilor! It is time that the government takes a solid look at the governance. As a province, we cannot afford TWO school systems. Ask yourself, how many students in a Catholic school are actually Catholic? FYI - I am an active practicing Catholic. With all the negative activities that have happened - shootings and bullying, I believe more than ever, that each of our students in Sask. need some education on ethics. Everyone needs to be taught - Treat others the way you want to be treated. Has P.E.I. not gone to one school division? Sask. want to be a leader, therefore look at combining the two school divisions with a specific cause for Catholic/ethics. Also, with one school division idea, maybe it will also help with the infrastructure/building of new schools.

Our School Division Director, Superintendents, Consultants, Coaches, Administrators, Teachers and all Support Staff work tirelessly to ensure students are our number one priority. My hope is that we are able to continue being leaders in education, sharing the successes and growth of our students, through tremendous initiatives and teaching practices that are further enhanced and supported by our incredible, locally elected Board of Education. Please support the school divisions of our province to continue to put their students first, focusing on their specific needs, at a locally determined level.

To Whom It may concern: I cannot stress enough the importance of elected school boards!! Who else knows the community and its needs better than an elected individual from that community?!? An appointed government representative certainly would not have the invested interest in these communities not know their needs!!!! Has the government not "messed" enough with teachers and all things in education... leave well enough alone!!! PLEASE!!

I am a principal of a small k-12 school. I have huge concerns at the speed of which this review is taking place. Changes such as the ones proposed in the review have huge implications. These models are focused on numbers, not student learning. I fear that with further amalgamation, the ability for front line educators to be heard and to make the needs of their student heard will be lost. Please, PLEASE give this decision the time it deserves, the time our children deserve.

I do not support any of the three models presented in the report and wish to remain a part of Prairie Valley School Division. The document options clearly acknowledge that changes to the current system may compromise student outcomes, reduce accountability, reduce community communication and access to decision makers, put more work on SCC's and disrupt our schools. The negatives far out way the positives. I do support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). I also support finding cost saving systems, strengthening our educational outcomes and standardizing expectation for our Boards, but cannot support wide sweeping changes as proposed in the document. Could the current local structure not be maintained while centralizing the purchase of large items such as paper, IT equipment, copier machines and consolidating transportation? Although I understand budgetary restrictions, a lower teacher/student ratio is crucial for success of all students with regards to academic achievement and socio-emotional well-being. None of the three proposed plans support this fact. I would rather our students be part of a smaller school, than being in overcrowded classrooms in larger centers. This is one of the reasons people choose to reside in rural areas. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support that change to governance or further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! I do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. I value the connection our community has with our elected Board member and do not feel a move to appointed boards would benefit our remote community. I fear loss of our local voice will negatively impact our students experience and performance may suffer as a result. Our current Prairie Valley School Division board member is very visible in our schools and community. I have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold. Rural communities thrive, grow, and revolve around their schools. Closing schools will "close" small town Saskatchewan. I believe that all children should have equal opportunities and having public and separate education with separate funding does not support equality in education. Having any of these proposed models will not only affect how teachers are able to best deliver their course loads, but I question if the already limited access to current School Division Support Teams will further diminish (Support Team meaning: Occupational Therapists, Speech and Language Pathologists , Child and Family Support Workers, Social Workers, etc) Nearby schools are at maximum capacity and there are great concerns for distance, safety, and time spent on buses for rural children. Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in

Why? Why must we change something that is working so good? Why must we make education so much more difficult for our children, why so quickly must this be decided? We need time, we need answers these are not robots were playing with this is the future of multiple HUMAN BEINGS!

The purpose of this feedback is threefold: to lobby for exemption from the review process as there are MANY implications with the City of Lloydminster Charter, to ask questions that I feel need to be answered, and to give my voice to what is going to potentially happen in my city and province. As a parent, tax payer, citizen and teacher in the city of Lloydminster SK/AB, I am very concerned with the proposed models presented in the review and here are my reasons and questions: 1. I question the haste in the timeline of when the report was released and the date that feedback is due and the time of year when this all occurred - during a very busy Christmas season. Why the rush? 2. What proof have you offered that this proposal will in ANY WAY benefit the students in Lloydminster? What was the purpose of this review and can you explain how it will save money (if that is indeed your reason)? 3. Lloydminster is a very unique city which historically has relied on its civic and provincial leaders to give careful and thoughtful consideration when making decisions that will affect our citizens. I don't feel that our voice is even being considered. 4. I am gravely concerned that the delivery model and exemplary services that have been provided to our students in Lloydminster, regardless of which side of the border they reside and/or what school they attend, will be compromised. I want all students to be treated fairly. 5. It is alarming to me that this report is so vague. Board(s) may or may not be elected - they may be appointed? How can an appointed board somewhere across the province possibly give the same understanding to our local needs, as a board elected by and accountable to OUR citizens? We do not want to lose local control of education for the city of Lloydminster. There is a blatant disrespect for the Alberta citizens in our city as this will remove their right of access to the decisions being made on their behalf. The vagueness of this entire report sets off alarm bells and for good reason. 6. It is my belief that challenges identified in the Educational Governance Review Report can all be met effectively through amendments to legislation, regulations and policy. This would be considerably less disruptive to continue with elected boards working under new mandates, regulations and expectations. 7. Sadly, if the voices of the citizens of Lloydminster SK/AB are not heard, there is the possibility of a move to Alberta. This is NOT what I as an educator wants, but it needs to be explored. Please give very careful consideration to our unique situation as a bi-provincial city and exempt us from the dissolution of our Public Board of Education.

After attending a meeting with regard to the education governance, it is a great concern that there is no mention of thresholds within the review. We are concerned that there is a good possibility of small town school closures even if operating at capacity. We do not want our school to be closed in Grand Coulee as it is a wonderful school and is at the heart of the community.

Dear Members of the Panel: I understand changes are being considered in our education system. As a member of the government who represents our interests as citizens and taxpayers, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community. Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support the Chinook School Division and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues: (1) Local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities. (2) Consolidation will set back the advancements that have been made in literacy and numeracy for years. (3) The NDP promoted consolidation held back education for at least 5 years and cost money rather than saving money. (4) This would be the second time that forced amalgamation excluded Separate School Boards, firstly in the NDP action and now in the Sask Party proposal. (5) It took at least 5 years for the Boards, formed only 10 years ago, to become accepted as the community's school system. Significant improvement in learning is just beginning to be achieved in the last couple of years. (6) A large percentage of the funding for education comes from local property taxes still. While the Province sets the taxation rate, the local taxpayers still pay the toll. This is different from Health where all funding except portions of capital come from the Provincial budget. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from their community especially if there are not elected trustees making decisions on behalf of the children and ratepayers. Sincerely,

Please don't change the way things are. Having the community vote for the people they want on the local education board is important. It gives us a say in the things that are important to us as communities. If we have a problem with our children in school, things are dealt with right away. With the changes that are being suggested, how long will we have to wait to have a response AND have something done!?! Our children's education is most important. Recently, there were cutbacks in the education sector affecting many education assistant's jobs. This, in my opinion, is not putting our children's education first. To Whom It May Concern: I am writing today in response to the K-12 Educational Governance Review. I am a mother of 2 children who both attend school in . I have a deep concern regarding the future of my children's education if changes happen within our province as they have been proposed by the Educational Governance Review. I am concerned that all four options given for consideration are all completely opposite of what the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, Service Employees International Union, Saskatchewan School Boards Association, SSBA Public and Catholic sections and Saskatchewan Association of School Business officials, as well as a parent group, the opposition education critic and members of the general public unanimously stated. They have given unanimous support for elected boards and for no more amalgamation. These associations are made up of the people that work hands-on with our children and I am concerned that their voice has not been heard. I am concerned that this change will actually cause inefficiency as this potential change would only affect 18 out of 28 of our school divisions. Running two separate school systems is inefficient. Ten school divisions would still have elected boards and only eighteen would have a provincially appointed authority. All the time and resources spent to create efficiency would only be spent to be recuperated from a little over half of the divisions within our province. I am concerned about when these changes would be occurring and how quickly. Planning has already started for the coming school year. When does the government plan on making these changes? What will happen to the plans and resources already in place? Discarding these plans would be a waste of time and money, which could both be put toward our children. If the goal is to create efficiency, how long will it take to make all these changes to a point where tangible efficiency has been created? Does the province of Saskatchewan have the money to make these changes? Change causes disruption which will inevitably slow down progress towards educational goals that teachers are working towards within the classroom. This slow down within learning will be happening during formative years of our children's education. I am also very concerned about accountability. There are essentially two levels of accountability with having a locally elected school board; the elected trustee is accountable to the community which placed their support behind them, and then together as a school board, the school board is accountable to the provincial government. If the province changes to a single education system where leadership is appointed by the provincial government, one level of accountability is removed. I am concerned that I no longer am able to choose who represents my voice in public education. By the removal of publicly elected school boards, you are removing the democratic process from education and my right to vote for who I place my trust in to run my children's school division. Education is public, not a provincial entity. Elected school boards can be specific to our needs and can focus on the area in which they serve. So if the province changes to a single board, or amalgamates to a smaller number of boards, whom will I contact when there is a problem or concern within my school? Thank you for your time and consideration in reading my concerns.

I believe our school system is already failing our children. The push pass system is a failure to the community. Kids/people must understand the good better best scenario, people are not equal you must work hard to achieve a goal. Its time to but money where the government's mouth is. All these broken promises of health care and education being Brad Walls claims of priority. To me it appears our government is in trouble amalgamating the school boards as well as the health regions shows desperation in attempts to save money at the sacrifice of our children and Patients. And our provinces accessibility to quality trained professionals. Reminds me of the Grant Divine government when SASKATCHEWAN lost professionals due to wages and opportunities. Our children need and deserve happy dedicated RESPECTED teachers when a teacher is RESPECTED and SUPPORTED by the parents, communities, and our GOVERNMENT their confidence trickles down to their students. Our teachers need to be Respected by means of a monetary aspect. Teachers struggle everyday with large unreasonable class sizes and lack of teacher aides. In my personal experience with a child in a large classroom a few class clowns or unruly children make the whole class suffer when the teacher must divert her attention to the problem children. our government already is sacrificing our children's opportunity to a quality education remember these kids are our future and decision makers we NEED to invest in OUR future for the better of our society .

Good evening. I am a resident of Lloydminster Saskatchewan and a parent of 4 who all attend or have attended the public school system in our city. I truly believe that the proposed changes need to be revisited before a decision is made. Removing local elected school boards is going to be detrimental to many of our communities. I would also like to speak specifically about Lloydminster. As you should know, we are a border city. This means that for 84 years our community has worked very hard to create a seamless education system for our children between the two provinces. Taking away LOCAL governance is not going to be a positive change to how this works for our unique city. The possibility of anyone outside of our community having any understanding of how the city makes our education for for ALL the students of Lloydminster equal is very unlikely. We do not fit into a mold here like other communities do, since our board has to work with both Alberta and Saskatchewan governments as well as our city counsel to make our situation run smoothly. Bussing, extra curricular activities, the NEEDS of our children are all issues that need to be understood by a school board who is aware of how to work with all the key payers. Please consider these facts before making a decision that will change our children's futures.

It is my wish to share my concerns with the options presented in the Perrins report. As an educator in a one school division, I see no benefit to our loss of autonomy. In fact any option that proposes amalgamation will only bring further challenges in our ability to educate our diverse group of students. Creighton is unique for many reasons. We are a small community that recognizes our Community School at its core. We promote an inclusive atmosphere in our community and our school. We have many talented caretakers, assistants, educators and administrators on our staff. These positions are skillfully filled with the assistance of our community member in the form of our School Board. No one better understands our unique strengths and challenges that our elected board. They entrusted with that that very important position by our community members. Without our communities voice. Our children have no voice. Our children simply cannot have their best interested entrusted to those who don't know their story, that don't understand their cultural and learning diversities and needs. It's too much to ask. I have yet to see concrete evidence as to the grand savings this particular solution to the provinces enormous deficit we'll have. I would need to be incredibly significant in order to justify our children's loss. There are far too many unknowns and unanswered questions at this point to move forward in my opinion. Please think long and hard about our sense of community before changes are made. After all, this province can I'll afford to get it wrong when our children's futures are at stake.

We need to keep our school boards locally elected and keep our decisions closer to our community's. We need to our focus on what matters to students and parents like math ,reading and writing.

After attending a meeting with regard to the education governance, it is a great concern that there is no mention of thresholds within the review. We are concerned that there is a good possibility of small town school closures even if operating at capacity. We do not want our school to be closed in Grand Coulee as it is a wonderful school and is at the heart of the community.

I feel that any government that has been in power for the last several years during a booming economy in our province and has managed to rack up such a deficient, doesn't have the financial acumen to make a sound decision on the future of school divisions in our province. Research has proven that there is little, to no financial gains to be made by amalgamating school divisions in this province. Massive restructuring leads to disruption both in the classroom and at the division level. Sun West has been innovative in their approach to education incorporating 21st Century Learning Skills and Personalized Electronic Blended Learning (PeBL). I would hate to see any distruption or discontinuation of this process.

NOT ENOUGH INFORMATION OR REVIEWS FROM THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT TO PROCEED WITH FUNDING CUTS. The North East School Division has a proven track record over the last 4 years of managing their budget and proving their school system is working efficiently. I understand that tough economic times has forced our province to review and make adjustments financially but reducing funding and consolidating school divisions is NOT THE ANSWER TO SOLVING A DEFICIT! The education of our young citizens is CRUTIAL to the development of our province NOW AND IN THE FUTURE. FURTHER DISTRUCTION OF OUR EDUCATION FOUNDATION WILL ONLY LEAD TO A FUTURE OF DEEPER SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ISSUES FOR THE PROVINCE. I urge you to consider not only the short term but long term effects of your actions. You were elected for the people, by the people. Make the right moral choices as a government and think of the future of this province, our children. Education is under immense pressure in this day and age to ready our youth for an ever changing and uncertain world. Further funding cuts and school closures will only damage an already fragile and essential need in this province.

I am writing you to let you know that I am not in favour of amalgamating the school divisions. All school divisions have their own unique needs and small town SK will be forced to do what is best for city schools if our voice is taken away with amalgamation. Class room sizes are already ridiculous and you are forcing teachers to do more with less! Enough! Our children matter and they are the future of this province. Not to mention, way more information needs to be shared with the people of Saskatchewan regarding this issue! How could anyone be in favour of this amalgamation with so little information!

We need to keep or School Boards locally elected and to keep decisions closer to our communities.

I believe that amalgamating all school divisions in this province would be an inadvisable move that may not be cost effective as several expensive administrative layers would continue to remain firmly ensconced in the governance structure. Study of some of the top educational jurisdictions in the world (according to recent international PISA testing results) reveals that several of the top performing countries, and Finland in particular, have brought school management down to the municipal level where municipalities oversee school building maintenance services, equipment and supplies, all of which are purchased centrally with monies supplied by the federal government and budgeted for by the municipalities. It is also interesting to note that Finnish municipalities hire principals, and principals hire teachers. Educational matters are decided by the principals and teachers of any given school, in collaboration with parents, although it should be mentioned that the Ministry of Education designs and maintains the universal 1-12 Finnish curriculum in consultation with teachers. (Note: all teachers in Finland are required to have Masters degrees in Education.) In this kind of organizational structure, there is no need for a group of highly paid administrators such as superintendents and directors for each educational jurisdiction. The Finnish Ministry of Education does oversee strategic planning and improvement for each school. While not all organizational designs can be easily transferred from one country to another, I believe this type of governance structure should be closely examined if the province wishes to promote the concept of transformational change. It does have possibilities and would put educational management back down at the grass roots level where it functions most effectively. Schools are not like hospitals. I am sure our provincial government is aware that at the moment Saskatchewan students perform only in the average range in Science, Reading and Mathematics, compared to all 66 OECD countries who participate in the PISA international testing programme. That Saskatchewan students perform well below the Canadian average is surely cause for concern. Saving money should not be the only objective in this exercise, when the performance of our students is equally if not more important.

If cuts need to be made, start with the people at the top, not those working with children.

I want the 28 school divisions to stay status quo. Our education needs to stay Education Strong. Saskatchewan Party there are three years left until you need citizens like me to vote. Keep our Sask Power intact and ours. Keep our health care strong. Keep our future workforce strong. The colleges and schools are developing a next generation work force. Plus a new generation of voters.

I ask that careful consideration is taken when reviewing our current governance of the public school system. We must remember that each community is unique to their specific needs and who better to offer guidance but the local people of your communities. As a parent of students from the NESD I am very satisfied with the way our division is being governed. I see community members striving to deliver quality education to the children of the region in a cost effective manner. I would not want to see this change. I think taking the voice away from our local people would be devastating to our children's education and well-being!

I am not in favour of any of the models presented in the report. I do not feel that any of them have thought about the students'-or the school's-best interests. We don't want appointed boards, but rather elected boards that will better represent Kipling and rural communities.

I truly believe that local representation in education is crucial in a democratic society. Locally elected boards are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. They are important advocates for ensuring excellence in education. Who better to serve the needs of students—which are unique to each division, and even each school within divisions—than those elected by our residents to govern education at the local level? The needs of children within Regina are very different to the needs of children in Willkie, etc. Only locally elected boards can make decisions based on their knowledge of their community. If you have someone from out of the community making decisions for schools and ultimately for children they don't know, their needs will not be met. Past experience with school board amalgamations in Saskatchewan is that they are disruptive and time consuming for boards, teachers, parents and school communities; and there were virtually no cost savings realized. Our existing school divisions are responsible stewards of our resources and are constantly finding ways to stretch resources and find efficiencies. I do not believe that further amalgamations of school divisions would enhance the education of our children. Would they increase reading and math proficiencies? Would they improve graduation rates? I believe not. The government made the Education Sector Plan and my school division has been following on this plan to the best of our ability. All hands have been on deck. All resources have been used. All coworkers are working together towards a common goal. The changes that have been proposed here do not have student success in mind. They do not have these goals in mind. This is my fourth year teaching. I know almost every board member and every person that works in the board office. I cannot explain how helpful it has been to know these people. They are always willing to help and are just an email or phone call away. Having a smaller division gives me the opportunity to be a better teacher. It gives my students a better education. As the panel appointed to study this change and report to cabinet, I would ask that you recommend the status quo regarding education governance in Saskatchewan. This would ensure locally elected boards of education are maintained as vital aspects of our thriving democracy and hallmarks of education in Saskatchewan.

Small towns in Saskatchewan have already given up too many government services and the autonomy to manage those services. This plan for an education super board that destroys the existing school division system just continues that trend. In the media, that has been available, there hasn't been any explanation how this plan will save money for taxpayers or be beneficial to students' education. Change without a direction will result in chaos for no purpose. Participation of local people in local school decisions strengthens the entire community and establishes the ability of a school to meet the variety of very different needs students attending their school may have. If our students are given an environment where they can be successful in learning we all will benefit down the line when they are working adults. Local decision making can more directly address local needs. A single super board cannot know, understand or care about individual communities or individual students. Their focus and the dollars they manage will be on the schools with large populations. This plan is obviously a rushed, poorly thought out response to the financial downturn that the Brad Wall conservatives did not expect and failed to prepare for. Successful farmers know that bumper crops don't happen every year and save some of the surplus to manage the bad crop years. The government should have realized that, too!

In regards to the possibility of change, does this mean we get rid of the higher up administration that are getting paid huge dollars which leaves less money for teachers in our classrooms? As for our school, enrollment was too low so they had to split classes which means huge students bodies in each classroom, but we still have a vice principal being paid wages for enrolment that by all accounts doesn't need to be if the enrollment is so low.

You want my thoughts? Hire back the 60 EAs and 15 teachers we had to let go because of cuts. Explain to my special Ed students why they no longer have funding. I'm an EA desperately doing the job of 3 while you incompetent politicians dictate and break promises. We can't keep doing more with less.

The most important thing is the children and their education. Each school and division has very different needs based on the individual children, school size, locations, and classroom dynamic. Our locally elected school boards are held accountable by their people who elected them to represent them, which could be a neighbor, etc. They have been chosen by their community to represent their community. These representatives help hold our provincial government accountable and are truly the advocates for our children. Could government appointed board members do the job...maybe, but they will not have the same accountability to be our children's advocates and to have their primary concern our children. Thank you

As one of many home based educators in Saskatchewan, I would like to see Saskatchewan Home Based Educators included as stakeholders in these discussions. I would also like to see Saskatchewan appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding to support home educated students. Finally I would like any governance model to be transparent and continue to include home education as equal participants.

Hello, I would like more information to make a decision regarding the 4 options presented and the outcome and cost savings of each. I feel that education is very important and cuts could be made if the decision making was thought through and presented with actual dollar figures and a plan for what the outcome would look like. What is the rush? I have been told that the last time division changes were made very few jobs were lost. There was a reduction in School Board Members last amalgamation, have the lost positions been missed? Was a noticeable amount of money saved or was money the same just spent differently? I think there are a few new schools being built in Saskatchewan so that is great news and means there must be more mill-rate revenue coming in. Are the new schools a large part of the overspending? If cuts are being made why just the Public Schools are looked at, the provincial system should be looked at. The education system is educating our future, is that really where cuts should be made? There is always room for improvement in everything we do. We should be able to look at what we have and make smart cost savings decisions over time. Thanks for listening.

While I can see and understand the need to create some order in the chaos that is the board structure, the one element that seems to be missed in all of this is that these boards are currently elected and responsible to their electors. While some of these boards have higher or lower costs than others, many are also very different in what they offer to their regions and have very different needs. To say that a province as big as ours, with as many different cultures and rural and urban density changes can be effectively governed by one board, let alone an appointed board is going to work out well is hubris at its best, deceitful at worst.

I support the current governance structure. Having our current division allows them to be more accountable to me as a parent of two students K and Grade 2. They don't get lost in the shuffle, our local schools have great support and guidance from the division they are able to adapt and act fast and efficiently. Please do not change this. A central board would provide less support and longer response times etc. Keep the kids interests in mind over your deficit. Raise my taxes.

I've been employed in the school system for over five years now and classrooms are already overcrowded leaving students not learning to their full potential! I have seen what classrooms with a large amount of students look like. Let me give you a visual; the students who are above and at grade level are left to learn on their own while the children with disabilities and behavioural problems are falling so far behind because the classroom teacher's workload is unmanageable. And this is what you want to implement? That is not the only issue. The amount of job losses within the smaller communities would be significant, leaving many families struggling even more than some already are, in which will cost the province, all the while contributing to the provinces unemployment! Education is the key to success and for some reason, it's always one of the ones to have cutbacks. Where would we be as a society if not for our teachers and support staff?! We cannot have future leaders and contributors to our province/country without proper education! This means leaving the smaller schools afloat to be able to teach students properly and be able to give each student what they need to succeed! #SaveOurSchools

I believe we need to keep the school boards as is. Being micromanaged by one school board would be detrimental to our students and the support they need. Different areas of the province have different struggles and different needs. Smaller communities would lose all the extra learning opportunities. "We have to cut the football team, the welding, the woodshop, and the girls cooking club, etc. because it is just not cost effective to run these programs because the population isn't there". As parents we all want our children to be successful and that means giving them the best opportunities to achieve those goals. Without this kind of support in place, and not being able to expose them to the opportunities out there, what will they become? They are our future.

I have to say I'm concerned regarding the latest division / amalgamation ideas! I truly believe local, personal based directors / boards / committees are what makes our schools tick. When choices are based on local needs/issues, and affect those who make the choices as well. That's when I believe the best decisions are made! I personally feel it would be a mistake trying to amalgamate the school divisions! Fitting every school community into a mold that one region/board feels is right just doesn't make sense. Individuality and community roots would be lost! Sincerely, a concerned Saskatchewan Citizen and Parent

Good evening. I am sending this email to have my voice heard. I urge you to consider who a possible amalgamation would affect. Education is not something we should be scrimping and saving on. Our children deserve an education. There had already been several budget cuts to education not to mention the merge that happened only 10 years ago. Please consider NOT AMALGAMATING Sask school divisions.

Cuts in education hurts workers who put their whole energy in giving our kids the best education and a good start to life. The need to preserve what we got while giving a fair wage and the staff we need is the utmost importance. Cuts to government looking not to overlap might be a better thing to do.

After reading the report and suggestions made from Don Perrins, I feel I a little uncertain about the future of our education in Saskatchewan. My son is only in grade one and will be involved in the education system within Saskatchewan for many years to come. I believe that all presented options create more uncertainty and confusion then will help current budget concerns, which is the only reason this is now becoming an issue. The report did not discuss the catholic system much stating it is protected but does that mean it will no longer be funded? Or does this mean the public system will now monitor the Catholic schools as well? If separate schools will be asked to be one division or divided into larger regions as well as public, then has Government thought about the conflict, upheaval and cost this will be to all citizens in Saskatchewan? I have lived in many parts of Saskatchewan throughout my life, from the northern areas close to La Loche to southern areas around Swift Current. I have lived in extremely small communities to Saskatchewan's second largest city. The schools and the needs of people are drastically different in all the different areas so I question how one central division would be able to understand the communities' needs. I personally do not feel that the complications and issues that will definitely arise from such drastic measures have been thought out yet and so I feel that this province is not ready to take on such a huge undertaking at this time. Furthermore, if all public sectors have to reduce spending; is this not fiscally irresponsible at this time due to the undoubtedly massive cost to the people of Saskatchewan? As a citizen of Saskatchewan throughout my life I have more questions and concerns about these new options then any feelings of this turning out as something meaningful and productive for our province. I went to public school both in Price Albert and Swift Current; I have also taught as a teacher in northern Saskatchewan, southern Saskatchewan and here in Regina. I have seen the differences between school divisions first hand and I question if making one large division will actually be beneficial for the students. All divisions have similarities with curriculum, assessments, and supporting students; however the procedures and functions of each division are vastly different due to the different needs within each community. I worry that such drastic changes will affect students because teachers in the classrooms, school environments, parents and communities will be unsettled for many years to come as things get worked out when trying at align and conform so many people on such a large scale. I feel this will cost the province millions of dollars to undertake simply for the fact that each division has separate local agreements, different procedures for reporting (i.e. report cards), transferring teachers to new schools, etc. If all Saskatchewan teachers work for one division or 4 large divisions, is the province prepared to pay for transfers when teachers are needed in new locations? At this time, it is a personal cost to the individual teacher to relocate in the province because the individual is acquiring a new job; however, if all teachers work for one division then school boards cannot transfer a teacher from one school to another when the new school is 6 hours away from the current one. This alone would cost the province a great deal of money. If cutting costs is the driver of this new approach, I believe there are many other options to consider first. For example, teachers are placed based on student population. If the divisions have too many senior administrators then why not have the same basic rules in place for all division staff? I have noticed many cut backs in the schools over the past years and it is the students that suffer because they do not receive all the supports and specialized personnel they truly need. I also worry that if the divisions become larger then each student will receive even less support from specialists such as speech and language pathologists and psychologists because they will be on the road driving across the province and not in the schools. My biggest concern would be that no matter what is decided, students and the people working with the students every day do not feel the brunt of all these changes. We must ensure that the children of our province come first as they are our future. Will someone in one area be able to understand and communicate with all the areas within this large province? Even with one division, senior administration and office personnel would have to exist throughout the province to ensure proper communication and delivery of curriculum is upheld.

I am not in favour of amalgamation of the Separate and Public School Divisions. The Separate School Division (RCSD), with emphasis on Catholic education and faith, needs to be preserved and maintained separately. Thank you.

Enough cutbacks to education. It can't afford anymore.

After reviewing the report, I do not feel that any of the outlined Models would be beneficial to our children's education! We need to have elected board members who will be an advocate and hear the voices of the students, parents and all our communities' individual concerns about education. Appointed boards will not help anyone out in rural Sask.as they are only doing what the government tells them to. I do not feel that that is what is in the best interest for rural Saskatchewan. In the Prairie Valley School Division, we are very pleased with the programming options that they provide for my children and our board members have fought hard to make Kipling a great place to go to school and learn in a newly renovated building. We are not in favor of amalgamating to bigger school divisions or changing boundaries because our school division is the optimal size now and well represented by our board. We do not think this will better our children's education or save any money, but rather waste time and be disruptive to our children's learning. Please listen to what is important to rural education and take these thoughts into consideration. Thank you. Sincerely,

I believe that it is important to see the school through the eyes of the children. If you are (always) from the city, how can you begin to see it through the eyes of a rural community student? The struggles are very different at a city vs. rural school, and a centralized system may not be the best idea for recognizing the differences when the diversity is so grand.

I am totally against amalgamation because it will result to lack of local representation and supervision.

To Whom it May Concern, I understand that changes are being considered in our education system in regards to amalgamations of current school divisions. As the MLA who represents our area, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community. As a teacher and community member, I have several concerns about the proposed changes to our education system. Education belongs to each community, and I want you to know that I support the Chinook School Division. I am asking you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature: 1. We need to keep our school boards locally elected. As a large percentage of the funding for education comes from local property taxes, it is important for school boards to be local and democratically elected. This way school boards, as well as school board members are able to make the best decisions regarding each different area of Saskatchewan, as well as the area's diverse people, students, and needs. 2. We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. Local accountability comes from locally elected boards, which make decisions for their communities based on their knowledge and feedback. Educational needs differ across Saskatchewan, and therefore so should the school boards. 3. Consolidation will set back the advancement that has been made in literacy and numeracy for years. In the last amalgamation (10 years ago), it took 5 years for the boards to become accepted as the community's school system. Significant advancement in learning goals, PD options, and literacy/numeracy programs is just beginning to be achieved in these school boards over the last couple of years. To consolidate would be to drop the initiatives that have so benefited students within the classroom. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community. As a teacher, I fear for the welfare of our students, their learning, and our schools across Saskatchewan. I hope that you will take these concerns to your colleagues, to stress the importance of education systems that put students and communities first. Sincerely,

Last year I moved home to _____ so my son could attend _____ where my father and myself attended. I did not want him to go to school in Warman where we were living previously. I believed that he would receive more attention at a smaller school and that he may be lost in the shuffle at a larger one. My husband grew up in Regina and felt like he was just a number to teachers. I felt like I belonged and really mattered. The teachers here really focus on the students and our community. _____ has had renewed enrollment in the recent years and I believe with all my heart that our community is thriving because of the school. I know I would not have moved back if it was not for our beloved school. Please don't take it away.

I'm having a hard time thinking that getting rid of the school divisions is a great decision. You need to think for a moment, if our students are not getting a good education and being looked after from people in our area, how the hell will this benefit them for the future? How will having someone, say in Saskatoon making a decision on their classes, etc. going to be better? We need people in our area, in our school to have a say / option / decision for our students! Not someone who has no idea who / what / where students are from or are doing. Our students are the future, if their education system gets screwed, how will that make it better? Keep our school divisions how they are! WHY FIX WHAT ISNT BROKEN!?

My son has unique learning needs. He is now in grade 3 with no EA assigned to him or his class. He is still at a kindergarten-grade 1 reading level and I don't even know what to say about his math level. My son NEEDS the assistance of an EA in order to ensure his educational success and instead we continue to cut jobs and support staff in schools??? If something doesn't change there is a real risk that my son will coast through school and fall between the cracks of the educational system. Last year the school reduced the number of EAs on staff. I can't imagine that my son's learning challenges are unique to only him and I have no doubt there are other children in our school who's education is being negatively impacted due to funding cuts. Please tell me how we plan to support the kids with learning disabilities? Intellectual disabilities? You are basically saying they don't matter! They deserve to have the support that makes them feel confident and ensures they are successful in life!! As a parent I am beyond disappointed in the resources available to help my son make it through k-12. Why is my government letting him down??? He deserves better than this! The children of Saskatchewan deserve better than this!

School Division amalgamations are disruptive and time-consuming. Shouldn't our focus be on the children and matters that relate to them scholastically? The Prairie Valley School Division is at an optimal size right now, so let's keep it that way. As for changing the governance of School divisions, rural schools will get lost with the focus being on the city divisions. No priority should be given to some students over others based on geography. Let's treat all of our Saskatchewan students equally.

To whom it concerns, I understand that changes are being considered in our education system in regards to amalgamations of current school divisions. As the MLA who represents our area, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community. As a community member who pays into education in Saskatchewan, I have several concerns about the proposed changes to our education system. Education belongs to each community, and I want you to know that I support my local school division. I am asking you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature: 1. School boards, like MLA's, should be locally elected. A large percentage of the funding for education still comes from property taxes, and it is imperative to me that school boards remain local and democratically elected. Much like our district MLA's, electing local members into local school boards ensures that these boards are able to make the best decisions regarding the different areas of Saskatchewan. Locally elected members better understand Saskatchewan's diverse people and needs. School boards should never be appointed. 2. We need to keep decisions close to our communities. Local accountability comes from locally elected boards. Educational needs differ across Saskatchewan, and therefore so should the school boards. 3. Perrins has no educational background. I strongly disagree with anyone who does not have an educational background being in charge of making any sort of transformational change to our school systems. We do not hire teachers that do not have an Education degree; therefore, all matters concerning education should be left to educational experts. People who will put schools, students, teachers, parents, and communities first. 4. Consolidating school boards will not save budget. They will be costly to consolidate, and will save very little once implemented. Furthermore, the real cost will be to the education of our students. It took 5 years for the current school boards to amalgamate. During these 5 years many school boards focused on establishing themselves rather than on the education of the students. Just now, are school boards setting goals and standards in literacy and numeracy, and implementing them in solid and effective ways. Consolidation would set back the progress that was made in terms of education. This is extremely costly to Saskatchewan's largest resource: its children. 5. Province wide School boards have been proven ineffective, as shown in Nova Scotia and Newfoundland. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community. As a community member, I fear for the welfare of our students, their learning, and our schools across Saskatchewan. I hope that you will take these concerns to your colleagues, to stress the importance of education systems that put students and communities first. Sincerely,

Dear Perrins' Advisory Panel Members: It is on behalf of our School Community Council at _____ that I send you this email with regards to the impending transformational changes in our province. We request the honour of your time and discernment in reviewing our letter that speaks of the great things happening in our school and across Sun West school division. It is our hope that the great things surrounding personalized and blended learning will continue regardless of which changes take place, as students benefit greatly from this educational structure. Sincerely, RE: Transformational Change = Provincial Commitment to Innovation = Personalized Learning. The term 'transformational change' has been often employed in recent months by politicians and bureaucrats alike, but the intent or the definition of that term has not been made clear. We understand that there are processes in place to ensure that the people of Saskatchewan have a voice in shaping that change. The _____ school Community Council would like to add our voice to the conversation. For Sun West families, transformational change means Personalized learning - it works and we are watching it happen in our classrooms every day. For the past number of years, students and staff in Sun West have been enthusiastically pioneering this innovative educational path, which is based on the belief that students - each with their own unique strengths, weaknesses, interests and preferences - need a voice in determining how and what they are learning. As our schools have come to embrace this way of thinking, we've seen wonderful changes in how our classrooms look, in the language that our children use at school and then at home, and in the choices that our children have in regards to their own learning. In this personalized environment, kids get to take charge of their learning and can learn in a way that best suits them. Also in line with personalized learning, we have witnessed the creative integration of technology in our classrooms. Our children have regular access to computers or tablets and a limitless library of digital resources to help them explore topics of personal interest to them as they develop the fundamental knowledge and skills mandated by the Province. And because students can work at their own pace, there are opportunities to succeed and grow in ways they cannot when expected to keep up or wait for their peers. Through the implementation of these innovative practices, we are creating young citizens with the character and critical 21st century skills – leadership, technology, collaboration, and social accountability – necessary to excel in the workplace and contribute to successful communities. The work of Sun West School Division and other entrepreneurial divisions must not be left to scramble for the crumbs that fall after a massive restructuring. There is great work being done - using lean and efficient processes - to personalize student learning in our schools. We very much hope that this continues regardless of the organizational structure of the education system. We wish you well in your deliberations.

hi in regards to the school,

Do not like the new math, it is a lot of nonsense. The math taught many years back was excellent, when time comes you have to help the child with her math, I cannot help them. Education should be simple and fun, not complicated. I don't see the need for sex education at the early grades, and bullying has to be eliminated, and that means better supervision at recesses.

When I took my schooling in the 60s, I came out with an excellent education, we learned about the whole world we had the older schooling and we also had prayer in the schools, the old system worked and the new one does not. I also wanted to add the point that Christmas has been replaced with happy holidays and I think that is an insult to the Christian people as Canada was formed on Christian values. - this is our country and prayer is still in the Legislature, so it should still be in the schools. O CANADA should be sung like it means something to Canadians, and schools are spending far too much time trying to please people who are not of Canadian origin, or just coming into our country. It's up to them to conform to our laws and ways.

Dear Mrs. Young, Mr. Starke, and other parties involved: We would like to express our concerns regarding the possible consolidation of school boards, particularly as it relates to the Lloydminster Public School Division. Lloydminster, being a border city, has many unique challenges, but they have been successfully managed in the past through the determination and leadership of our local municipal and school leaders. We are very concerned that education will suffer greatly if Lloydminster is included in an expanded division. At present, students throughout the city receive the same opportunities regardless of where they live or attend school. This is a challenge when funding comes from two different provinces, but through the creation of a municipal levy (embedded in the Lloydminster Charter), this has been successfully achieved. Due to restrictions within the Charter, seamless delivery of services would be essentially impossible across an expanded division. This inequity of funding within an expanded school division would be hugely problematic and difficult for anyone to support. Another concern is the possibility of appointed school board members. With Lloydminster covering two provinces in one school division, the elected voice is even more essential. The people here are aware of the unique challenges that face this city, and they are best equipped to make decisions that will influence the future of their own young people. Alberta residents especially rely on their local school board to have their concerns heard as they cannot vote in Saskatchewan elections. This is all magnified when you consider that there is a separate school board in Lloydminster that will retain its own local school division, school board, and board office in the city. To take these things away from the public division would put it at a serious disadvantage, and would most likely mean numerous student transfers to the separate division solely for local access and representation. In conclusion, we ask the government to consider other ways to address the concerns outlined in the Educational Governance Review. Amendments to legislation, regulations, and policy would be considerably less disruptive than the proposed consolidation of school boards. Please continue to recognize the unique situation of the Lloydminster Public School Division, and ensure that every child in Lloydminster is given the same opportunity to learn and thrive. Sincerely,

It is important that Catholic school boards and districts remain separate so that our children learn and understand the catholic faith, and Catholic values. Our school has strong relationship with our local Catholic parish, priests, and pastoral staff. My children have a better understanding of religion and our traditions in the Catholic faith because of these relationships. I am not supportive of amalgamation with the public school system, since they do not share the views or practice traditional Catholic events, prayers, or beliefs.

I have serious concerns about this report put forward, the first being the fast-track timeline. The short consultation period is inadequate for the proper questions to be asked and answered regarding the future of our school division. As a rural voter, I deeply value our dual track school and ability to personally meet with my ELECTED board member to voice my concerns and congratulations. Our school has thrived in the ESSP and the new shift towards "Transformational Change" threatens to not only be costly to tax payers but pull us backwards from our educational goals. Please consider extending the consultation period to at least 6 months and provide an accurate accounting of the cost these new changes will incur. Also, an example of a working successful model of this education system would also be useful in the discussion. If status quo is not an option, I vote 3B.

I've heard people say "find another way to fix education". That implies - people know that our system is not working. People are scared of change. People fear the unknown. However - It is time to try something new. Amalgamation would benefit our school staff and students.

<p>I am a Mother of a Grade 6 And 4 at</p>	<p>We have the greatest Teacher at our School. I also have a grade eight student. When I compare the level of education my grade 8 daughter got in grade 6 compare to what my current daughter in grade 6 it is a huge difference. I don't blame the teachers at all. I have so much respect for both teachers but how can they give the same level of education when you have split classes of 30+ students. The choices that are being made with our children's education are in no way in the best interest of the students. It is very disappointing. I hope that we can make our children a Priority. They are our future. Thank you,</p>
<p>To whom it may concern; I am a Saskatchewan resident of Lloydminster and I have concerns about the changes to our school division boundaries and board models. I have a hard time believing that the proposed joining of the school divisions will benefit many of the smaller communities or unique areas like our border city. There are enough issues with the border without having it controlled from a place where the people know nothing about the dynamics. Also nothing is ever run as good when it isn't governed locally. Local members have something to lose if things aren't handled properly or divided fairly. You can't run all school districts in a province the same because of the diverse differences geographically. If you group larger cities with smaller towns, the town's voices tend to go unnoticed or get overpowered because of numbers. Bottom line, it would be a huge mistake to proceed with this proposed change, things are much better as they are. Regards,</p>	
<p>It is very important to me as a Roman Catholic, to have a quality Catholic Education; also that I have a say in what it going on and am allowed to participate in voting etc... Being connected with the local Parish and community is of utmost importance, especially when preparing and celebrating the Sacraments. Please don't make changes that keep us from having a say in our children's' education (we have 4 children).</p>	
<p>I have deep reservations about the EGRR that was released just before Christmas. I am a rural land owner and am proud of the small school my children attend. Under this proposal to amalgamate school divisions I see no upside for anyone living beyond city limits. I have several questions regarding these proposals: Who was consulted? Where is my elected board member? Why are you doing this? Why after the ESSP was just implemented in 2014 and meant to run to 2020? How will this affect rural schools? What will the cost of restructuring be? At what point of cost overruns will the amalgamation be tabled? How's it working out in Alberta's single region health care system? What will the effect on teachers and classroom resources be? If the ministry of education can't find money to pay its class 5 teachers how will it find money to administrate this massive overhaul. Seems very top-CEO heavy.</p>	
<p>Please don't make changes that keep us from having a voice in regards to our children's quality Catholic Education. We need to be able to communicate with our local Parish and priest, so we can create a better tomorrow, especially through Catholicism and sacramental preparation. Thanks.</p>	
<p>I want to voice my opinion on the amalgamation of the Saskatchewan school divisions. If this does go forth it is going to be the kids that suffer. We live in Maidstone, SK. And right now there isn't enough help for the amount of kids as it is. And if this goes through there will be even less. Our children should not have to give up their chance to learn just to save a couple dollars. Education and the health care field are 2 things that should never have to suffer cut backs. I think this will be detrimental to our province. And I am crossing my fingers that everyone sees the negative impact it is going to have on our kids. Thank you for your time</p>	
<p>This is not in best interest of the educational system. How can it be? What if "the few" people on this board make the wrong decision and it affects all the schools in Saskatchewan? One bad decision and our children's education is harmed. Does The Lloydminster hockey organization make all the rules and set all things pertaining to hockey for Regina? No - that would clearly be a very wrong thing to do because Lloydminster does not know Regina... same thing with education. Why would someone in Regina make decisions for Lloyd or anyone other than Regina? If your answer is money ... then you better have a different answer because education is what makes our world go round and it needs to be top priority! Honestly I could go on and on, but there is no way that some board in Regina could do what is right for schools in SE Saskatchewan or NW Saskatchewan! Put the children's education first!</p>	
<p>I am against this change. We are happy with how things are currently.</p>	
<p>The only comment I have is that the way math is taught from about grade 2 to grade 8 is completely ridiculous. It takes the common sense right out of math. Students learn math in a way that complicates things to a level that even parents with a very good understanding of math get confused.</p>	
<p>Locally elected boards are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. They are important advocates for ensuring excellence in education. Who better to serve the needs of students—which are unique to each division, and even each school within divisions—than those elected by our community to represent our community? Please do not amalgamate school boards. Thank you.</p>	

Hello, I am a mother of two Lloydminster Public School Division students. I do not agree with the school division consolidation plan outlined in the Government of Saskatchewan's "Educational Governance Review Report". Please do not proceed with the consolidation plan. I think the decisions associated with Lloydminster public schools are most effectively managed by our locally elected school board of trustees. These local people know the unique requirements of our border city, they are accessible to parents and most importantly they understand the needs of our community students. We currently have a system in Lloydminster that works for all community children regardless of home address. In addition, both Alberta and Saskatchewan parents have equal access to school board representatives. The education system in Lloydminster is caring, fair and seamless. I think consolidating the Lloydminster Public School Division with other divisions in Saskatchewan will be disruptive and costly and will lead to discrepancies of access to trustees depending on if you live on the Alberta or Saskatchewan side of Lloydminster. Please ensure that our local Lloydminster school board trustees maintain their responsibility for our Lloydminster public schools and use their local expertise to meet the challenges identified in the "Educational Governance Review Report". Sincerely,

I urge the government of Saskatchewan to consider that different areas of our province have needs that can only be determined by the communities that deal with those needs on a daily basis. We have a provincial government right now who is great at pointing out our needs are different the other provinces in our country. They fight for us and our needs. However they are turning a blind eye to the fact that the same is true when it comes to educating our children within our province. Our needs and challenges are different from community to community. This is not about money.... for once, as right now everything is about money, but it is about doing what is best for our children and our future. The most common mistake we make with children is trying to fit them into a mold. By allowing all schools to be governed by people who have no understanding of the community and the children in the schools within them we are just creating another mold. Which is everything we as parents, educators and responsible adults are teaching are children not to conform to? I have been a huge supporter of the SK Party. However, the fact they are willing to sacrifice our youth somewhat contradicts that fact they are interested in Saskatchewan's future at all. I disagree with the carbon tax as well, but if given a choice between carbon tax and protecting our youth's education which will in no doubt be sacrificed by this change I choose our children. You want people to move to Saskatchewan so you focus on creates jobs! Make them want to bring their families, leave our education system alone; I would not bring a child into the system you are Suggesting. Do what you promise what is best for our province and our future.

I think the school districts should stay the same we are getting bigger where my kids go to school and they have requested the trailers to be brought in. Will we have any say in what is going to happen to the education our children will receive. Will there be layoffs and then we won't get any extra help. Our daughter has medical issues and the teachers have been amazing in helping her with her recovery she is going for surgery again and will she just be ignored and kicked to the curb if she needs any added help!

In light of the K-12 Education Governance Review, I feel concerned and deflated. I foresee many negative setbacks from Transformational Change. You see, this affects OUR future. Our STUDENTS are OUR FUTURE, and this policy is taking away their voice. Education is key for the advancement of our province, and if we do not properly invest in our children's education: we will be set for failure. Please reconsider this policy. Thank you for your time.

I have tried to find a good reason for the Gov of Sask and the ministry of education to upset our system of governance on such a drastic level as to attempt amalgamation of the Lloydminster public system outside our city jurisdiction. An attempt to do so could open Pandora's box considering our municipal levy that enables us to accomplish seamless delivery to both Sask and AB students treating them equally. 80 plus years of work has bought us to this point and any disruptions of this could be catastrophic. This may cause an out surge of students from public to Catholic due to parents desire to have local representation, wouldn't that be something to deal with? Such a decision could lead to an onslaught of applications for minority Religious school systems that could lead to a total disruption of our schools impacting our students for years to come. School boards and School systems seem willing to come to the table and work with government to find solutions to satisfy governments concerns. Mr. Wall's government has done a fabulous job since its being put in power, please don't let this mistake bring a bad light or mar their reputation of good government.

In response to the proposed changes to educational governance, I would like to make clear that as a parent, I know that locally elected boards provide the highest quality education for my children. Locally elected boards make decisions that affect classrooms, and these decisions are best made close to those classrooms. Appointed trustees are not an acceptable alternative to the current system. I am in favour of keeping the current system, or possibly "realigning" boards and divisions, although I don't know what that would entail. Additionally, I would like to stress that the savings the government is trying to find must not be at the expense of students in classrooms.

Our schools do not prepare students for post-secondary education and sets them up for failure. The career counsellors have no idea what they are doing and provide no help unless you at the elite in the grade 12. No aptitude testing or anything to help the students figure out what they would like to be. Course curriculums are not being taught i.e. a my daughter had to drop out of Chem in Oct as she did not know her grade 12 Chem which we found out here in 2017 and we were out money we paid for that classes and had to drop out of the next Chem too. How is she going to pick up what should have been taught if she has never been taught it. Teachers are quick to judge and they often focus on the negative rather than the positive. Hand writing and Phonics are not being taught and the is affecting life and schooling later on. Teachers want to Instruct their way only and not adapt for the child's style of learning. Testing to identify learning problems/difficulties should take so long to obtain...my first child, it took 3yrs. Need to go back to failing kids and using a numerical grading system so kids learn how to emotionally deal with poor/lack of effort or not being prepared to write the exam. When the school recognizes a teacher did something wrong they should not be telling the parent and child that they will always side with the teacher and the teacher won't be getting reprimanded. If school buses are not running and the kids do nothing at school, why not close the school for the morning/day Kids need bigger lockers so they can put winter coats in. When it was -47 last week my child still wore his fall jacket cause he has a small locker and it's filled with his books and binders. Report cards should still be sent home as not everyone goes on the website or has a computer. Teaches should be paid should, and reflected In the following year, if they taught the full curriculum. When students with a 92% average don't have high enough marks to qualify for a bursary or scholarship something is wrong...make the tests harder or put the grades on a curve. Should bring back the Lord's Prayer.

Living in the far north, isolated by at least 4 hours of driving, combining with others is just not feasible. Living in the north has barriers due to our isolated nature. We can't access the resources the south has unless we travel, which is costly. It will only hurt the north and our children's education. Sometimes , I believe we are forgotten about or disregarded for the interests of the south and removing our board or continuing to cut costs and positions only sends the message that the children in the north don't matter.

To whom it may concern; If amalgamation means less services for students or lengthy wait times then I disagree. If it means job loss, I disagree. If it means students will have less opportunities because of deductions, I disagree. If it means larger class sizes, larger than our 25-35+ classes, I disagree. I am so proud to be a teacher in Saskatchewan. I am really worried though about our students suffering, job cuts, lower wages and less support for us all. I read that there would be little impact in the classroom, but that sounds impossible. Most divisions, if not all, will be cutting jobs. I hope everyone knows that. Finally, I don't believe Catholic schools or private schools should be exempt from any of this because of legislation. They should be seen as no different!

I am afraid that with amalgamation, there is the danger of losing the Catholic focus of the education our children is receiving from Catholic Schools. We would also lose control of the education of our children. Catholic schools are partners with their neighboring parishes which may also be lost.

I am so disgusted with this government and how they always put our children's last on their priorities. During elections they pretend to care and somehow get back in but then just like all other politicians they go back on their word and instead do cutbacks for teachers, schools and in the end fail the students!

The school board system should stay the same. I don't want someone not from my community making decisions that affect myself and my children. Leave things alone!

I am concerned that our government's fast decision on transformational change will negatively affect our rural students, schools, and communities. Our rural students may not be as numerous as larger city schools, but they are an important part of Saskatchewan's future, and they will need a great education in order to contribute to our province. If any one of the four options in the Perrins report is used, the rural voice will be silenced. I want someone local, who is familiar with our schools and our community's needs, to be the one making decisions about the education of our children. I fear we will have no one left to speak for us, and no one left who understands rural school issues. We will be neglected and forgotten. Our problems will be swept under the carpet and easily ignored. There are other ways of saving money in school boards; let the school boards have a a chance to come up with ways of cost sharing. The Saskatchewan Party government values farmers, so why not their children?

One giant school board wouldn't work, there are too many differences throughout the province. I can see reducing the number of current boards through amalgamation, but not at the cost of closing schools or cutting jobs. The speed in which this is being done, with only a few days to submit feedback is incredibly disheartening, something as important as our children's education both requires and deserves informed deliberation, and inclusion of the parents and communities affected.

Re: Perrins Report K-12 Governance Options I absolutely oppose every option for governance presented in the Perrins K-12 Report. My children have all attended Lloydminster Public School Division (LPSD). Our youngest son is in his first year of high school. We are Alberta residents. As Alberta residents we have a vested and passionate interest in what happens in LPSD and we have participated actively in LPSD over the years. My concerns are outlined below: 1. The Perrins Report demonstrates an incredible lack of respect for the approximately 20,000 Alberta residents living in Lloydminster and the residents of the County of Vermilion River to the west that send their children to LPSD. The proposal could remove locally elected Trustees, local decision making, and local accountability from the educational equation. Alberta residents do not have the ability to vote in Saskatchewan elections and have no voice in Saskatchewan matters yet Alberta residents will suffer through this latest initiative from the Minister's office. Frankly, Saskatchewan residents will suffer through this initiative too. 2. The Perrins Report demonstrates naivety of the Lloydminster context. The Lloydminster context includes "equity" for all students regardless of the family address, Alberta or Saskatchewan. Equity applies in all schools regardless of which side of the provincial border a child's school is located. For example, PreKindergarten is not funded by Alberta Education. Equity means that LPSD provides PreKindergarten programming across the city available for all PreKindergarten aged students. Alberta Education does not fund Driver Education. Equity means that Driver Education is provided to all LPSD students of the appropriate age regardless of a student's address, Alberta or Saskatchewan, and regardless of the fact that Lloydminster Comprehensive High School situated in Alberta delivers the program. Equity also means that all students benefit from transportation services. Equity and seamless delivery of educational services for the residents of Lloydminster is a significant priority. To ensure equity for all students and seamless delivery of K-12 programming the City of Lloydminster introduced a special municipal levy, embedded in the Lloydminster Charter. All funds raised to support seamless delivery must remain within Lloydminster to serve the students of Lloydminster. Funds from the municipal levy cannot be used to service any form of an expanded public school division that includes areas outside the existing Lloydminster boundaries. Equity and seamless delivery also mean that families send their children across the provincial boundary into Saskatchewan or into Alberta daily to attend school confident that the same level of programming is provided across the city. Seamless delivery means that the provincial boundary does not exist for the purpose of serving students, families, and the community. 3. The very nature of a bi-provincial public school division that reports to both Alberta and Saskatchewan, collects student grants from both Alberta and Saskatchewan, and is accountable to parents and the public living in both Alberta and Saskatchewan is far more complex in governance and operations than any school division existing wholly within Alberta and Saskatchewan. To brush this reality aside by asserting within the Perrin Report that "Nothing in the Charter prohibits amalgamation of school divisions or revision of the boundaries of the Lloydminster school divisions (p18)", is the same as telling the truth but not the whole truth. 4. The Perrin report references Saskatchewan PISA results. The report then goes on to highlight Governance options. There is no connection within the report to show any link between the governance options presented and improved student results. There is no reference to research or experience to draw this link. To imply that pursuing any one of the governance options will lead to improved student results is wrong, misguided, and ignores the results of educational policy in those provinces where student performance is consistently among the top in Canada. It is unbelievable that a report requested November 15, 2016, delivered to the Minister December 10, 2016, available publicly just prior to Christmas, with a deadline for submissions January 23, 2017 could have any credibility. Regards

One of my worries concerning amalgamation of school divisions is that our rural schools just become figures on paper. Our current elected members are a strong part of our communities. They see firsthand the needs of our communities, families and students. I fear without our caring local board our students will not receive the true representation that they deserve.

Stop amalgamating everything! All it serves is to screw everyone over. When the Chinook School Division absorbed Shaunavon School Division, it allowed students access to new classes. However, it also allowed for the schools in Shaunavon and area to be powerless in decision making. These schools have no choice but to follow the mandates of the new division and are incapable of budging in a case-by-case situation. Also, the government and most urban dwellers like to forget about the rural areas. Rural communities do not run the same way urban communities do. Rural communities need to be respected for the way they run. Stop forcing rural areas to act and run like big urban jungles. Go into a school for a day and witness just how things are really going (go in plain clothes and not as a government official, otherwise it's cheating). See the real side of education and not just a bunch of ridiculous numbers. Quality of education is failing because of powerless educators and the focus on numbers, and not on the student and the individual needs of the student. This amalgamating will not save money or solve problems. Amalgamating only leads to job loss. EA's are being cut and children with special needs are left to suffer because of budget cuts. In summary, STOP THE AMALGAMATION OF EVERYTHING!

I was an Educational assistant for many years in a small school. I saw children thrive with hands -on-care. Then the school division closed the school. Our students are bused miles to get to school and all the services we were promised have been cut. The children have bigger classes and less learning. It is so sad when you watch children struggle and there is no one around to help them. The parents are having to do most of the teaching as the poor teachers are overworked with your teacher- student ratios (that do not work). There are less Educational Assistants and less hands on for the children. Now teachers have more politics, paperwork , etc. to do and every meeting is miles away, so takes more time away from classrooms. We are not going forward we are going backward with these larger school divisions. The children spend too many hours on buses and get to school to find teachers overworked and they have no extra hands to help out. Less services are provided from divisions as they are stretched beyond their means. I know of two cases where children needed therapy and were told, there was just no more space to help them out. An example is: speech pathologist should come out, do the assessment, write up the plans and the Educational assistants carry out the program. Costing the divisions very little money and the children get help. An Educational assistant cost 1/3 less than have a teacher or speech pathologist do . Simple math. You wonder why Saskatchewan children scored 10th in the provinces because they are not getting the education they were 10 years ago. Also, the new 1-4 grading system is not working. Why strive to get any better when a 4 is all you can get. Is a 4 equivalent to 75 or 100%? If 75 is equal to 100, then why work for 100 when you can never get it. Twice in the last year, I have encountered University students who are having trouble . They were both good students in high school but now are losing out to students from other places where the bar was set higher. Now they have to reeducate themselves and waste more time and money to find their place in the university grading system. We have failed them. Saving money on buildings did not save our education. It destroyed it. The cost savings of closing schools only increased transportation and stress on the very children you were supposed to be helping. I think it is time to reverse the thinking of larger is better. It is not. I found an old 1954 pamphlet when country schools were closed and the propaganda is the same but it still doesn't work. if you want good education, you need to hire more people who work for less wages that are actually at the classroom level, helping children.

To whom it may concern;

The reason I list my experience here is how on EARTH do you expect the average parent to understand that report and what it means for their children in their own town? I deal with media releases/reports/etc all the time and reading through it, I felt pretty overwhelmed trying to sort through my questions and shuffle the information into place to see what this means for ROSTHERN. I don't believe it was presented in a way that gave all parents a chance to advocate for their children. Added to the disgracefully short timeline that has been imposed here. These changes will be made under the noses of parents and before we know it, what we are used to will be gone.

Our schools are falling down and we have an extremely high percentage of EAL and other high needs students with little EA support. How does this report effect what I have done so far? Will I have to start over again if things are reshuffled? The thought is disappointing, to say the least. When I say "what we are used to will be gone" it scares me more than I can describe because Rosthern hasn't had any fat to trim for a good number of years. Making do, that is what we are used to. And that is why the people who speak up on behalf of our children are CRUCIAL to our survival here. An appointed representative who has never lived here, never set foot in our schools, never sat at a table and had coffee with me while discussing the challenges our children/schools face will not serve us well. My CURRENTLY ELECTED representative, Trina Miller, has done ALL OF THOSE THINGS. She lives here, her children go to school here, she cares about what happens to the schools she represents. I voted for her because she has taken the time to hear my concerns and then in turn, she voices them at the board table. I have the utmost confidence that she has the best interest of this rural area at heart. Someone at a desk in Regina who has never heard of my town? How can they represent my children and say they have their best interests at heart? Out of sight, out of mind. I was happy to read in the report that it was stated that elected representatives best serve our needs. It is absolutely true. An Education Quality Council to measure education system performance, student outcomes and to monitor progress of the ESSP? HOW are student outcomes ensured? By teachers. By EAs. By parent volunteers. The people on the ground, in the schools, sitting and reading with the kids, helping them with their math and teaching them to succeed. Student outcomes are our end goal here so how does anyone expect those outcomes to meet the 2020 targets when they continue to cut our classroom supports? The ESSP itself does not raise student outcomes. Student outcomes are ensured by hands on teaching.

The ESSP isn't ensuring student success there. I am. The teacher is. And so is every single person who graces that classroom. Changing the makeup of our school divisions to save pennies has nothing to do with increasing student success. If anything, it will severely disrupt

things at the administration level which will trickle down and inevitably impact teachers in the classroom. Our teachers in Rosthern are outstanding professionals but one can only handle so much for so long. I have read the report and I still have no idea what this means for my children. Sadly, I believe the time allotted for parents to respond is merely a show and our concerns will be ignored in favour of what suits some made up technical formula. Children do not fit into a math equation with only one answer. Each division, each school, each classroom, each child has individual needs that can be met if everyone works together. I don't know what the answer is, but I do know what the answer isn't. Ignoring parents. Ignoring the people in the schools, whether they be teachers, support staff or a parent volunteer like myself. No amount of red tape will ever help a student succeed. But it does have the power to ensure their decline. Please do not ensure the decline of our students with whatever decisions will be made under the nose of parents in this province. Very sincerely,

I am a parent of two in the Saskatoon public schools system. My youngest is special needs so we draw on the education system more than others. I do not believe I need an elected board to hear my concerns. I believe we could attract more qualified individuals if they were appointed. I believe schools should be located based on student enrolment and travel distance. Kids should not be on a bus for over an hour. I believe in fair education for all. As such, I do not like how we have public and catholic at systems and I think merging them should be investigated. I believe there are efficiencies out there in amalgamating school divisions. Even without amalgamation, I think there are too many bodies in administration and would prefer to see more bodies in the schools interacting with students. I believe in educational assistants. We are realizing more and more kids have learning disabilities and with integrated classes teachers need this help. I believe in more specialists. Why doesn't Saskatoon Public Schools have an occupational therapist? I get frustrated when savings are found by cutting caretakers and admin assistants. Find bigger savings by sending superintendents back into schools or classrooms. I would be happy to discuss our experiences further if need be.

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report I would like to offer the following feedback: I do not support any of the three models presented in the report and ultimately we wish to remain a part of Prairie Valley School Division. It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community. I do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. Currently under the direction of the Prairie Valley School Division we celebrate some of the highest performance scores in Reading and Math as well as extraordinary High School graduation rates. What guarantee is there that these standards of excellence will be maintained through provincial amalgamations? Nearby schools are at maximum capacity and there are great concerns for distance, safety, and time spent on buses for rural children. In Mr. Perrin's report the opening letter to Minister Morgan states that ALL stakeholders who approached Mr. Perrin for conversation UNANIMOUSLY support elected boards and NO more amalgamations! WHY would we continue with pursuing drastic changes?

As a member of the SCC, I support the school's administration and staff to achieve better outcomes for all students. Our SCC also provides vital feedback to our school board when it comes to matters affecting our school community. Our input is valued and our efforts have a direct impact on the academic success of our students. To this end, we understand the importance of community voice and local decision-making when it comes to our children's education. When it comes to the future of the provincial education system, first and foremost should be what is best for students. However, we are concerned that some of the issues being considered do not reflect priorities for our students. Community voice may be lost if locally elected school boards are dissolved or school divisions are made substantially larger. Reductions to education funding found through efficiencies may result in losses for our students that cannot be easily rectified. Our students' success is fostered by a community working together to support their educational journey. Parents, teachers, school staff, trustees and community members all have a stake in what our children can achieve and how far they can go. This is an investment in the future of our society. Further cuts and widespread changes will only deplete our most important resource – our children.

As a parent with children in elementary school I believe our boards should stay local as well as the SCC should be made up of parents that have children in THAT school.

We do not need to further amalgamate School Divisions. Education is our future and centralizing decision making is only moving it further away from the students and the teachers. Solve the budget problem some other way.

Larger school divisions with larger class size are not the answer. Access to services and windshield time already waste enough time in the size of divisions that we have. Students need direct services and early intervention. Funding cuts and amalgamations will directly affect services offered to students by professionals and teachers. We cannot put more on the teachers.

The education system in this province is broken. The new math approach is a joke. The new report card for elementary kids is an expertly designed piece of vagueness that provides no insight as to how a child is actually progressing. The student lead interviews are a nice idea but really don't serve a purpose as the student gets to direct the interview instead of the parent. The lengths of the parent/teacher interviews are way too short. A teacher being scared to really speak honestly about the kids to parents is sad. Kids need to know how they are doing and their feelings are not the single greatest item of importance. The same goes for parents feelings. I don't see how reducing teacher's wages or benefits will improve my child's education. I don't see how combining school boards will improve my child's education. I do expect that if such a plan is going to be considered that I as a parent will be consulted prior to anything being put into effect. I truly am concerned for the future both for my kids and everyone else's. Kids now avoid conflict at all costs. They believe they have a say in how they are to be educated. They can't take constructive criticism because teachers rarely give it anymore. Criticism or attempts to correct kids' behaviours are more likely to be treated as "bullying" before being recognized as an attempt to change behaviours. If you want to make changes to the education system, start with allowing teacher's to teach a curriculum without fear of reprisal or 'bullying" from parents. Separate parenting from teaching, and focus on the subject. Allow kids to fail so they can learn how to work hard to improve. Unless you can show me how making budget cuts can improve the educational experience ...don't attempt it. Lastly, for the record I am not a teacher. I'm a parent working hard to help coach my kids towards making good decisions. I go to parent teacher interviews and am constantly disappointed because it is almost impossible to learn anything negative about my kids. Almost impossible to learn where they need to improve. I won't be able to learn these things because my child is sitting there directing the interview. Sometimes kids shouldn't be sitting at the parents table when these conversations take place. Fix the approach of the system.

Why is the Government trying to restructure the School Divisions? Education is a sacred right not a financial project. Children of Saskatchewan are more than a financial equation.

It is important for decisions to be taken locally with focus on the importance of faith in the case of the Catholic education. Not sure this could be accomplished with the amalgamation of school divisions/ boards. We want board members that understand the different communities and needs, and we want to be able to elect them and not being assigned by the government. I don't oppose to efficient use of resources and try to achieve economies of scales; however there is still a need of understanding each community's needs which are very different from one to other. By taking decisions centrally, some of those needs will not be understood, thus resources will not be assigned.

Some questions that I feel need to be answered prior to making any decisions: Why are you doing this? Why? It's unproven. Amalgamation timeline: Why the rush? What benefit or harm is this doing to the students? They are our priority. What are the cost savings for each option? What exactly are the efficiencies (in dollar savings and providing quality education)? How will they know the needs of each region? What are the biggest issues for student today? What was the cost of this report? Should a 3rd part be brought in for consultation? How about raising taxes to fight the deficit? How can a government make such an important decision in such a short time frame? Why is the "status quo" not a choice? What role would SCC's have in this new system? Transparency: What details are available financial/Education branch? What is the financial savings audit showing for all options? Where will short term / long term finances be allocated? Can larger purchasing agreements provincially save money and save current division boundaries and structures? Please explain why the separate school divisions are not required to change their structure i.e.: public division should also mean separate (Catholic division). Is it right to tax people for education but not provide a voice? What other areas within education have they investigated to save costs rather than divisional structure changes? Have any of these models been researched and found effective? Why the short time frame for changes of this magnitude? What is the saving going to be? Health board? 10 to 20 million, doesn't make sense. Where is the evidence of financial savings, will it be retained? What happens to professional support staff/special needs now determined by local need?

Leave it local. Community members understand our community.

I fully support the letter submitted by Pense school families and parents. Just to make it clear I DO NOT support any of the changes the education minister Don Morgan or his appointed Dan Perrins has set out before us.

I think there needs to be a better, firmer plan in place before such a huge change can be made and more time to properly do this in! How can 1 super board or four major School Division boards know what smaller schools need? And meet those needs more efficiently than what is being done now. EACH school is different and can't be clumped into 1 or 4 boards. In the end, it is our KIDS that people need to think of, and how it will affect our kids. How can a school in Saskatoon / Regina and another in Carrot River possibly have the same needs?

First off: What's the rush! If you want to improve education in Sask schools, that's great. I've got no problem with it. But when you rush it through, it looks bad. Like you have a hidden agenda. In the information you put forward there are no numbers of cost savings and I think that's the biggest reason why you're planning this. As a party, I would be careful with this plan. The Sask party has great support in rural Sask. Don't ruin it!

I am concerned about: 1) Loss of effective and accountable public voice 2) Unintended consequences of amalgamations and appointed boards 3) Less say, control and input in your child's education 4) Loss of relationships with parents, parishes and community partners I'm also frustrated with the short deadline the public has been given to respond to this along with the timing of the request for our opinion.

I am concerned about: 1) Loss of effective and accountable public voice 2) Unintended consequences of amalgamations and appointed boards 3) Less say, control and input in your child's education 4) Loss of relationships with parents, parishes and community partners I'm also frustrated with the short deadline the public has been given to respond to this along with the timing of the request for our opinion.

I strongly feel that the school divisions are large enough already, by amalgamating to larger divisions the smaller rural communities may lose their 'voice'. The need for locally elected representatives to assist with concerns in all areas is of utmost importance!

A few years ago our division went through an amalgamation. There has been no proof that there was any money saved. All it did was disrupt the students and families. As a parent of two, my main concern is my children's education. However, with another amalgamation I feel that the needs of the students would not be met. Please leave our Children's education alone. If there were another amalgamation that would mean school closures, and longer bus times for the rural children. There is NO WAY that a child should spend an hour on a bus just getting to school. My next thought about the alleged amalgamation is the Board Of Trustees. Our board is elected from members of our community. They see firsthand what each school and student needs. If the amalgamation does go through the Board of Trustees will be handpicked by the government! How is that having the BEST INTEREST of the students in mind? Rural schools and city schools operate totally different. What works for the city does not work for the rural! In the past we have seen a few school closures and the only ones that benefit from that is the GOVERNMENT! If you want to save money start by cutting the jobs at the top with the GOVERNMENT! Find other ways to cut cost that don't have an impact on the children! Our children are our FUTURE! Let's get them an EXCELLENT education, having an amalgamation isn't giving them an EXCELLENT education!

I am strongly in favour of Option 3.

I am not sure where the government thinks that amalgamating school divisions and appointing trustees is in the best interest of the child. I was very involved in the last amalgamation and it was heart wrenching to see kids fall through the cracks and become statistics in our system. By enlarging the school division there are many kids who will just plain quite school. Keep the divisions the way they are and don't appoint trustees do it the democratic way and let us vote in who best represents us. This is a scapegoat for the Government to pass the buck regarding there misspending and putting our province in the situation we are in. Let's hurt the middle class one more time. Most front line employees are not even full time and hold two or three jobs to even make ends meet. Your proposed changes only hurt us more.

I support locally elected school trustees for the province of Saskatchewan. Local trustees know the needs of their local community and voice the concerns. They are the intermediaries between schools and the government. In a democratic society taking away elected officials and appointing individuals becomes an authoritarian style government. Does the Sask Party Government under the leadership of Brad Wall want to be remembered as making transformational change dictatorship leadership?

I would think there would need to be an official vote to dissolve locally elected public boards as these were people that taxpayers voted in. Picking on public boards and not Catholic is unfair. I also think they are all doing a great job with what they have given to them and to rip out the current culture in the school divisions would be disastrous. Not only upsetting the learning of my children but children province-wide. For the what ifs here, there isn't enough money saved by education amalgamation to make it worthwhile and will definitely have a negative impact on student learning as adult job satisfaction is affected and this will inherently have terrible consequences. Teachers will leave the industry and Principals will basically have to run their own board office from their desk and not have time to make a positive difference in their schools. More brains working on this problem makes way more sense than having a small advisory group. Please consider the problems this will create in the learning environment and ultimately on the population in Saskatchewan. Take a look at the numbers, finding equality in the funding formula makes much more sense long term and will not affect school divisions which are currently over-funded.

First and foremost any Governance change can not jeopardize student out comes. The primary goal has to be to first put the needs and requirements of the students first. The second goal should be the efficient use of resources. I would like to have seen an amalgamation of the separate and public boards, as that is where I see true efficiencies. As a commitment to the Catholic religion there could be a governing committee within each Board that is focused on the maintenance of the Catholic religion, which I believe is a requirement dating back to confederation. I don't think that the efficiencies in governance will be achieved by a centralized school board. If anything this will increase costs due to an increased amount of bureaucracy. I would be willing to support either a realignment of existing boundaries, with an amalgamation of boards that border larger urban areas, or an amalgamation of boards to either 4 or 5 zones. This would allow each Board to still focus on issues of regional importance, but would be able to eliminate a number of administration positions. I also believe that economies of scale can be achieved by going to a centralized purchasing/acquisition, and standardized equipment for each school. Whatever the outcome any future Boards need to still be elected by the voters of the Province, it would not be acceptable to go to an appointed Board.

I can accept change as long as it is for the right reason. I feel that more consultation is needed for such a big decision. We have a very diverse population and If we do not think it through the outcome may be worse. I would like to continue with board elected trustees.

As a parent within the Chinook School Division I would like to take this opportunity to express my opinions regarding the report on potential change to the governance structure. My children are enrolled in _____ School. While this school is relatively small I have taken an active role within the school since my children started _____ to help ensure that our small school is able to thrive. Our entire community is dedicated to helping our school survive and as such this commitment from the community shows the importance of keeping decision making process closer to the communities impacted. Every area in this great province of ours has its own unique challenges and advantages. With keeping the decision making processes closer to home you would be ensuring that these challenges are addressed and that the advantages are utilized to the best advantage. Even though our school is small we have an amazing staff/student/parent relationship. Also to note is the exceptional education that our children are offered. I strongly feel that the children of our school are getting the best possible education...if decision process was to be moved further away there would be the chance that the benefits of the 'smaller country school' maybe not be noticed. Our students are testing very high on all standardized testing that takes place within the school system. The number #1 consideration factor needs to be that of the education and future of our children....I strongly suggest keeping decision process closer to home and keep electing passionate and caring people to help make those decisions Thank you for the opportunity to give input

Amalgamation of our school divisions is not a benefit to the students of Prairie South. We have very different issues than the city schools and lumping us all together is not beneficial. We need representation by those who understand our obstacles and are willing to stand up for the students of our area. We need to focus on what is best for students (which is to have a strong voice in their corner) and not what is best for administration.

Too many kids in the classroom especially in the elementary. Teachers are so busy with controlling the children that they have little time to actually teach them. Smaller classrooms will allow for more one on one teaching which will improve the level of understanding. Currently our children are not meeting academic standards and our bandage is to get a few more EAs or have a few additional ELA reading groups. Let's address their problems at the start have smaller K - Gr 4 classrooms and teach them the basics from the start. As a very active parent in my children's lives and an active parent in our school, I am disgusted by the lack of basic phonics, basic math, spelling and reading. What happened to teaching kids spelling lists, memorizing multiplication and basic science? I realize that funding is always a huge challenge for governments, but my thoughts are if we educate our children we will have a much happier, healthier and stronger society in the long run. Smaller classrooms for focused education and stand up for children's academics. Sometime old systems are not bad, and not all new systems are great. Thank you for the opportunity to share with you my concerns about our school system and I realize that changes cannot occur quickly but evaluating classroom sizes can be very impactful. Thank you

There isn't enough information presented to make a decision this quickly. We need more time to have the questions we are asking to be answered.

I feel that our public education system has faced several years of budget cutbacks that has impacted the students negatively. I am concerned that another change is going to add to this. If changes are going forward, I would suggest that they are those that do not involve a restructuring of our whole education system structure.

K-12 Education Governance Review Advisory Panel: After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report I would offer the following feedback: We do not support any of the three models presented in the report and ultimately we wish to remain a part of Prairie Valley School Division. We do support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). Currently under the direction of the Prairie Valley School Division we celebrate some of the highest performance scores in Reading and Math as well as extraordinary High School graduation rates. What guarantee is there that these standards of excellence will be maintained through provincial amalgamations? It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! We do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. Our current Prairie Valley School Division board member is very visible in our schools and community. Provincially appointed board members will not be as accessible, nor will they know their communities' needs. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support the change to governance or how further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. We have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold. Rural communities thrive, grow, and revolve around their schools. Closing schools will "close" small town Saskatchewan. Nearby schools are at maximum capacity and there are great concerns for distance, safety, and time spent on buses for rural children. We need a permanent high school plan to accommodate the best interests of our students, their families, and our community, as well as a permanent high school transportation plan. We would rather our students be part of a smaller school, than being in overcrowded classrooms in larger centers. This is one of the reasons people choose to reside in rural areas. Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in. In Mr. Perrin's report the opening letter to Minister Morgan states that ALL stakeholders who approached Mr. Perrin for conversation UNANIMOUSLY support elected boards and NO more amalgamations! WHY would we continue with pursuing drastic changes? Education needs to be kept at the highest of standards so that we have an educated work force that can get jobs! Otherwise, our whole economy will suffer! Regards,

It is with great concern that I want to respond to the Perrin's Report. In spite of the many vague generalities that it seems to bring forth, I am concerned that it points toward removing some very basic principles that form our democratic system. The possible removal of local elected representation in the public education system only brings with it a further deterioration of the small community and the voice of the people. The governing from an increased distance seems to suggest a one solution fits all. Our province is so much more diverse than that. This is a generational life altering proposal that seems to be rushed through with little time for thought provoking participation by the principle stakeholders. Perhaps another stretching of the democratic process. If our educational system is to put the wellbeing of the student first, then more years of amalgamation rising to the forefront is at best questionable. I like to think that the education system is primarily or wholly about the children. Are many of the proposals about their welfare or is that only cursory to the financial woes of the current "democratic" government.

I am opposed to the amalgamation of school divisions. Please keep our boards local with locally elected representation.

Why is this massive change being pushed through? Granted more analysis would just end up costing us more as taxpayers. Why is there no \$ amount provided on the costs of the proposed options? If board members are appointed, who is our elected voice? How will unique school divisions (or dual track schools such as ours!) have any say in decisions? Why is there very little mention of students in the 35 page report? Why these models? (That are unproven nationwide) While I currently don't have children in the system I will soon. I feel there has been little said about the decisions publicly as it does affect people who may not currently have children in school. Our youth are our future and adjusting their education without knowing the outcome is very scary.

Good morning! As a home educating family we would respectfully request the following items: 1) That SHBE and HSLDA be counted as stakeholders in these discussions; 2) That the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students; and 3) That any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators.

I have read the report and attended our SCC meeting and info meeting held in Melfort. I do not have enough information to support the proposed changes and I don't think the panel has enough information to make any decisions at this point. These proposed changes will impact our children's education and the day to day operations within our schools far more that the potential savings. I think the panel and powers that be need to spend a bit more time looking at the impact of these potential amalgamations and how they will impact our children's education. I cannot support the proposed changes. I like and appreciate having people from the same community we live in, represent the school that our children attend. There are numerous benefits from this I see being lost through amalgamation. Thank you.

K-12 Education Governance Review Advisory Panel: After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report I would offer the following feedback: We do not support any of the three models presented in the report and ultimately we wish to remain a part of Prairie Valley School Division. We do support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). Currently under the direction of the Prairie Valley School Division we celebrate some of the highest performance scores in Reading and Math as well as extraordinary High School graduation rates. What guarantee is there that these standards of excellence will be maintained through provincial amalgamations? It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! We do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. Our current Prairie Valley School Division board member is very visible in our schools and community. Provincially appointed board members will not be as accessible, nor will they know their communities' needs. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support the change to governance or how further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. We have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold. Rural communities thrive, grow, and revolve around their schools. Closing schools will "close" small town Saskatchewan. Nearby schools are at maximum capacity and there are great concerns for distance, safety, and time spent on buses for rural children. We need a permanent high school plan to accommodate the best interests of our students, their families, and our community, as well as a permanent high school transportation plan. We would rather our students be part of a smaller school, than being in overcrowded classrooms in larger centers. This is one of the reasons people choose to reside in rural areas. Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in. In Mr. Perrin's report the opening letter to Minister Morgan states that ALL stakeholders who approached Mr. Perrin for conversation UNANIMOUSLY support elected boards and NO more amalgamations! WHY would we continue with pursuing drastic changes? Education needs to be kept at the highest of standards so that we have an educated work force that can get jobs! Otherwise, our whole economy will suffer! Regards,

Dear Minister Morgan: I am writing on behalf of The _____ School Community Council. The SCC _____ totally supports our board and we feel that to change this system would be detrimental to everybody concerned. Our school board provides voice and also represents students and teachers as well as the whole community. I personally feel as well as many others that having everything run by people sitting in an office in Regina is a waste of time. Do any of you actually know where _____ is? What can you possibly bring to our school unless you have been here? Forced amalgamation will disrupt our students and their learning. Our school divisions are large enough to run efficiently and additional amalgamation will not cut the costs at all. We have a lot of concerns about the impact this could have on our rural schools, vulnerable students, quality of education etc. We trust our school division will continue to find efficiencies that will not detract from the quality of education that our kids are receiving. We feel that as a rural school our school divisions have our children's best interest at heart and people in Regina won't be able to see that. Just because we are a rural school doesn't mean that our children are no better than children from a city school, they should be seen as an investment in the future of all Saskatchewan industry and not as a way to save money. Amalgamating school divisions DOES NOT benefit the students or their educational needs. As the Minister responsible for education, we are strongly urging you to oppose this amalgamation of our school divisions and also oppose government appointed school boards. Things as important as this should not be decided by a few people who think that they know better than everybody else, instead it should be allowed to be discussed through the proper channels with the people who are going to be affected by this, teachers, community but most of all the students. They are the priority in this, students are the reason that they want an amalgamation in the first place, why not ask the students what they want to happen, after all they are the future generation of the same type of people who will be sitting on boards of some sort one day. IT'S THEIR EDUCATION, IT'S THEIR LIFE, IT'S THEIR CHOICE. I really hope that you do what's right for the children and not just because you want to save money. Yours Sincerely _____

As the school community council for _____ we wish to express our concerns about the future of the provincial education system. In our role, we support the school's administration and staff to achieve better outcomes for all students. We also provide vital feedback to our school board when it comes to matters affecting our school community. With respect to the future of the provincial education system, the students are the top priority. We are concerned that some of the issues being considered do not reflect priorities for our students. Community voice will be lost if locally elected school boards are dissolved or school divisions made substantially larger. Reductions to education funding found through efficiencies may result in losses for our students that cannot be easily rectified. Students' success is fostered by a community working together to support their educational journey, an investment in our future. Further cuts and widespread changes will only deplete our most important resource--our children.

I don't like any of these options. Small communities are going to suffer again!

If the Governments proposed changes become a reality we will all be in big trouble as they will be stealing from our greatest resource, 'our children-our future leaders'.

My thoughts are that it is imperative to keep the school divisions separate as the need for a Catholic education would be lost if the school divisions were combined. There needs to be a stronger voice within our schools to stress the importance of why it is a Catholic School and I personally feel that we need to have religion back in the classroom rather than leaving it all up to the parents/church. Parents need more of a voice when it comes to making decisions about the education of their children. Too many decisions are being made in regards to the financial constraints rather than what is needed for the children within these school divisions. I have also seen a lot of wasted time and resources being spent in the classes in which children are not learning, however, having lots of free time and fun activities. Seems to be lots of days in which the kids are going on field trips and too many days off school. The days of educational time spent in the classroom has decreased greatly as it seems that every year the school year is becoming shorter with more time off. The ratio of students that are passing through the system without completing their grade level needs to be assessed. I understand we want student success and for students not to have the fear of failure, however, too many children are making it through school with horrible English and Math skills. Just passing kids for the sake of passing needs to be reviewed. If kids are not passing they need to be held back. Once these kids get to high school they are lost in the system and hardly make it through to graduation.

My vote is option 3b if one has to be picked but I'm wondering why this massive change is being pushed through? Why was there no \$ amounts given in the proposed options? If board members are appointed who is our elected voice? How will rural and unique school divisions have a say, in decisions that affect them the most? Why these unproven models? Most of all why is there very little mention of the students in the 35 page report, they should be and are our #1 concern! A very concerned parent,

Not sure why we need to Amalgamate again. I do not see this saving \$ in the long run and cannot see how we can be efficient and grow as a teacher/school if there are less school divisions. I, once again, see our students' education being affected in a negative way. Hopefully, you will reconsider these changes.

I am writing to you to express my grave concerns about the possible amalgamation of the Lloydminster Public School Division. I have been a teacher in this Division for the past years and have always been very proud of the high standard of education that has been provided here. Our academic record speaks for itself in terms of the Divisions' commitment to following current best practices and providing much needed supports to both students and teachers. Having local administration and a local elected school board that understands the complexities and needs of a bi-provincial city has also been invaluable. Navigating the complexities of being part of two provinces is very difficult and requires an expertise that not many people have. Unless you are in the situation, it is difficult to understand the time, energy and fortitude that it takes to advocate to make sure that all students are provided for equally, regardless of the province in which they reside. I have closely followed the current amalgamation talks and I feel that Lloydminster Public School Division should be exempted from the current amalgamation proposals. The Alberta taxpayers of Lloydminster deserve to have a say in the education of their children. Their tax dollars provide financing for the School Division and I believe that as stake holders they should retain the right to representation through a locally elected school board. Lloydminster Public has always prided itself in providing equitable opportunities for all children. Politics, financing and legislation should not be the primary concern in Education. The most important goal in Education should be the education and well-being of the children we are educating. Great education requires a combination of great teachers, adequate resources and school environments that are positive, progressive and work hard to foster great teacher-student relationships. I have all of these things in my current position at LPSD. I am respectfully asking that you would consider allowing LPSD to maintain the status quo and continue to provide the best education possible for our students.

For 15 years the Sask Party has squelched discussions on making education better and cheaper. First busses and buildings need to be turned over to the municipalities. Bussing was an answer 60 years ago when country schools were closed and every section had a farm family. Some municipalities would decide to keep busses where the density of ratepayers is high. Cities could rationalize the four bus systems into one good service. Buildings would serve schools and the community. Library, arts facilities, and recreation could serve both education and the general public. Large public libraries just across or down the street from large high schools can be found in newer sections of both our cities. If we go to one undemocratic, politically correct, manager of political appointments, we should keep the present school division administrations. Education could then function and roles could evolve in a studied fashion.

As a parent of children who have and are attending Regina Catholic Schools I value the dedication, direction, representation, and management of our local school board. I do not believe that amalgamating school divisions or boards would be in the best interests of our children or our families. However, I believe there could be better communication and coordination between the catholic and public school systems so that school holidays are more aligned. I still think that the majority of the school board should be elected so that the needs of parents and children can be properly represented. I am open however to having a few government-appointed board members with a specific skill set in the field of education and management to help improve and maintain the ministry's policies and procedures as well as monitor the financial management and operation of each division. Whatever decision is made in regards to the governance of education in this province the determining factor must be, "What is in the best interest of our children?" Cutting corners on our children's education will only lead to under-educated adults for our future. The governance of schools cannot just be a top down approach it must be a coordinated, cooperative, and communicative model that incorporates the needs of students, educators, administrators, parents, communities and governments alike.

I realize that times are tough in Saskatchewan. For better or worse we have all of our eggs in one basket, oil and potash. The key to diversifying our economy is education. Cutting costs, at the expense of our children and future, is short sighted and wrong. Research indicates that there is a strong correlation between the amount of money put into an education system and student results. In life you don't get "something for nothing". If you cut money to education expect our children, who are the future leaders of our province, to suffer. P.S. For the sake of accountability I only hope that there will be an amalgamation of RMs in the future.

I don't think changing or amalgamation of the current school division is a good idea. I live and teach in a rural area. Rural Saskatchewan is not the same as the urban areas. By appointing a group of people to make decisions on my area of the province who know nothing of the people and what happens in the North East, I don't feel that this is fair to the children of this area. Don't believe me- come to my school in _____ and see that we are more than a school, we are a family and learning happens in extraordinary ways. The students in my school are polite and generous. They care for each other and their community in ways that city people can't fathom. There is a history here that unites us, as a people, as a community, as a group with common knowledge. We are unique and we are special. Only a person who was raised in this kind of environment knows the intricacies of how to care for and maintain our unique lives. We do not take lightly disturbing what we have built. Because in the North East we have built amazing communities with amazing people in them. Once you have lived here you will forever have a part of yourself entrenched in the North East. We are hard workers; most of us have ties to the land around us and are not afraid to get our hands dirty. And we are patient because we know that good things come to those that wait. But do not be fooled into thinking that those things make us weak- we may have to travel to go to stores that you take for granted but we value what we get because we have to work harder to get it. A person in an urban environment does not understand who we are and to make decisions about our children's education is ridiculous. Less than 100 years ago my great grandparents started a school with the families in their area, it was 1 room and there was 20 students from Grades 1-8. The only high school was 15 miles away and it required knowing someone in the community to live with because travel was not an option. My grandfather was proud of the education he got in the one room school house. All that remains of that school is a sign on a farm but that is what we in the North East come from, people who built what they needed to better their children's lives and we have not changed, we still want what is best for our children. The proposals that your government has put forth are not what is in our children's best interest.

I don't believe any options presented by Mr. Perrins are beneficial to the future of our province. Reducing the number of school divisions will reduce the quality of education for our students and directly impact the performance of the Teachers and Support Staff. School Divisions are already large enough. We have the largest divisions per kilometer of any of the provinces. Locally elected boards are a necessity for smaller communities to have a say in what will affect their children. School Divisions are already stretched very thin and any further cuts will dramatically impact the future leaders of this province. The financial overhead involved with further amalgamation will further add to our \$1.2 billion deficit, not help tackle it. It will also greatly impact the moral of staff like it did in the original amalgamation. If you want Saskatchewan to be in good hands in the future, please DO NOT cut any further from education.

Our divisions are large enough already. Further amalgamation would only serve to distract from our important job of teaching children. Speaking about our division, we are already lean and services are spread thin. More resources, i.e. money, needs to be invested in education, not less. Less resources will only lead to doing more with less and 'making do'. Our children, our future, deserve better. Locally elected school boards protect the specific interests of their division. The further away they are from the front line, the greater the issues become and all will suffer.

We are a group of parents from Prairie Spirit School Division (PSSD) who have children with exceptional medical, behavioural and learning needs. We also have concerned parents who have been working with us whose children do not have exceptional needs. Up until this year, we considered ourselves to be success stories and examples of how children with exceptional needs can and do achieve with the right supports. Last year, PSSD cut 74 frontline positions, 60 of which were Educational Associates who not only helped our children, but also managed school libraries. Our children were directly affected by these cuts, and

Based on our experience going through the entire process outlined by legislation for parent complaints, we have made some observations regarding governance in education from a shareholder (parent) perspective. A key observation we've made that is directly related to the work of the task force is that the current governance model has set up a situation where it is very much "us" vs "them" between the school division and the Ministry of Education. Instead of everyone working together and solving the problem, our issue has remained stuck because of this, leaving our children caught in the middle. Although our school is working very hard with the resources that they have, all children are impacted by this current situation, not just those who directly need EA supports. As parents, our primary concerns with respect to governance in education are equity for all students across all school divisions, accountability to shareholders, and participation opportunities for stakeholders, including parents and front-line staff in the classroom. We strongly support all the recommendations made by Mr. Perrins on page 20 of his report, under the heading "Shifts in Governance." We believe the recommendations in this section are the key to success in improving K-12 education governance in Saskatchewan, regardless of which one of the four model options is implemented. In particular, reinforcing the role and value of the school community councils will be valuable in ensuring parents have a stronger voice. Oversight and standardization across school divisions would also be very valuable in ensuring equity for all students. We are concerned that amalgamating school boards would further depersonalize families and limit their voice and participation. Based on our experiences so far, we have observed that processes within our school board are already very long and cumbersome and a larger school board could make these processes even more difficult to navigate. Each school division has their own unique set of needs and school boards should be able to react to their own local issues. This could be solved by a needs-based approach to services vs the current formula-based approach where resources to a school are determined by funding and population. Whether K-12 education is governed by boards similar to what we have now or one large super-board, we support a model where the needs of children come first and parents have a voice. With the current governance model for education, parents with valid concerns for their children's education are not being heard, there is little to no recourse available to parents with concerns, there are issues with transparency and accountability, and a great divide exists between some school boards and the Ministry of Education. We believe strongly that support for children's learning, behavioural and medical needs should be equitable and based on needs, not a formula. We look forward to seeing these issues addressed in the future by implementing the suggestions on page 20 of Dan Perrins's report. In closing, we'd like to thank you for the opportunity to participate and for considering our comments. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any further questions or if we can be of any further assistance in this process.

Can the gov't really say there is no support for a tax increase? Everyone knows that a simple 1% increase to the PST (wall can even call it a temporary measure tied to resource price rebound), will raise the required billion dollars and keep our school, hospitals, etc. moving forward. I find it strange that public service employees did not share in the resource boom, but are asked to now shoulder the cost of low commodity prices.

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Education Governance Review Report we would offer the following feedback: We do not feel that the options presented in this report will result in significant cost savings without negatively impacting the quality of education of our students, eroding community voice, and affecting the sustainability of our community. (1) We support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for students and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). (2) We do not support the concept of an appointed Board of Education. We believe local voice is an essential part of a successful school-community relationship. (3) We do not support any of the 3 models presented in the report. We feel forced amalgamation puts our school, and many like it, at risk of closure. (4) We want to know what potential changes there will be to the rural school closure thresholds that are currently legislated. We feel this is a critical consideration in evaluating the options. (5) We would like to see a permanent solution for high school transportation and are concerned what impact forced amalgamation will have on bus ride times for our students. (6) We believe that further progress can be made in existing school divisions to find sector-wide efficiencies and cost-savings and recognize that the government may need to be more directive in requiring these sector-wide efficiencies to be realized.

Resident of Grand Coulee.

What concerns me personally, not speaking on behalf of our SCC, is the lack of support that new Canadians receive within the school system. Financial support is there generally for the families however the schools are over capacity in class rooms and Educational Assistants in those class rooms. It seems that the focus is on those that are top achievers and those that need a great deal of help however the middle of the pack are the ones that can fall through the cracks. Before opening the doors to new students the impact of overcrowding must be addressed. It is wonderful that we can help so many people from around the world but it appears as though after they get here there are no provisions made for students as a whole. Someone will lose out. It is my fear that the average student who currently has no urgent needs will fall through the cracks and suddenly fall into the area where great support is required. When concerns like this are asked of the SPSB, the response is "we are working to assure this doesn't happen but contact your MLA. This causes to question: what is the purpose of the board. The mill rate is handled by the Department, the community councils are supposed to be the eyes and ears for the Department on the ground floor, but it has been 8 years since the SPSB or the Government has asked the council's to assist in the Strategic Plan. We are informed as to the Strategic Plan from the Government; the school administration passes along the Strat Plan to the councils and then we look to support it. SCC was created to bridge the gap between students, teachers, administration and the board I thought. I don't see a lot of input other than two hours a week twice a year for SCC assembly's to connect with Government or the Board.

I read the Educational Governance Review Report by Dan Perrins and would strongly advise that the government NOT pursue changes to the existing governance structure. After reading the report, it strikes me that numerous reviews of school governance and the performance of the education system have taken place in the past 25 years. Many changes have already taken place and the report correctly indicates on page 19 that there is considerable complexity and cost of achieving change. The current cost of the governance structure is 0.6% of total operational funding (page 15); I believe any changes to the governance structure will only cost the province more. The report also indicates, in many places, how important it is to have strong local leadership and to preserve and strengthen parent and community voices. Moving to a system with more direct provincial government control would undermine the objectives of local leadership and it would seem to also run counter to the Sask Party Plan for Growth that is committed to "deliver smaller and more effective government" (Page 3). The current governance structure works and we are only now beginning to see the benefits of the last changes and amalgamation. This is demonstrated by the cost savings already achieved (page 14) where the Provincial Leadership Team (PLT) pursuing the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP) beat their target savings objective in both magnitude and timeline delivering over \$8 million dollars in savings one year ahead of schedule. The work done by the PLT toward becoming more efficient was significant and demonstrates that clearly these stakeholders know what needs to be done. It is striking that in their Efficiency Priority Heat Map, changing the governance structure is not considered to be a cost savings nor is it considered to bring more efficiency to the sector. Clearly the relationship between the ministry and the boards must improve. The ministry appears to have no trust in the board. The ministry does need a mechanism to establish standards of performance and assess the performance of each school division and board (using PISA/PCAP/or the 3 year graduation rate benchmark). It would be a mistake to expect more progress on the goals of the ESSP by transitioning to a centralized governance structure.

This is totally unnecessary. I feel this is a waste of time, energy and most importantly money. Don't see how this benefits families, students or workers or improves the education of children. I can see however how it would diminish workers rights and collective agreements.

The Catholic School board is doing an excellent job. Provincial government interference would be detrimental to the quality of education and the ability for local parents to control their children's education.

Just to let you know I'm basing my concerns and views as a parent/guardian on my thirtieth year of putting my children through school, and what I have experienced. My concerns are: If this transition comes into play, I think it's just a cost cutting approach, which will affect the educators the services that are certainly available, but more importantly the children. You need to take a strong long look at how this is going to affect our children's lives. They are the leaders of tomorrow! As for education they need to have the best. The loss of the values, the religious aspect of the Catholic School system. I would not want to see the uniqueness of the Catholic school system disappear. The parent's voice won't be heard, as the system will become too large and therefore it won't be able to accommodate what the parent has to say. In my own experience I have had to go through many people to get help for my granddaughter over the years. I fear that if the system becomes one, the difficulties to get answers and help for children like my granddaughter will only get harder. Also the concern of a child with disabilities. I have noticed the support differs between the two school systems. If there is one school system, will it reevaluate the support so these children aren't left without the proper support they need?

I am opposed to amalgamation of the school divisions. Please keep our boards local with locally elected representation.

As a member of the Board of Education with Saskatoon Public Schools I would like to put forward the following comments for consideration. To begin, any changes in governance structure must keep student at the core and ensure the quality of education is not eroded in the process. Student learning and wellbeing must be the guiding principle for any change with intended and unintended consequences considered. I believe locally elected Public School Boards are the best vehicle to serve the needs of a diverse student population. The current budget and economic downturn has created funding challenges in education and we want to work with the Ministry to be a part of the solution. SPSD has been able to work effectively with School Community Councils, local organizations and levels of government to provide positive, beneficial outcomes for students. Many of these initiatives has been achievable because of a close, connected relationship the Board is able to maintain, learn from and build with the larger community. SPSD has been able to build relationships with partners to advance learning outcomes for all students and I do not believe this would be possible under a one Public School board scenario. The ground breaking partnership developed with Whitecap Dakota First Nation is a great example of this. Building the relationship to reach an agreement took over 15 years. A major contributing factor leading to the agreement was the ability to quickly and collaboratively address the many issues which arose directly between local governing bodies. I believe the flexibility and agility under which the Partnership was formed would be lost under a single Board Governance structure. This concept is echoed through the many relationships and Partnerships SPSD has established including the Open Door Society, STC, CUMFI and others. Building these relationships and having the autonomy to do so have had a direct, tangible and positive impact on students and student learning. While I realize the Province in under considerable fiscal restraints, I am unclear how any of the four options presented by Perrins would significantly decrease costs and improve student outcomes. SPSD has been able to work with other School Divisions to find efficiencies and this work continues. I am certain efficiencies can be found among all of the Provinces School Boards but less certain a single Public school Board is the way to find and achieve these. Certain business functions would be incremental for the larger divisions to administrate such as payroll, IT, resource purchase etc. and perhaps looking at these areas could result in savings without the loss of local voice. On the point of elected versus appointed Boards , I understand the rationale to be the ability to ensure a particular skill set is housed among board members as well as representatives from the Indigenous community. I agree having a skilled Board is critically important but not at the cost of undermining the democratic process. Board members are chosen by the Public because of the skill set they have and training is easily provided to round out any areas the Board collectively lacks. On the note of ensuring Indigenous representation, the Aboriginal Constituency of the Saskatchewan School Boards Association has expressed its opposition to appointments to boards, preferring instead to see people on school boards elected to school boards. I concur with this opinion. In closing, I would like to highlight the work, initiatives and best practices SPSD has been able to accomplish are largely because we have a local voice which we can learn and receive guidance from. The Board has the flexibility and agility needed to identify and address changing trends in a single school year, all for the betterment of students. Best practices have been developed in SPSD because the ability to act quickly to implement change is available, in my opinion a single School Board would not has this ability, less effective and unable to support students as well. All of this is not to say changes are not needed. Additional efficiencies can be found, better outcomes for students can be achieved and Governance structures can always be improved. I would only humbly suggest any changes keep student wellbeing at the core value and local inclusion as the guiding voice.

Do not want to see a loss of an effective and accountable public voice. There are unintended consequences of amalgamations and appointed boards. Disagree completely with the parents having less say, control and input in my child's education. I want to be involved in her future and do not want to lose my input for her education. I feel it is very important for a parent to be involved in all aspects of the education system and do not want a loss of relationships with parents, parishes and community partners.

I don't believe any options presented by Mr. Perrin's are beneficial to the future of our province. By reducing the number of school divisions in the province, it will reduce the quality of education for our students and directly affect the performance of the individuals working for the school divisions. As it currently stands, many of the employees are already stretched thin and working outside of the scope of their positions in order to maintain a current standard. Any further changes will dramatically impact the future of our students. It is imperative that the school divisions remain the same and intact in order to provide proper education for our children.

I feel further amalgamations will prevent local voice and a loss of identity within our schools. I do not believe that amalgamations will save the government any more money. It will create chaos and have a deleterious effect on our schools and on our community. As well, appointed trustees will further decrease our voice in decisions that will affect our schools. This is a poor decision put forth by our government. I oppose amalgamations and appointed trustees.

I, like many, feel that school boards should be left localized. We pay taxes to our school and want to know that our student are getting the best education they deserve and by doing this we locally elect people that we know, and trust to voice what the people of our communities want. If it doesn't stay local then our students become just a number, rather than a local student.

I strongly believe in the elimination of public vs catholic schools. I believe that all schools should be public and if people want to send their kids to a catholic school then those should be made private. We are supposed to be an inclusive and non-discriminatory Country and this is not setting a good example. Going to one Board, consolidating at the top, I'm sure it's the best option to remain consistent throughout the decisions made within the public sector. I understand the growing population of Saskatchewan and the affect it's had on the number of students in schools, however grade 7 is very young age to be putting kids in high school. Earlier exposure to sex, drugs and alcohol are very concerning. Our school system in Canada is severely outdated, the Pythagorean theorem is certainly not something children will need to know but they spend a lot of time learning, just for an example. I also think that a child being out of school all summer long affects their ability to retain information and as a result the teachers are left to struggle at the beginning of every year to bring the kids back up to where they need to be. A more structured semester system would work best, perhaps 9 weeks on, 2 weeks off. Saskatchewan was the first in Medicare, let's be the first to implement a strategy that makes sense for the education system. I do appreciate the amount of technology being used in the classrooms and I am hopeful that it continues to expand. I really enjoy home logic and it gives me up to date information, that if I need to help my child because they are struggling, I see it at that time and am able to intervene rather than at the end of the semester. Thanks for the opportunity to submit comments. Cheers,

I believe in a democratically elected Board of Education and do not agree that a Board be appointed! A provincial appointed board will not be accessible - I want to continue to have a voice for my school and community! None of the 4 options in Perrins report are compared to the status quo JUST each other! Therefore none of the options show they will have a better impact on my son than what is currently in place! None of the options provided show they will save money compared to what we currently have in place! Also the 4 options ONLY include public school divisions - if the goal is to improve efficiencies how is it possible that these options are only for public school divisions and not separate school divisions? This makes absolutely no sense to me! I want an elected board and no amalgamation!

I am signing this petition because I care about the number one thing here: Our Children in Saskatchewan! Think of the future of these children. If anything MORE money needs to be allocated to schools to hire more teachers and more resources to help each and every child in their own way! Times have changed and so have the demands of these children! Taking away these individual school systems will jeopardize the learning of the children. These school boards and Divisions know that demands are needed within THIS area. You can't tell me every school all across Saskatchewan will have the same needs and demands. Some schools will be forgotten and some totally over looked! I am voicing my opinion and saying: Please Don't do this! Think of the children!

The word "amalgamation" frightens me as a parent and community member. For those of us that live in "rural" Saskatchewan it seems that the system "rural" does become overlooked with program, funding etc. I've seen this happen when "Amalgamation" occurred when the Saskatoon Health Region combined with Watson/Humboldt and surrounding area. Rurally didn't reap any benefits from that. And behold we are to watch as now the province will become "ONE" health region. Now the School divisions are doing same thing. You think this will save \$? Not after all upper management gets their severance packages etc. It'll be interesting to see how this all pans out and who will be 'negatively' affected.

I am a teacher and a parent. The changes to Saskatchewan Education that you propose are unacceptable. We need local elected representation on school boards across Saskatchewan who understand the needs of each community and can advocate specifically for the students in our unique communities. Not only do we need local representation we need to continue to have local boards so that parents, teachers and students can advocate their needs to board representatives who also have an invested interest in our community. Amalgamation means that fewer students will receive the educational support in a prompt and efficient way. Education is a community's effort to help our children grow and prosper to become citizens who contribute positively to our communities. Only a local board can understand what is needed to make this happen for individual students in my community. Making changes to education that are so significant and will cause so much change, based on costs and budget, is minimizing the importance of education and has the potential to fail a generation of children.

I wonder how the government can base big decisions on one sole report by one person, and carry through like it's going to be the real meal deal.

My general thoughts on amalgamation are negative. I am not in favor of it. I experienced it when living in Alberta health system) and it resulted in a "superpower" board that are high paid and do not listen to all the clientele they serve, notably the most rural or least "influential". As a rural resident my whole life, first in AB, and now in SK, amalgamation most often results in the rural communities losing services while paying more. Why? Because centralization always gravitates towards cities. This causes us to lose jobs, increase bus rides and reduces our say, as proportionally our population is low, even though our land mass is high. How many reps on the current advisory board are rural? How many will be in amalgamated boards?? We represent the largest land mass and lowest population. This is why we don't do well. Our needs are so different from urban areas, and we are never ever well represented by urban centric boards.

our school division has been operating fairly well within their budget. Our biggest neighbor, Saskatoon, has not taxed appropriately and as such has a HUGE debt. It is not a stretch to imagine we could be joined together with them, and we don't want to fund their debt. It is not incurred by us, nor is it fair to a division that has been run efficiently.

My children have the great privilege of being in French immersion, in a rural setting! How amazing is that! Our community is proud and passionate about this. Do you think in an amalgamation that this pride and protection will translate?! It is imperative to have elected members in our small areas who give a voice to our valid concerns and triumphs. If there are divisions that are not efficient, and not doing a good job, fix those divisions. Don't break what is working in other divisions. Reduce the number of administration, both in the provincial system as well as the school divisions themselves. Monitor closely the "training" dollars spent...locations and durations. Monitor the cost of adding new curriculum, and stop focusing on dumping technology in schools, which I think is a waste of money, really my kids do not need to experience smart boards, have access to laptops, and watch educational TV in school, so ridiculous (kids are provided technology at home!). Rural divisions do not do well in amalgamation. Please do not lump us in with "unlike divisions", where we lose our funding, lose our voice, and in the long run, lose our children.

I am writing to inform you that I am in strong support of our boards remaining local. I also strongly disagree with any further amalgamations. As a parent, I want a local representation and voice for my children's education. As someone who works as an interagency partner with both local school divisions I am very concerned about further amalgamations. Each school has its own unique challenges; each rural area requires its own level of support. Amalgamation takes away from the ability to meet those challenges in a way that is best for the students. The government needs to stop trying to make people just a number; they need to understand that you cannot production line people and services. It simply does not work. I ask that for once, the Sask Party listen to the people of Saskatchewan and make a decision that is supported by the majority.

I am appalled by the direction your party are taking our provincial public education system. It is clear that the real agenda is not saving money to address the deficit the SK Party has created, but rather to undermine public education. While SK Party MLAs voted themselves a big increase, they have cut educational funding, reneged on a legally negotiated contract, removed Education Assistants from classrooms where their incredible work allowed children with disabilities to benefit from education, and all without due process and consultation with the people who pay for the public system (citizens), and for whose benefit your government is legally required to work. This total mismanagement of education is all the more senseless and heinous given that proposed cuts WILL NOT address the massive deficit the SK Party has racked up during an unprecedented time of economic boom in our province. As a citizen and taxpayer, I want to see funding cuts to for-profit businesses into which the government has poured millions of dollars in subsidies. I want to see immediate wage cuts to MLAs, not a token "wage freeze" in 2018. I want to see repayment to the taxpayers for the excessive monies paid out in the Global Transportation Hub fiasco. Oh, and also a full review of this scam. I want to see all P3 contracts cancelled thus saving millions. No more overpriced infrastructure, instead fix the schools we already have. I want to see that never again will the SK Party pay out hundreds of thousands of dollars, or maybe millions - hard to say given the lack of transparency of this government - in court cases against working people (the loss at the Supreme Court level; paying for a case in BC against their provincial teachers federation!). I want to see class size reduced so teachers can actually teach and students can learn. I want to see all educational assistant positions restored and funded. I want control of curriculum and schools returned to educators, not under the thumb of politically-motivated politicians who have no idea about classroom management or children's learning needs, but rather are guided by an agenda to destroy public education, and substitute for-profit schools catering to their base. I hope I have made myself clear.

I am somewhat okay with the government's plan. That being said, this government has been 'rough' with teachers in the recent past. They have been disrespectful and condescending during bargaining negotiations and they led an awful smear campaign in the media. I am okay with taking a pay cut/no raise for the better of Saskatchewan, but let's see those MLA's take the first pay cut!

Thank you for inviting input regarding this very important change coming to our education system. After 23 years of teaching, _____, I am grateful for the opportunity to participate as education continues to evolve. I support making the education system less top heavy with administration and understand the need for cost reductions. However, any and all changes MUST result in direct benefits to students. Therefore, class sizes, teacher/pupil ratios, special programs, and reduced travel (bus) time must be improved or maintained by the imminent changes. Academic achievement is reported to be above average in Regina Beach and Lumsden schools, and all 3 schools' student population continues to grow. These are both indicators that students are being educated well and that increasing numbers of parents want to live outside of Regina to enjoy raising their families with access to quality education. It's important to remember our history when Lumsden Elementary was bursting at the seams and the construction of a school at Regina Beach gave all students the space and reduced travel time they deserved. The students and communities continue to thrive as a result of the additional school. Our schools and communities have been through two major (and disruptive) amalgamations and managed significant budget cuts --- we've trimmed all we can and simply can't manage any further amalgamations or budget cuts at this time. The three models presented for reorganizing our elected board members could be made even better if a blend of all three were to be implemented. If the number of board members is to be reduced, and appointed rather than elected, community members could (should) be allowed to apply for, and be interviewed by, the ministry rather than pure appointment. Many community people and educators are deeply dedicated to their schools and would not be known to the ministry without a call for applications. Once again, thank you for the opportunity to provide input. Please keep the faces of the students foremost in your minds as changes are made. Sincerely,

I do not support any of these options because I see them as being undemocratic, unnecessarily expensive and not centered on students. All of these options diminish workers' rights and collective agreements. The goal of restructuring school divisions in Saskatchewan must be to improve the delivery and quality of education to children, their families and communities. All students deserve a quality education system, safe and healthy learning environments and the supports to be successful.

I am extremely concerned about the direct ramifications our government is proposing in changing the governance of our education system. The education of our children depends on people who have their best interests in mind and not what is best for the Government and their pockets. The loss of effective public voice, less say, control and input into MY CHILD'S education and the loss of relationships with parishes and community partners are truly harmful to the future of this province's education system. It is truly sad that this government undervalues education so much that they want to destroy it.

Greetings, I would like to go on record to state that I oppose any plan that would change the status of the school board in Creighton Saskatchewan. Although there is only one school in the division, it is the lowest cost school division, and because of its geographical location, any travel time involved in a potential amalgamation with other divisions would not only be a burden, but would be costly and time consuming and have a direct impact on the quality of education for our students. Thank you.

Please leave our governance as it is. No one knows our kids better than the local boards that govern us. Every district is different and cannot be covered with one "blanket". The distinctiveness of the present governance continues to bring education to our children in the best way possible; there is no need to fix a wheel that is not broken.

Education for all is very important and standardizing education does help ensure that everyone has equal opportunity to partake in the learning experience. The tools to setup and support education should be available to all schools and teachers. Having standardized education ensures all students are receiving the same level of education across the province. The Catholic school division must also maintain control of what is taught in their schools. Teachings must align with Christian beliefs and values. This is why although school standardization is important; the Catholic School Division must continue to have a board of Representatives to align all aspects of teaching to Christian beliefs and values.

I would like to express my concern with having the school boards consolidated. It is very important that we retain our local school board members. They are part of our community and therefore know firsthand what is needed for our students, schools, and teachers. If consolidated you would be having a board member from a far distance trying to deal with problems that they know nothing about. We need to keep it local, and small. Our school division is too big already! Please listen to those that have taken the time to read the review and voice their opinion. We are speaking in the best interest of our CHILDREN! Thank-you,

As an employee of Regina Catholic Schools and a professional member of SASBO I completely support and agree with the formal response put forward by SASBO on my behalf.

I am disheartened by the very idea that locally elected individuals will no longer have any input into the education of our children. We teach our children the importance of democracy, the importance of working with your neighbours to achieve success, as those are the people who have the most influence on your life and vice versa. If the provincial government decides to implement Option 1 of the Perrin's Report, I am convinced that we are removing democracy and, therefore accountability, from our children's education system. This would be very difficult for me to explain to my children. Please consider another option!

I am deeply concerned by the government of Saskatchewan's proposal to make significant change to public education in Lloydminster. (1) The change does not apply equitably to both Catholic and public I would personally provide financial support to challenge the equality of access which is violated in this move. (2) While changes to the Lloydminster Charter - unbeknownst to ministries of education in both provinces - allow for amalgamation, this action requires significant change to the Lloydminster Charter creating separate boundaries, issues around the local levy, and elimination of seamless delivery which has been a fundamental principle guiding education in Lloydminster. (3) Alberta residents in Lloydminster will have no political access to education which will violate their rights guaranteed by Alberta legislation. All Albertans in Lloydminster are guaranteed the same rights provided all other Albertans and I would recommend strongly that Alberta does not sign an Order in Council as it would violate the constitutional rights of Albertans in Lloydminster. (4) This change does nothing to improve the quality of education in Lloydminster or Saskatchewan and simply increases the chaos in a system that has been floundering in mediocrity according to PISA results. I urge you in the strongest terms to ensure Lloydminster Public remain as it is in order to preserve the rights of both Saskatchewan and Alberta students and the integrity of the Lloydminster Charter. Leaving Lloydminster Public as it is will in no way undermine the direction you wish to pursue in the balance of Saskatchewan.

I have many concerns regarding the proposed changes to the Educational system in Saskatchewan. As a mother, grandmother and an educator, I strongly believe that the local voice in Education needs to continue to be a priority and to accomplish this school boards must remain locally elected. As an educator, I have experienced the disruption and confusion that the last round of forced amalgamations caused within our schools for students and educators. I would ask that this not occur again and that educators have the opportunity to continue to focus on student learning and supports.

To Whom it may Concern: I do not support any of the options to restructure our school divisions. I feel that this Government should be putting more interest into helping improve the quality of Education for our Children by putting this money into more Teachers and Support Staff. We have seen that amalgamation of school divisions are costly ventures, not putting the students' interests first. The goal of our Government should be to help build communities and families and I am afraid that with these options some communities may suffer. We need to help our children learn. They are the future. Please leave what we have alone. Sincerely

We need to keep the regions the way they are; we won't have a voice as a rural school. I'm concerned we will have our schools have more cutbacks and our kids are the future of we cut back so much they will never have a chance. We need to keep representation from all schools to keep things fair and on the right path. I'm quite concerned we will have no voice if the boards amalgamate. What is going to happen to rural students and the schools? We need to keep as much help and funding to our division so we can continue to raise these kids for a bright future. Please don't amalgamate.

I have a lot of concerns in regards to the options proposed. Here are just a few. You say that Saskatchewan has had low graduation rates over the last couple of years. If you do the math you will realize that the students that you are talking about would have been just starting out 10 years ago when the last forced amalgamation happened. I don't think this is just a coincidence. The students suffer when this happens and there is no cost savings so I don't see the positive. A question I have as a taxpayer and a parent to 2 children in this school division is where are my tax dollars going to be spent? Are they going to be kept and spent in the local area in which I live and my children go to school to better their education? Local school boards that are elected by the people in the community are important to everyone in the province. Not every city or town has the same needs in regards to learning, extracurricular activities and support needed. The local boards know what is important to the community and what our needs are because they live here too and chances are they have had a child or more go through the exact school system at one time. From where I stand I do not see a positive in the options that are being proposed. All that is going to happen is that the kids are going to suffer, lots of people are going to lose their jobs, the province still isn't going to save any money, unemployment in Saskatchewan is going to go through the roof or a lot of taxpayers are going to be forced to move out of province to find work. Again, I do not see the positive in any of this. Please don't ruin my children's education and the opportunity to become a contributing member of society. You have to realize that these children are the future so you are gambling with the future of the province.

I feel the changes being considered in our education can be very harmful to the entire education system. Locally elected boards can make better decisions around the education in their local communities. I feel smaller rural schools will suffer the most if divisions are made larger. Thank You.

Dear Honourable David Marit, MLA Wood River. I believe the current school division model is effective. Communities have a strong relationship with elected board members, which hear and act and serve us well. I feel this would not continue to occur without a community elected board or if amalgamation were to move forward. Without a community voice people may not answer directly to concerns and might make unilateral decisions which are not based on local needs. Further, keep an open mind to not considering amalgamation. Experts across the country have stated that there are little to no savings made with an amalgamation.

I understand changes are being considered in our education system. The importance of local voice and listening in each community is crucial. Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support the Chinook School Division and ask you to consider, and emphasize: 1. We need to keep our school boards locally elected and, 2. We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

As a parent of three children in the Saskatoon Public school division I believe that the school divisions should not be combined to one school division. I believe we should keep the status quo. I also believe that the government should consider increasing the PST before any cuts are made to Education. The increases lately to Education have been barely above the cost of inflation. Combined with making the school boards pay for the cost of the increase in teacher salaries this has led to less money overall in order to dedicate to our children and their continuing education. I agree that there are hard times ahead for Saskatchewan but making our children and the public sector pay for the mistakes of our government is just not right. Increase the PST and give more money to Education in order that we may be competitive on national and international levels. Thank you.

K-12 Education Governance Review Advisory Panel, After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report I would like to express my concerns with the options provided in the Educational Governance Review Report: I do not support any of the three models presented in the report and wish to remain a part of Prairie Valley School Division. The document options clearly acknowledge that changes to the current system may compromise student outcomes, reduce accountability, reduce community communication and access to decision makers, put more work on SCC's and disrupt our schools. The negatives far out way the positives. I do support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). I also support finding cost saving systems, strengthening our educational outcomes and standardizing expectation for of our Boards, but cannot support wide sweeping changes as proposed in the document. Could the current local structure not be maintained while centralizing the purchase of large items such as paper, IT equipment, copier machines and consolidating transportation? Although I understand budgetary restrictions, a lower teacher/student ratio is crucial for success of all students with regards to academic achievement and socio-emotional well-being. None of the three proposed plans support this fact. My husband and I just moved our kids to _____ School in October 2015 from _____ School in Regina and we would rather have our children / our students be part of a smaller school, than being in overcrowded classrooms in larger centers. This is one of the reasons people choose to reside in rural areas. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support that change to governance or further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! I do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. I value the connection our community has with our elected Board member and do not feel a move to appointed boards would benefit our remote community. I fear loss of our local voice will negatively impact our students experience and performance may suffer as a result. Our current Prairie Valley School Division board member is very visible in our schools and community. I have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold. Rural communities thrive, grow, and revolve around their schools. Closing schools will "close" small town Saskatchewan. I believe that all children should have equal opportunities and having public and separate education with separate funding does not support equality in education. Having any of these proposed models will not only affect how teachers are able to best deliver their course loads, but I question if the already limited access to current School Division Support Teams will further diminish (Support Team meaning: Occupational Therapists, Speech and Language Pathologists, Child and Family Support Workers, Social Workers, etc.). Nearby schools are at maximum capacity and there are great concerns for distance, safety, and time spent on buses for rural children. Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in.

Creighton Community School is an isolated school; I have had children go through the school. It has been a well-run school. I feel that the excellent / well run school would suffer if it is not left as it is. We have a very unique situation in Creighton, being remote, a border community, working with students that move back and forth from area reserves. Creighton has had a lot of success helping and keeping students in school. If things change, people - I will say down south do not understand the challenges that are faced in a community like Creighton.

I can't understand why the government is doing this if they have no \$ to implement this. Not only do I think that we are going backwards in education, I have heard that this model does not work well (as in Alberta) so why are we doing it? To save costs? I figure that those in the lofty higher up jobs should consider taking a pay cut and not penalize the teachers and support staff who are making barely enough to support their families. And shouldn't we be thinking what kind of quality of education we are giving our kids? Seems to me that it's all about the \$ and not what's important: our kids, their education and the support that we can provide them. **THEY NEED TO GET OVER THEIR SELFISHNESS AND THINK ABOUT THAT INSTEAD!**

Thank you for the opportunity to share my thoughts regarding the educational governance review report recently provided to the public. My first comment would be that while I recognize the need to develop a report of such quality due to the complexity of the issues, I find the report not very accessible either in terms of length or language, to the vast majority of parents who you are asking to respond. I am not saying there is not a need to write such a report and make the full report available to all, but I think more effort could have been done to also provide a more condensed version or perhaps even produce some type of survey that allows people to share their values and priorities around the question the report raises without needing to understand all the language and complexities of board governance. I would say I highly appreciate the desire to investigate the efficiency and effectiveness of our current governance models and the willingness to change things if needed. In my experience with different NGO's and having lived in Mexico in which the educational curriculum is governed centrally on a national level I do have some concerns with over centralization. Essentially I find that typically in these scenarios those making decisions and setting parameters for feedback and monitoring can be quite out of touch with the context of the "hands on" people who are implementing the resources. In this case I'm referring to both teachers and in the end, parents. In this type of structure, it is possible that while the ideas of the governing body seem good they don't actually work for the people trying to use them and they offer very little flexibility for the diversity of people who will use them. Therefore I suggest if the province decides to become more centralized in its educational governance, it is crucial that systems that allow for the "higher ups" to be in touch with and continue to appreciate and truly engage with the public are very important (both teachers and community members). I note there is a stark different between doing things that seemingly involve people but perhaps really aren't allowing people to engage in ways that value who they are and the insights they have - the length of the report we have been asked to read is perhaps one such example. While I value greatly the advice and insights of experts, I believe they also play a crucial role in knowing how to explain things that make sense to people and don't undervalue the ideas and opinions of the seemingly "non-experts." In the end, truly engaging people may take more work but will allow for more by-in, commitment and togetherness in the end - this I think is extremely important when we are speaking of the education of our children.

I'm concerned with what might happen in schools with less money. The school I work in needs so much attention to detail and detail costs money. How can anyone take from a child's education when children are our future? There are so many other things in a provincial budget that should be cut, rolled back or froze before you even consider education. Without education there will be no future for a lot of these children growing up. I beg you to consider other cuts before you cut from us. I'm totally OK with amalgamation but only if it benefits our education that is provided to the children. I sincerely hope that you listen to the people and figure out a way to improve on your decisions. I would also like to note that votes will be lost and a new government would likely be formed in the next election if you continue to head in this direction. Broken promises will get you nowhere, just like breaking education up.

The need for the province to be sectioned and have its own division is massive. If truly our main concern is "what is best for the kids" then everyone involved would see how the divisions are the best way. There is a smaller vein to travel to see problems resolved and changed made. There IS NOT a sense of being lost in the shuffle or put to the bottom of the list because of school size. This is what is best for the kids, teachers and community. As with our board and division we feel it's easy and the staff are approachable in division to contact and communicate with. Not to mention the students! Because after all, this is supposed to be about them. How is there to be a level of care, excellence, attentiveness, involvement and so many other factors if all we have is one umbrella type division. Please for the sake of our kids keep the divisions the way they are.

To the Honourable Premier Brad Wall: This letter may look like I am not a supporter of the Saskatchewan Party but that would be wrong. It is BECAUSE I am a supporter that I am responding. We have a billion dollar deficit and it needs to be addressed. Your education minister is stirring up a hornet's nest with consolidating Saskatchewan public school boards. There will be no savings to address the deficit. Any money that you will save in one hand will be paid out of the other hand. People will see the report for what it is - power and control. I can understand that the Minister of Education would like to have one Board that he would appoint; it would make his life much easier. His life is not supposed to be easy. It is a difficult job and probably the most important post in Saskatchewan. Educating the future generations will determine the prosperity of Saskatchewan for years to come. It is good to search for ways to reduce spending but the end result must be reasonable. If you want enemies then attack their children or their grandchildren. If you cannot understand the importance of having the school board being elected and local to the area than you are not the Premier that I thought you were. Lloydminster is a unique situation where half of the citizens reside on the Alberta side.

I have attended schools in both Alberta and Saskatchewan without giving any thought to the border. We are in some difficult economic times and we must live within our means. Lead by example and have all elected officials take a 10% pay cut and make it known that civil servants across the board will take a 5% pay cut with no layoffs. Ensure that everyone knows that when the economy improves the civil servant's wages will be the first to go back up. Hold off on all capital expenditures. Increase existing taxes as a last resort. Do not add new taxes.

I do not believe that further amalgamations of school divisions is in the best interest of the rural students in Saskatchewan and will have a negative effect on everyone in the school system, teachers, students, boards, and the communities as a whole. There has to be more effective, less destructive ways to reduce costs. The models presented in the Educational Review Report are not supported by anyone in our household and we wish to remain part of the Prairie Valley School Division. I do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members and we need to have locally appointed boards so that the members of the community and as parents of students continue to have a voice in what happens in our areas. I believe that there will be deep impacts of our school system in rural Saskatchewan if the changes occur as to what is being proposed. Rural communities need their own schools and separate school divisions to provide the best education to the students. I for one, moved specifically to a small town because my husband and I did not want our children to go to a big city school where they really become a number lost among the crown of hundreds of other students. My hope is that all of the proposed education models do not proceed and that the public is heard in regards to their thoughts and opinions of how these amalgamations are going to negatively impact the students.

Transportation for rural school divisions need to be addressed for both high school and elementary school students. As well, thresholds for school closures for rural communities. Elected official that represent our needs as a community not just as a whole.

Lloydminster is a unique bi-provincial community which has successfully maintained an equitable standard of living under our charter for over 84 years. As a resident of the city for my entire life, I have lived on both sides of the border. Throughout my life I have never really noticed a Saskatchewan/Alberta divide. The proposed governance changes to education in Saskatchewan will create a divide in our city. As a citizen and an educator, I see how impactful our unique bi-provincial structure is to ensuring equitable access to education for students in Lloydminster. Proposed changes in the Perrins report have not taken in to account the seamless delivery model which allows both the public and catholic school divisions to respond to the learning needs of students throughout the city. I strongly recommend the government to reconsider the changes for the Province, and remove Lloydminster from being included with these changes. Many local leaders, administrators, teachers, and community members have worked effortlessly over the past decades to create a system which is fair, cost effective, and academically successful for the residents. Please keep student learning and success at the forefront of decision making.

Lloydminster is a distinctive city which continually deals with change from two governing bodies. Education in Lloydminster is valued by the residents and it is the unique structure which makes our system so valuable. As a parent and a teacher, I have great reservations and fear of the proposed changes to educational governance in the Province. Losing local autonomy would not only be destructive to our system, but it would also fail to accomplish any financial gains that the Government may be looking for. The relationships between the Boards, Division Administration, the Governments, and teachers are essential to maintaining a high quality system of education that focuses on student success. I am gravely concerned what education will look like for my son if the governance structures are to change and the city is left with serious challenges when it comes to appropriately funding programming. Changes to the current structure will definitely have an impact on student opportunity and student success throughout the city.

My general thoughts on amalgamation are negative. I am not in favor of it. I experienced it when living in Alberta health system) and it resulted in a "superpower" board that are high paid and do not listen to all the clientele they serve, notably the most rural or least "influential". As a rural resident my whole life, first in AB, and now in SK, amalgamation most often results in the rural communities losing services while paying more. Why? Because centralization always gravitates towards cities. This causes us to lose jobs, increase bus rides and reduces our say, as proportionally our population is low, even though our land mass is high. How many reps on the current advisory board are rural?? How many will be in amalgamated boards?? We represent the largest land mass, and lowest population. This is why we don't do well. Our needs are so different from urban areas, and we are never ever well represented by urban centric boards.

our school division has been operating fairly well within their budget. Our biggest neighbor, Saskatoon, has not taxed appropriately and as such has a HUGE debt. It is not a stretch to imagine we could be joined together with them...and we don't want to fund their debt. It is not incurred by us, nor is it fair to a division that has been run efficiently.

y children have the great privilege of being in French immersion, in a rural setting! How amazing is that! Our community is proud and passionate about this. Do you think in an amalgamation that this pride and protection will translate?! It is imperative to have elected members in our small areas who give a voice to our valid concerns and triumphs. If there are divisions that are not efficient, and not doing a good job, fix those divisions. Don't break what is working in other divisions. Reduce the number of administration, both in the provincial system as well as the school divisions themselves. Monitor closely the "training" dollars spent...locations and durations. Monitor the cost of adding new curriculum, and stop focusing on dumping technology in schools, which I think is a waste of money, really my kids do not need to experience smart boards, have access to laptops, and watch educational TV in school, so ridiculous! (Kids are provided technology at home!!). Rural divisions do not do well in amalgamation. Please do not lump us in with "unlike divisions", where we lose our funding, lose our voice, and in the long run, lose our children. When I read the report I identified two issues; financial vulnerability of the provincial government to school divisions and educational achievement of students across the province. The 3 options presented are traditional solutions to these symptoms. My feedback would be to inject more creativity to the problem solving approach. Amalgamating school division to a centralized urban location may solve the financial responsibility issue but leaves the grassroots parent driven education effort feeling muted and erodes educational achievement possibilities. The status quo can be improved for possible administrative savings and delivery of resources to students. My suggestion would be to consolidate capital planning and expenditures to a regional structure. A structure that allows for knowledgeable people with expertise with the bricks and mortar of education. Make some small changes to the divisional structure that keeps the base of the education (parents) involved and invested in their local students. As for the on reserve issues of student achievement and how education is delivered in our remote northern expanses of our beautiful province I don't have knowledge to comment on the broader social and cultural issues that result in the dismal student attendance and achievement. But I hardly think this will be solved by changing boundaries or amalgamating regions. Be creative, look for examples that are working globally. Please don't just perform the usual government mantra of amalgamation. It is hard to undo hastily made decisions that create unintended consequences greater than the intended solution to the problem.

I am writing today in response to the K-12 Educational Governance Review.

I have reviewed the report by Dan Perrins and have deep concern regarding the future of my children's education if changes happen within our province as they have been proposed by Mr. Perrins. They are as follows: 1) The first concern I have is that all four options given for consideration are all completely opposite of what the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, Service Employees International Union, Saskatchewan School Boards Association, SSBA Public and Catholic sections and Saskatchewan Association of School Business officials, as well as a parent group, the opposition education critic and members of the general public unanimously stated. Unanimous support for elected boards. Unanimous support for no more amalgamation. Unanimous support. Not majority. These associations are made up of the people that work hands on with the children of Saskatchewan. My children. If this report is truly about what's best for the education of our children, why was there not an option that encompassed what our front line workers supported? 2) Another concern I have is that this potential change would only affect 18 out of 28 of our school divisions. How can these changes create "efficiency" within our province when two programs will have to be run? 10 school divisions would still have elected boards and 18 would have a provincially appointed authority. How is running two separate systems efficient? What will happen to our P3 schools where there is regular public school, French Immersion and Catholic schools? These are brand new schools that the province has built, and now they will be run by two separate governing systems? If the proposed changes have such

great efficiency, why would it then exclude ten of our school divisions? All the time and resources spent to create efficiency would only be spent to be recuperated from a little over half of the divisions within our province. 3) As planning for the 2017-2018 school year has already begun, when exactly does the government plan on making these changes? Will the plans already in place be scrapped? This would be a waste of time and money, which could both be put toward our children. The Perrins Report repeatedly states that the goal is to create efficiency. We all want efficiency, which is true. However, how long will it take to make all these changes to a point where efficiency has been created? Change takes money and time. Money our province simply does not have. Surely there are other changes that can be made where money can be saved. If these changes take five years, meaning five years of transition within his education. This will be reflected in the classroom. These years cannot be recuperated.

These changes have lifelong effects for our children, whom are the future of our province. This disruption inevitably will slow down progress towards educational goals that teachers are working towards within the classroom. How long do you predict it will take until these "efficiencies" are realized tangibly? I think you really need to ask yourself, are we spending a dollar to save a nickel? It seems as though Saskatchewan is trying to get into the "business of education". 4) Accountability is a major concern of mine, and the many parents I have spoken with. With having a locally elected school board, there are essentially two levels of accountability, the elected trustee is accountable to the community which placed their support behind them, and then together as a school board, the school board is accountable to the provincial government. If the province changes to a single "super-board" as already has been done with our provincial healthcare system, one level of accountability is removed. People will be appointed to positions that have deciding authority when it comes to my children's education. This is their job, not one that they have volunteered for or receiving a small per diem for. One might argue that the person appointed to make these decisions would have an education in this area, but there is value in having a board of people, from all walks of life, all with a conviction to stand up and work for better education for our children. It is said "two eyes are better than one". It can also be said that there is value in having a table of opinion, thought and experience, which would be lost if Saskatchewan went to a single provincial system. I spent some time reviewing the Saskatchewan School Boards website in preparation for this email and I found a statement on the Vision 2025 document that I thought was quite fitting that I would like to share. It says: "Public education is best governed by locally elected accountable boards of education who: (a) Require valid and reliable information to guide the decisions they make, (b) Receive the supports they require to ensure all students have the opportunity to learn, and (c) Have the autonomy to make decisions in the best interests of the students and communities they serve. They require sufficient, equitable, sustainable, predictable, transparent funding to fulfill their mandate of educating students. Value and respect the role of all education and community partners" http://saskschoolboards.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Oct12_StrategicPlan_2013-2025.pdf 5) By the removal of publicly elected school boards, you are removing the democratic process from education. You are removing my right to vote for who I place my trust in to run my children's school division. Education is public, not a provincial entity. When I have a concern regarding my children's public education, I call my school trustee. My school trustee comes to our School Community Council meetings. My school trustee and school board know the conditions of my school

The school in my community has very specific needs, which are very different from schools in other areas in the province. The schools have a large need for English as a Second Language. The schools are very rich in diversity, but that creates a need all its own. That makes our needs very different than the needs of the school in and for the record, I don't know the needs of the school in , I just chose another town which completely proves my point, we are not aware of what each other town needs, because we are all so different. Why would it even be considered that a province wide singular education system be beneficial for our students, when the needs of our students are so different throughout the province. Elected school boards can be specific to our needs and can focus on the area in which they serve. So if the province changes to a single board, or amalgamates to a smaller number of boards, whom will I contact when there is a problem or concern within my school? All the parents I have spoken to are very concerned about this. Will we have to try and get the attention of someone all the way in Regina? Will our representative have ever been to or even be able to locate it on a map? I personally already have sent many letters to government regarding education over the past two years in respect to equitable funding, and most times I just get a form letter back. There is a huge fear that the public will not be able to have a say in their child's education, aside from voting in a provincial election. Thank you for your time and consideration in reading my concerns. I truly do hope you hear what your front line staff and stakeholders have to say in this matter.

My main concern with your plan is that it takes away a local voice. Education is a very personal journey for parents and children. The boards in Saskatoon understand the problems that the schools and children in Saskatoon have. The difficulties and challenges that Warman has are quite different. I am worried that you are losing an important voice and perspective.

It is crucial that school divisions (in particular) Catholic divisions, maintain their individuality and governance. This is needed to maintain a systems identity, location and division needs. Is the money savings(questionable amount) really worth the impact this would have on education?

Good Afternoon: Upon reading the report I was saddened not see any connection from the four options to any of the strategic outcomes or indicators from the Heat graph? I am assuming then that the four options are just addressing the cost savings to the province? I would like to see a deeper analysis of how each of the options addresses not just cost savings but ways to address educational concerns such as low PISA rate; FNIM graduations rates etc. If I could see the connection of how changing boundaries or having one provincial board would address these outcomes; I would have better feedback to provide - as the report is currently structured; I see just cost savings as the objective, which honestly will not work unless morale and other areas are addressed. As well, local voice from the SCC is diminished? I find this concerning as local voice represents communities and most SCCs have a good perspective on day to day issues that surround the schools....not a good move as every school and community are different and need community input. Thank you for taking feedback in your process and truly hope that the process continues to involve community feedback.

I have been teaching for twelve years, in two School Divisions I believe it has taken ten years to get some normalization back in education. Since I began teaching, we have had ever-changing curriculums, amalgamations, changing goals and expectations; now as a teacher, I believe we need time. It feels as though we are just starting to figure things out and changing now would not provide any advantage to our students, and our student's well-being should be our focus. I believe we can keep our current system and find savings by standardizing finance, IT, student data entry systems, I also believe we need one standard local agreement for teachers. This could provide savings and would allow the teachers to continue to provide the students with quality education. I think if we are really focused on transformative change, why we do not look at the way we deliver education. Online programming can be highly effective and could bring a variety of electives to small rural schools at a reduced cost. If amalgamation of the divisions is the best for our students, how come we didn't do it when the province was flush with cash? Why are you not looking at amalgamating the Catholic School divisions? According to the Provincial audit, they are draining a good deal of our resources in education.

I am not in favour of the amalgamation of our school board into 1or 4 divisions. This only hurts our children and the quality of education they receive. Please do not take away our locally elected boards; I feel this would be detrimental to their learning.

I do not agree with the Government's proposed changes. Changing governance or amalgamating school divisions is not the answer to financial challenges that the government is facing. I believe that having appointed board members will have a negative impact. Local boards are the voice that matters in education. We need to keep our focus on the things that matter to students and families.

I do not see any of these options being good for the students in Saskatchewan. School divisions need elected local governance to address the needs of the students in the schools in each division. Forming larger school divisions will result in a huge expense for tax payers and will not be in the best interest of our children.

To the Ministry of Education: I am a parent of three children that attend the Lloydminster Public School Division and I want to voice my opinion that I think it is the wrong decision to amalgamate school divisions for several reasons: 1) Our elected school boards are in touch with what our specific school needs are. 2) A government appointed school board would not be able to provide the same support when it comes to our precious children's futures. They would not have the same accountable as an elected board either. Several matters could get swept under the rug with no repercussions. 3) Being in Lloydminster is a unique situation with both Alberta and Saskatchewan funding. Alberta funding may get cut if they were forced to pay into an "amalgamated school division" without having assurance of where the funds would be spent. This would directly affect every public school student. Please reconsider this decision and allow the Lloydminster Public School Division to remain its own entity with an elected school board. Thank you for your time.

As a parent and School Community Council member I want to stress the importance of preserving parent and community voice when considering further amalgamation. This is much more likely to happen in smaller school divisions where the boards better know and understand the people they are representing. Local people best understand the needs and concerns of local students and are best able to make decisions that will benefit their school and community. Locally elected boards best represent the parents' interests. An appointed board would be more concerned with being accountable to government, and less able to understand local needs and concerns, especially in rural areas. In our school division, one thing I appreciate as a parent is the four day school week. I like having the option to schedule appointments for my children on Fridays if needed, or for them to have an extra day to explore other interests at home. In our primarily rural school division, parents voted in favour of the four day school week and I would hate to see this eliminated if further amalgamations happened. Another priority in our rural area is keeping the amount of time that students spend on school buses reasonable. We want to maintain the schools that we currently have in our division so that students don't have to spend a lot of time traveling to and from school. Their days are already full enough. The number of school divisions in Saskatchewan has already been significantly reduced through previous amalgamations. Given the size of our province and the diversity of people and needs within the existing school divisions, it would take a long time to work through administrative changes if further amalgamations happen. I believe that preserving access to decision makers for teachers and parents should be a top priority. If the school boards are amalgamated further, those with the ability to create change will be even more removed from our local communities and schools. This leaves people feeling powerless and that they are without a voice. We need elected representatives who are in tune with our local concerns and unique needs! The focus of our education system should be to create an optimal learning environment for the students, and I feel that their needs would not be met during the time that teachers and administration are focused on the amalgamation process. Please consider this decision from the point of view of the teachers, who are expected to carry on with 'business as usual' while dealing with the stress of change, which will likely leave them with less support staff and less access to the school board. Without teachers and staff who feel understood and supported, our children will suffer and the desired education outcomes will NOT be achieved. I would ask that you consider leaving school divisions as they currently are, and instead focus on improving accountability and efficiency within the existing system. Providing training to board members so that they meet the expectations for required competencies is a great idea. If specific knowledge or skills are required to make board decisions, perhaps it would be better to ask an expert in that field if they would be willing to run in the election, rather than having appointed representatives. Work with the people you have. I would expect that the majority of people who run for school boards already have the best interests of the students and teachers as their priority, and that is a great place to start.

I am from Lloydminster and reside on the Saskatchewan side. PLEASE DO NOT CHANGE OUR SCHOOL DIVISION BOUNDARIES! You are messing with an already precarious situation with the Alberta government to ensure that all of our cities students have access to a great education system. The Alberta government has already shown that in multiple instances that it does not recognize Lloydminster's unique circumstances as a city that resides in both provinces. Any change to division boundaries threatens funding for all students in our city. And in putting funding at risk you put our children at risk. PLEASE DO NOT APPOINT A DIVISION BOARD! Lloydminster's school division has created a vibrant and amazing school community and by appointing board members you put that wonderful community at risk. You are threatening our right to choose how we educate our children. I understand the need for consolidation to reduce costs - but please leave Lloydminster out of it!

I am against consolidating the school divisions into one. I fear this is not in the best interests of students and families

I hope that you will not consider amalgamating the catholic schools with the public schools. My concern is that the children's catholic faith education will be compromised and that they will lose their identity as Catholics. This is already happening at an alarming rate as children are attending public schools and are not receiving very much education in their faith. The atmosphere of a catholic school with prayer time, nativity sets at Christmas time, catholic posters for inspiration, and just being able to mention the word God is a unique experience that they would not be able to do in a public school. Please keep this in consideration in your decisions. Thank you.

I am tremendously disappointed with the provincial government and their plan to reduce funding to education. Their plan to amalgamate the school boards is just that, a desperate attempt to save a few dollars, at the expense of the quality of the education of our children. All the while expanding their own bureaucracy at the provincial government level. What hypocrisy! Through my tax dollars I expect quality education and health care for my children. It is time that the Saskatchewan Party lived up to their responsibility to provide what the tax payers of this province have paid for and expect for their money paid.

As a parent I believe that control over education MUST remain in the hands of parents through locally elected boards of education. Education is first and foremost a responsibility of the parents - not the government. These locally elected boards allow parents to effectively articulate how they want their children educated within the workings of the provincial curriculum. Remember these are our children - not the provinces. I DO NOT want the provincial government assuming it knows better how my children learn, should be taught or the values that I and my community espouse. Education is NOT a business and should not be treated as such. Anyone who has ever spent even a brief moment with children would have to admit that interactions with children (whether 5 or 15) are inherently inefficient. Trying to make them otherwise is ludicrous. Trying to force the system that works with them to embrace efficiency as its prime objective is equally ludicrous. Don't mess with my children's education. They are served by qualified, responsible, and diligent professionals in their teachers, administrators, and board.

Dear Madams and Sirs, I believe it would be in the best interest of Saskatchewan families to remain under local administrative governance since there are many diverse needs across our province and country. If one considers groups such as those with affiliations in language, religion, population demographics, proximity to urban or rural centers, culture, socio-economic status and countless others, no two school divisions could possibly have exactly the same goals and circumstances. As an educator I realize how meeting curricular outcomes may look very different depending on available resources, parental involvement and student preparedness. And as a parent I know how important school climate is to my children's wellbeing and development, and I would rather have people living within that community who understand our collective mission on the forefront of driving the decisions made surrounding their education. All said, I don't feel that we can apply a one-size-fits-all, cookie cutter formula to every school and expect acceptable results.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback. When considering the options for the education model that will best support our students I ask the Ministry to consider the following: 1. Catholic education is important. Thank you to the Minister of Education for valuing the Constitutional Right to have publically funded Catholic Education in Saskatchewan. 2. Student achievement is a priority. Our school division is in the midst of completing the next three-year strategic plan and has had statistically meaningful academic improvement for our students in the last three-year plan 2014-2017. We would like to continue this good work with our next three-year plan (2017-2020) that staff, parents, community stakeholders, Catholic constituents, trustees and children are developing that will help our children meet the 2020 provincial growth plan. 3. Relationships are important. Local relationships and partnerships in administration and management of the educational affairs of the school division has provided the opportunity to encourage long term, positive relationships with staff, parents, community stakeholders, Catholic constituents, trustees and students to RESPOND LOCALLY TO OUR CHILDREN in Prince Albert. It is my hope that the educational model moving forward will consider how crucial local relationships are in supporting students and teachers at the local level.

(1) The governing Saskatchewan Party did not campaign about any budget shortfalls last year? Now they are borrowing 1 BILLION dollars! With an arrangement to borrow up to 5 BILLION more dollars. (2) The government changed the way in which Education was funded - in late May early June - they off loaded the salary increase back to Boards of Education. (All previous salary increases had been covered by the government and they now "changed" the rules midway through the game). These forced many Boards to layoff or not fill positions - 21.5 fewer teachers in Good Spirit School Division in the fall of 2016 than there were in June 2016. This makes the school boards look like the "bad guy" during the first year of the governments new term - how convenient. (3) If the government is going to force the Boards of Education to be the "bad guy" why doesn't the government once again give Boards of Education the ability to levy tax rates locally? No one loves to pay more taxes but if I knew my taxes were going to help schools and health facilities (don't get me started with health care) I would be in favor of it rather than cut, cut, cut with our current government - keep the farmers and rich happy. (4) The government is now talking about changing the number of school divisions. Leave the number of school divisions alone. Let there be locally elected officials. Keep the decisions in education close the communities that the schools are in. (5) The current government can talk all they want about supporting education and building new schools. They do not support teachers and the teaching morale in Saskatchewan has never been lower.

I have a few questions regarding the proposed changes to our school system: 1) why are the changes happening? In my opinion the system is not broke so why are you "trying" to fix it? 2) How are these changes going to affect the students? Teachers? French immersion programs? Rural schools? My children go to a small K-12 rural school that offers both French and English curriculum. I want to know how these changes will affect them! 3) Is this all about trying to save some money? A good education is worth far more than a few dollars saved! 4) Are small schools going to lose their voice? Are the changes looking after the needs of the larger communities where there are more students but ignoring the needs of the small/rural schools?

I have three children in the public school system. I disagree with the amalgamation of school divisions. I think that decisions about schools and divisions should be made locally, not by someone - appointed by the government in another city or town. I also would like to say that I see teachers at our Community School working very hard to provide children with a strong education and positive all round school experience. To do this, they are coming early, giving up lunch breaks, and staying after school to provide sport, social justice, and leadership experiences outside of regular teaching hours. On top of this, they are giving up further personal time to plan educational opportunities for students. I disagree with any proposed wage caps/decreases and believe teachers should be paid more, as professionals for doing all the important and hard work they do.

Good Afternoon, I would like to provide a few key points of feedback regarding the Educational Governance Review provided to us by Mr. Dan Perrins. First of all, thank you for keeping our students' best interests in mind while considering the possibility of amalgamations. As part of the teaching community, it would be concerning if outcomes and graduation were not in the foreground of this discussion. As a teacher in Lloydminster,

I am teaching a Saskatchewan Curriculum, and have become very fond of the relationship between two provinces due to our unique situation.

I really enjoy the setup we have created, and I am able to see the growth in our individuals both academically and socially as responsible community members. This is largely in part due to locally determined options that our elected board and trustees have been able to create around a somewhat hockey driven community. I fear that without having a locally elected board, students would lose the opportunity to connect their passion to their studies. Furthermore, our situation poses a problem with funding from Alberta residents', tax dollars being used to exclusively support our community's Children and the Lloydminster Public/Catholic School Division. Our City's Charter has established a seamless funding structure to ensure that the students in our city have equal opportunity regardless of which side of the border they reside on. An expanded school division would make it nearly impossible to keep the funding from Alberta in Lloydminster Schools, and if it did, could look very different between schools in the same division. Finally, I do challenge that the issues on pages 20 and 21 of the Educational Governance Report could be addressed through changes in legislation, regulations, and policy. It would be hard to imagine that a change in school divisions with new appointed boards would be less disruptive than continuing to grow under elected boards of education with new mandates, regulations, and expectations.

This report is going to hurt the rural school divisions and bring more tax money to the larger centres. Forcing children to be bused from one community to another and the one they are sent to don't have all the opportunities that they should have therefore giving our children less opportunities and a poorer education. We need parents and other people besides Government appointed people to run our school boards because they will have the best interest of our children in mind. The Government will work totally on budgets and run it like a business and our tax dollars will be a waste with our children suffering. Breaking this down into so few districts is crazy. There are a lot of different needs in different areas and these will be lost in the big picture. We have to stop and realize why school boards exist and why we need them involved in our children's education. Education should never be run entirely by Government with no input from boards and to cut this down to so few boards it will squash the voice of the parents who have the children's education as the most important thing. This new idea you have will end up sending rural kids to the city which will kill small communities. It is also not fair to have little children riding a bus every day and losing an hour or more of their life every day riding a bus. To have a Government appointed individual to just right up a proposal on how our education system should be run in such a short time with very little input from school boards and parents and then ram through such a short deadline for response is just ridiculous. Let's slow this down and work with the boards, parents and others involved so this very important decision is done right the first time. Thanks for your time.

What is the rush to pass this? When have we ever decided such a major change in 3 weeks? If it is cost cutting, then my question is, Are there bonuses still being handed out in our province in the school sector? Can two or more managers be combined? In other words, you need to look at cost cutting at the top! We don't even have enough text books for every student in our school. Our teachers have to buy most of their own supplies. You cut down the cleaning staff to where they have to pick and choose what is priority for the health and safety of our children. Amalgamation is not the answer by any means. We, as a rural school will be effected severely just as before. We need locals elected to our board so that we have people that understand the pros and cons of each division's situations. Amalgamation is not the answer! You need to take more time to research this. This seems like the carbon tax problem, so do your research BEFORE you make a situation worse.

We do NOT agree that amalgamating the boards for all divisions is a good idea. We think that each division needs its own board to better deal with the needs of the schools (and in return, the students and parents as well). The local boards are more personal, elected instead of government appointed, and as such are doing a much better job than someone who is filling a seat because they are a certain sex or skin colour. We do not support the change and think it should stay the way it is.

We feel that not having Board members who make decisions solely for their own school/community would be beneficial in province. Our schools suffer because our Boards have single view (do not consider division). We would like to see a different board structure. This would be more cost efficient.

I am strongly in favor of leaving the school boards as they are - with officials elected by their peers. A provincial model cannot effectively manage all of the schools in the province. This is very important to our family as my children attend a rural school. Without proper representation, the rural schools will be lost in the shuffle.

My opinion is that one school division is wrong. There is too big of school divisions already and students in the rural are not getting the supplies and support they need as everything is being sent into the cities. Start taxing the cities for their school taxes and you will find more funding. Leave the money brought in by rural in the rural and our schools will support them. Our teacher to student population is too large already.

I think if things are working well the way they at why change it. The K-12 system isn't perfect but that's because we art perfect but like I said if it's not broken then why try and fix it, plus instead of appointing ministers and other people to do a review of the system why not take the money spent on that and put into the school system where it is needed. Far too many time our governments spends money in this way when it could be used to better and support the existing programs that are already in place

I find this amalgamation unnecessary, my daughter is in Kindergarten and in the three months that she has been going, I have noticed such a huge positive change in my daughter's intellect. The parents are the ones who have the most accurate insight on how our children would benefit and thrive the most. I am opposed to this governance proposed. Please don't fix something that isn't broken to begin with. Thanks

As a staff member, I would like appreciate the Ministry of Education to consider the following in regards to the Dan Perrins report: a) Catholic education is important. I am pleased with the commitment to continued Catholic education in Saskatchewan that was made by the Minister and I would like to affirm this with the Minister and the Ministry of Education. It gratifying to see that the Minister of Education continues to value the Constitutional Right to have publically funded Catholic Education in our province. b) Student achievement is a priority. As a loyal employee of our school division and most importantly, a parent, I am pleased to acknowledge that through the hard work and dedication of our staff, parents, community stakeholders, SCC's, Catholic constituents, and trustees, we have seen statistically meaningful academic improvement for our students over the last three years. Student achievement was a priority in our 2014-2017 three year strategic plans and I believe that with the Ministry's support of our next three year plan (2017-2020) we will help our children meet the 2020 provincial growth plan. c) Relationships are important. Keeping in mind that Saskatchewan has a small population in relation to other provinces, our geographical size makes consideration of local relationships and partnerships important when managing educational affairs. Although there are many similarities to the divisions in Saskatchewan right now, there are many differences. By realizing these differences exist and focusing on the opportunities these differences provide , our school division has been able to operate efficiently. As a result, we have one of the highest graduation rates of success in the province for all students especially First Nation, Metis graduation rates. I know that the relationships I was and am still able to create are vital for the success of our students. I believe in the importance and power of developing long term, positive relationships with all stake holders in our division and we must respond locally to our children of Prince Albert if we want to support them in becoming engaged citizens who have a strong sense of self and community. I would like to thank the Ministry of Education in giving the people of Saskatchewan the opportunity to provide feedback at this critical time. As an educator in this province , I appreciate knowing that my voice will be heard and fair consideration will be given to all feedback when making the best decisions for the education of our children.

We need to keep our school boards local, so that they can better serve the community and their unique diverse needs. We also need to keep our ELECTED board of trustees. It's the voice of the public as CHOSEN by the public to represent the community. They know the communities in which they serve and better yet, the communities know them. They attend local events and meetings and truly care about the school community. We need transparency, not another government appointed person. Many Thanks

Please ensure this makes it to the premier and the Minister of education: My wife and I have one kid at School and another starting soon. We feel strongly that public education is best served by locally elected trustees. In education, decisions are best made at the grassroots level and school boards provide a connection and accountability with the community. Loss of local voice through the reduction of locally elected boards of education will not be good for students, communities or the education system, especially us with a small rural school. Our kids' education will be what suffers when some appointed person in Regina or Saskatoon is making decisions that are 'supposedly' good for all. Yeah right. They will be good for those in Saskatoon and Regina and not the little guys. We will have no local voice at all and get _____n because of it! Communities and school boards that already have experienced forced amalgamations in our province know that it is very disruptive for schools and students. Huge changes like that take significant time and resources and they don't save money. The whole idea behind this is to save money but it won't. Furthermore, it seems the government is trying to make education governance similar to health care but the money for health care comes mostly from the budget. Money for education comes largely from local property taxes. I am not in favour at all of my hard earned money going to pay for Saskatoon and Regina education. I pay my local taxes so my local community can educate our kids the way we know best to serve our local community. Local democratically elected school boards are the best choice for my community. Local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities. The previous consolidation held back education for 5 years and cost money vs saved money. Can the government never learn from past mistakes? This would be the second time that forced amalgamation excluded separate school boards. It took at least five years for the boards, formed only 10 years ago, to become accepted as the community's school system. Significant improvement in learning is just beginning to be achieved and now you want to squash it and run more a dictator type situation with no local voices or feedback!? We are hugely against this forced amalgamation. This feels like we are living in a dictator state how this is being forced upon us with no time for feedback. I thought we lived in a democracy!?

The government needs to leave well enough alone and let the school division proceed as it has been.

I am a parent, born and raised in Saskatchewan. I would prefer to see the Division model remain but am not opposed to boundary realignment and perhaps some reduction in the number of divisions in the province. A provincial model or 4 regions may be too broad and remote to truly identify student's needs. Local perspective does make a difference.

Options 1 and 2 are stupid and 3 A and B are the best for everyone.

As an employee of Regina Catholic Schools and a professional member of SASBO I completely support and agree with the formal response put forward by SASBO on my behalf.

I have been very happy with how PVSD has been run, the level of academic achievement and the overall direction of the school board. I do not like how school divisions such as the Regina public have been run however I think the Regina Catholic has been run well and fiscally responsible. I do not feel it to be a good decision to penalize boards for others lack of responsibility. I point to Regina Public and see how they funneled money away from maintaining their facilities and letting them fall into a state of disrepair to the point where the government had to step in and build new facilities. In the meanwhile the Regina Catholic and PVSD had sunk a ton of money into properly maintaining their facilities as any good steward would but then do not get the new facilities. We here in the _____ area have been in need of a new high school for a long time. The government will point to enrolment is not quite there to justify it however they do not look at the facts! People who live here are registering their kids in Regina schools finding loopholes and stating addresses as living elsewhere, or simply paying to go to Luther or Athol Murray. These are some of our frustrations and a centralized or appointed voice will not be able to communicate this effectively. We need vision and I am not opposed to change and in the end the quality of education is the most important, and a strong commitment to values. I also fear that saving money will equal loss of employment and this is never a good thing to add unemployment to an already hurting economy. Trimming the fat can be a good thing and setting specific locations and requirements to run a school board would be advisable and having stronger consequences for those boards who do not rise to the challenge and removing them from making decisions may be a good step but to penalize those who have done a fantastic job is not the right answer. We all know the challenges that are faced right now and it is a great opportunity to reach out for great creative ideas! We need to improve efficiency not add to the bureaucracy! Some changes that should be made to "Elected Boards" are that those running should not be past employees, and they should be that of parents whose children are currently enrolled in the zone they are running. Changes need to be made but they need to be made in a way that would improve the situation as well as addressing the issues of the community the schools and the students!

This is an awful idea; our children have not spent all of the money this government has why do our children have to suffer. First health care and now education. Please read think this

Students and families come to school with a myriad of social, emotional and mental health needs that impede readiness to learn and outcomes for students. These needs are best supported by the school as part of an in-house student services team; specifically the school counsellor working inter-collaboratively with school staff, division staff, families and outside agencies. Currently, the Province of Saskatchewan does not have a model for school counselling that guides best practice for school counsellors. The Ministry of Education can make it a priority to provide direction, consultation and policy for a School Counsellor model. Other provinces have developed and adopted successful models that guide policies and best practices for counselling work provided in schools within the K-8 system. The Advisory Panel could consult with key stakeholders to development and roll-out such a model that will guide school counsellors and social workers in their day to day work; as well as provide consultation and direction on the future of this important work in schools.

I am opposed to any changes made to the current education system which is working for my child. Amalgamations will take away from my child's learning and may mean cuts to teachers and EA's as well as potential for the loss of the school. Without a local public voice, we will not be properly represented in any regard. There is nothing about these proposed changes that will be a benefit for the school and therefore I am expressing my opposition to these changes.

While I understand the need to be cost-effective, I also believe that amalgamating into a super-division to be highly suspect. There is no way that rural Saskatchewan students and parents will be heard in this type of division. Again, as I saw what happened when the Autism Resource Centre was subsumed by Child and Youth Services, rural Saskatchewan lost out. We receive no services, no benefits, and the same will happen if we amalgamate into one super-division. I would prefer to stay as is, but if not, then the model of 8-14 divisions is much preferable to the provincial model.

Our school system is bursting at the seams already. We cannot have larger classroom sizes than what is already in place. The education system in our area is subpar as it is. Don't make things worse for our children than it already is.

I have some grave concerns regarding the possible amalgamation of one large provincial school board.

The possibility of closing a school in a little town will have dire effects for not only me and my family but for the town itself as one of the things that draw people to is the fact that there is a school here, and our town is a thriving young family town. Please take time to consider those families who will be affected by a decision that can potentially physically hurt someone. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Keep rural school divisions rural!

I feel that the report does not fully clarify the cost savings of each option and a guarantee if there are cost savings that his money will be directed back into education. In addition, the options other than the status quo at this point to not guarantee that the voices of the most important stakeholders - the children and their concerned guardians - will not be heard if there is not a local level representative. Every area of this province is different and therefore requires different resources, having one school board would homogenize the school system and children would fall through the cracks more than they already do. Educating the children of this province should be our first priority. Our children are falling behind the rest of the country in many areas, one of which is technological abilities. If we want to grow this province then stop relying on fundraising efforts and put money back into the school system. Decreasing the amount of hands on at the local level is out of the question. Costs do need to be cut, but perhaps they could be cut in other areas and leave education alone.

I would like to see a division model remain in place. This model will provide the best support and understanding for children in their area. I think the way to reduce the number would be to combine public and separate school divisions in the larger cities especially where P3 schools have been built.

I'm against this change to the school divisions. It takes our voice away, it is a threat to the rural way of life and in my opinion is just another step towards private schools and government irresponsibility.

Recently the Saskatchewan Government released a document commissioned from Dan Perrins called Educational Governance Review Report, Kindergarten to Grade 12. I understand our province is facing significant financial hardship during this time of slow resource revenue, but the options presented in this document would end up costing more than any potential savings would be able to recoup. While the suggestions to centralize some aspects of Administration are good suggestions, and I'm positive Saskatchewan School Boards are in favour of them as well as basic good governance best practices and responsible management, all four options for educational governance are bad for the province. Elected school boards are the paragon of good governance and responsible stewardship of our most valuable asset – our children and their futures. We elect school board members through a democratic process that ensures local voices are heard at the decision-making stage. Our school board directors live, work, and raise their children in our towns and RMs. Our school boards are directly accountable to us, the citizens and taxpayers in the school division. An appointed board would mean a loss of awareness and decision-making about our children's education. I strongly, strongly urge you to do the right thing and insist that Saskatchewan remain a leader in Canada when it comes to educational governance, and retain our duly elected school boards. In 2006, Saskatchewan underwent a round of school division amalgamations that ended up costing the province more during the two-year transition period than any subsequent savings was able to recover for years. Those amalgamations saw many schools close as broad guidelines were introduced that mandated the number of students a school must serve for the school to be considered "viable". For many small towns and rural areas in Saskatchewan, this meant they lost their school. Losing a school is the death knell of a town in rural Saskatchewan. While this report certainly doesn't advocate school closures, we have seen dozens of schools close every time divisions are amalgamated. The process of amalgamation is itself disruptive, time-consuming, and costly. Worse, it detracts from student learning and educational achievement. Please don't gamble with Saskatchewan children's future. Please listen to our school boards, our teachers, our administrators, our School Community Councils, and Saskatchewan citizens and parents who reject all four options presented in this document but who advocate for administrative centralization and good governance policies.

The last round of forced amalgamations that took place in 2006 were costly, both financially and administratively. Amalgamation is not the answer to the challenges we face in educational governance. The Governance Review Report contains some excellent suggestions for good governance and administrative efficiencies where possible. We know from past experience that amalgamation does disrupt what happens in the classroom and can lead to school closures. School closures are not good for Saskatchewan. I do not support any of the four options presented in the Governance Review Report. It is in the best interests of our students, our teachers and staff, parents, and the people of Saskatchewan to retain elected boards of education, to reject amalgamation of school divisions, and to implement administrative efficiencies under the existing divisions. To retain status quo on the number of public school divisions in the province. There is little mention in the Report of the actual cost savings any of the four options would provide. Amalgamation will not save money. The few positions that would be cut would hardly compare to the other costs. There are name changes, letter heads and web sites, print materials, and not to mention the millions of resources in our school division that would need to be relabeled and people will be needed to do that work. Similar moves in other provinces have resulted in much longer bus rides, higher costs for administrators, and reduced access to school boards. Appointed school boards mean no local representation and less transparent governance. Local residents would lose their voices - their direct access - to the people who make decisions for their children's education. There is very little mention in the Governance Review Report of actual students or how any of the proposed governance changes might affect Saskatchewan students. In Prairie Valley School Division, we need to protect our outstanding graduation rates, attendance rates, educational opportunities, extracurricular activities and more! **EQUITABLE OPPORTUNITIES** for all students regardless of their location within Saskatchewan must be retained. Any financial gains thought to be made through the 4 options are a mere drop in the bucket and will barely show on the ledger and would actually increase administration costs for a number of years; that is not cost savings. The cost to students is far greater than any savings. I **DO NOT** want to see rural schools run by city mentality. I **DO NOT** want to see rural schools get the short end of the stick. I **DO NOT** want to see Saskatchewan communities have school closures and I most certainly **DO NOT** want to lose the opportunity to have elected rural representatives on our local school boards. Every profession starts with a teacher. Students and parents deserve a choice between city schools and rural schools and many of us live where we live because we choose to. Choice is important and I don't want to see an appointed Board forget about what we have worked so hard to protect. Costs need to be considered more carefully before any changes are made to the Education Governance.

I think it would be a great idea if the school stayed in or near Pilot Butte.

I do not think our schools, districts and our children will have local, fair representation, and I am not impressed with the suggestions presented. I will homeschool my child if this ridiculous suggestion is passed.

Prairie Valley School Division is a school division that focuses on the needs of the communities it serves. I have come to know that it is unique in a positive way. We are close to public and separate school systems and listen to other parents speak of issues or problems they have faced within those systems. I must say I am thankful most times we are a part of Prairie Valley School Division. PVSD in most part has done well at addressing the rural needs of the community. Through meeting bussing challenges, listening to the voices of the community when planning and building new schools. I find there is a more personal approach within the school my children attend. I can walk into my children's school and I am greeted respectfully by any employee even if they do not know me. Our family has faced personal challenges. The staff at have gone above and beyond to help us meet the needs of our children so they can have the best learning experience. I have spoken with families with similar challenges and they are treated unfairly and as outcasts in the public school system. Left to fend for themselves as their child's personal challenge is "not their problem" I cannot imagine, and therefore am grateful for the support we have received. It is my opinion that PVSD should continue to operate as it has with an elected board. I do not think any of the other options would be for the better for everyone involved. Thank you for listening.

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report, we offer the following feedback: We do support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). It is essential that I continue to have a voice for our school and community! We do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. We do not support any of the three models presented in the report. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support that change to governance or further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. We have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold we are legislated by. We need a permanent high school plan, including transportation, to accommodate the best interests of our students, their families, and our community. Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in. Regards, School Community Council

We need local directors and need to keep our Regina Beach school in Regina Beach. Our communities depend upon it.

I think this is horrible. When you have smaller schools like ours, which is needed for our community and surrounding areas, it will get lost if it is one big school division. I believe that we have already lost more funding than what our school can handle by losing aids and programs and support from our current division board let alone if we had a no division board and were in one large board. If we were in a large division board our needs like biology 30 and law classes would be lost. I don't even have children in high school and we are feeling these affects in teachers aids let alone what will be offered when my children reach high school age. We need more money and more support not less and moved further away. Horrible, horrible idea. Please don't do this.

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report, I would like to offer the following feedback: I do support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). It is essential that I continue to have a voice for our school and community! I do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. I do not support any of the three models presented in the report. I have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support that change to governance or further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. I do not feel that the options presented in the report will result in a significant cost savings without negatively impacting the quality of education for our students, diminishing community voice, and affecting the sustainability of our community. I want to know what potential changes there will be to the rural school closure thresholds that are currently legislated. I feel that this is a critical consideration in evaluating the options. We need a permanent high school plan, including transportation, to accommodate the best interests of our students, their families, and our community. I feel that further progress can be made in existing school divisions to find sector-wide efficiencies and cost savings and recognize that government may need to be more directive in requiring these sector wide efficiencies to be realized. I urge you to do further research, most notably on the points I have noted above, before making a decision that will ultimately affect the quality of education for our children.

To Whom It May Concern: As a parent of children who attend a rural community school I am against the amalgamation of the school boards.

Option 3 keeping the divisions is the best- it may involve moving boundaries to balance numbers out. There could be some more centralizing of services (IT, Purchasing, etc.) but management is best locally- empowering local leaders and community partners is best.

I am disappointed to learn of the options put forth by our provincial government regarding transformational changes in education. I have been a teacher who has taught in a variety of schools and in different capacities for over thirty years. Teaching is not only my job, it is who I am and I know that most of the teachers I work with feel the same. Oddly enough, teaching is the only profession I know of where people willingly and gladly put in many extra hours, (extra-curricular, etc.), knowing that they will not receive any extra pay or recognition. Teachers do this for their students. So when teachers have something to say about education in our province our government would be wise to listen as teachers will be advocating for our students. The Perrins report suggests changing school board trustees from elected members to appointed ones. Our public has a right to have a say regarding their children and their education. The present electoral process of school board members addresses that right. Elected school board trustees have a vested interest in education! They listen to parents regarding a variety of concerns and issues. They vie for the position of school board because of their passion and concern for education. If we scrap the present process and appoint people then we have absolutely no control over who ends up in these positions. What kind of qualifications will these "appointed" people have? Will any of them have any idea at all what goes on in a school? This brings me to another grave concern that I have. According to the report, the possible restructuring of present day school boards will allow the provincial government to have more control over education in our province. The present day government has given me absolutely no reason to believe that they possess the knowledge needed to understand what goes on in our schools every day. The blatant lack of adequate funding for education during the Sask Party's reign is just one indicator. And I am not referring to teachers' salaries! I am referring to the growing needs of students. In our bigger cities, we have had a great influx of children from other countries. Most of these students have little to no understanding of the English language and they are placed in an English speaking classroom. Yes, there is some EAL support, but nowhere near what is needed! When teachers talk to people who are not in the teaching profession and they tell them how there are sometimes 4 or 5, (or more), students in the class who don't speak English, they are aghast! "Well, how do they understand what is going on?" "Don't you have support for them all the time?" "How do they learn?" Good questions!! The lack of support for our EAL needs is just one of the many challenges facing schools and especially the classroom teachers. We have students in dire need of so many other things: food, proper clothing, counselling, proper mental health supports, and the list goes on and on! The diverse needs in today's classrooms are unbelievable! Our government needs to put more funding at the grassroots level. If we just keep letting these children "slip through the cracks" then you will likely see increasing need for funding in other social programs down the road. How can a government that largely ignores these dire needs and concerns in our society feel that they are qualified to have more control in our education system and in our schools? I believe they don't! Our students deserve better!

Just wondering how many actual honest answers to your survey you will get when you are posting names with comments online?

This is an awful idea! It is impossible to ensure that all schools are receiving the adequate attention when there are people who have never even been to half of these schools, in charge. You cannot assess and understand the needs of people you haven't met. We need to keep the school boards run by people of the community.

Our children and teachers need more hands on deck. We need front-line people to work with students on a consistent and daily basis. Our future deserves well educated people, and that begins with government support in public education. We don't need more spending on consultants and administrative costs. If we can find a way to cut down on these expenditures, while turning our focus to the students, our future will be better off. This means rural schools having the staffing, programs, and bussing to ensure every student in every school has what they need to succeed, whether that be a timely bus ride to and from school, or a realistic class size. I worry that a provincial wide division would leave rural schools struggling and forced to move to larger centres. This would mean hour long bus rides both ways for children and class sizes where our children would suffer a great deal and wouldn't even come close to their potential. Without a school, we have seen rural areas suffer in every aspect and thus, our rural schools are critical. Let's keep our priorities where they need to be- in the best interests of ALL students in every corner of the province.

I think any changes to the existing structure of rural schools will be harmful to the youth attending these schools and communities

I would like to see our division remain as is. If it isn't broke, don't try fixing it. These folks do a fine job and I have no complaints. Local people from the community are the way to keep things.

I am in favor of looking at the reduction of units across the province in order to make a more effective use of manpower and money. The number of board appointments should also be reduced accordingly. ALL board members should be elected.

K-12 Education Governance Review Advisory Panel: After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report I would like to express my concerns with the options provided in the Educational Governance Review Report: I do not support any of the three models presented in the report and wish to remain a part of Prairie Valley School Division. The document options clearly acknowledge that changes to the current system may compromise student outcomes, reduce accountability, reduce community communication and access to decision makers, put more work on SCC's and disrupt our schools. The negatives far out way the positives. I do support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). I also support finding cost saving systems, strengthening our educational outcomes and standardizing expectation of our Boards, but cannot support wide sweeping changes as proposed in the document. Could the current local structure not be maintained while centralizing activities like payroll, group buying power for items such as paper, IT equipment, copier machines and consolidating transportation? I do support more equality across existing school boards so students in the northern parts of the province have the same opportunities as those in the south and vice versa. This can be accomplished through standardized policies & procedures defined and reviewed at the provincial level. Although I understand budgetary restrictions, a lower teacher/student ratio is crucial for success of all students with regards to academic achievement and socio-emotional well-being especially in all inclusive classrooms. None of the three proposed plans support this fact. I would rather our students be part of a smaller school, than being in overcrowded classrooms in larger centers. This is one of the main reasons we chose to live in where we do - so our children could attend the local school and not have to be bused elsewhere. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support that change to governance or further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! I do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. I value the connection our community has with our elected Board member and do not feel a move to appointed boards would benefit our remote community. I fear loss of our local voice will negatively impact our students experience and performance may suffer as a result. I have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold. Rural communities thrive, grow, and revolve around their schools. Closing schools will "close" small town Saskatchewan. I believe that all children should have equal opportunities and having public and separate education with separate funding does not support equality in education. Having any of these proposed models will not only affect how teachers are able to best deliver their course loads, but I question if the already limited access to current School Division Support Teams will further diminish (Support Team meaning: Occupational Therapists, Speech and Language Pathologists, Child and Family Support Workers, Social Workers, etc.). Nearby schools are at maximum capacity and there are great concerns for distance, safety, and time spent on buses for rural children. I do not want my children potentially adding hours to their day to have to be bused in to school risking life and limb on the commute everyday - not just in inclement weather. Has consideration for the additional busing costs been factored into the equation? Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in and I cannot support any of them.

Regards, Mother of 2

I don't agree with amalgamating school divisions and creating even less school divisions than today. I know the government wants to do this to cut costs, why not since costs are being cut everywhere else especially in healthcare; however this is not the best option for the STUDENTS and STAFF. Remember, it should not be all about money; education should be the top priority! Having appointed members to the Board of Education will mean that parents and students will no longer be able to influence the board at an individual level. I look at the PVSD Board of Education members today, and I can say that I personally know two of them.

I feel 100% comfortable approaching either one of them with any issues I may have. I can guarantee that I will not feel this way if there is an appointed board. I am also confident that these Board members will actually LISTEN to my concerns and ACTION them. Once again, having an appointed board will not have the same effect. I strongly support keeping school divisions the way they are today and not continuing this government's priority of cutting costs at the expense of our students, teachers and parents.

I am very concerned with the lack of information detailing the government's plan for all choices of transformation. Where is the valid data and research backing the choices of transformational change? I feel that this has been forced on the Province of Saskatchewan with little information and time required to make informed decisions about our children's education. I feel that our leadership at the government level has not been transparent or accountable for their inability to nurture our youth. Again there is a very real disconnect between our cities and the North. Brad Wall I challenge you and your leadership to explain in detail and provide a valid argument with data for transformational change.

To whom it may concern: I am a resident and ratepayer in the Town of Grand Coulee.

I am

interested in the education of students and the well-being of the qualified staff.

Our

family is strongly committed to excellence in education. I agree with this statement: After review of Mr. Dan Perrin's Educational Governance Review Report, we would offer the following feedback: We do not feel that the options presented in this report will result in significant cost savings without negatively impacting the quality of education for our students, eroding community voice, and affecting the sustainability of our community. We support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction of students and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). We do not support the concept of an appointed Board of Education. We believe local voice is an essential part of a successful school community relationship. We do not support any of the three models presented in the report. We feel forced amalgamation puts our school, and many like it, at risk of closure. We want to know what potential changes there will be to the rural school closure thresholds that are currently legislated. We feel this is a critical consideration in evaluating the options. We would like a permanent solution for high school transportation and are concerned what impact forced amalgamation will have on bus ride times for our students. We believe that further progress can be made in existing school divisions to find sector-wide efficiencies and cost-saving and recognize that the government may need to be more directive in requiring these sector-wide efficiencies to be realized.

My concern is that we can't get any answers from the local board trustee and NWSD, how can we get any proper communication from a bigger board and a further amalgamation. In _____ we are a border town with a growing population who desperately need more space, more school, a new gym, more teachers' aides, more teachers. We already lack extra options for our high school students which shows as they try to compete with their Alberta high school students for jobs, and college spots. We have no recourse as it is now to plead our case, notwithstanding, making it hard to get to annual school board meetings and/or meet with board trustees because of the distance between communities. Once again the bigger cities will get what they require and if the Sask Gov Minister of Education would drive around and see his province, it would clearly should that the school system is in dire need of fixing. The infrastructure is old. It is a shame to let the future of the province struggle with further cuts and bigger part of the pie of money go to the reserves and the cities. What about rural Saskatchewan kids? We are unique. Even if we don't like what happens with the Sask Gov Minister of education, we have no recourse in an ombudsman. Our hands as parents seem tied, the communication is limited, and just like the changes NWSD has made to grade marks, and it is unfair and unconstitutional for a decision to be made without information to the tax payers. This is very scary.

The needs of the children in our schools must remain the top priority of our school division. It is important to me that the representative for my local school board be elected and has a voice that represents my local community. We live in a rural community and our school division is big enough as it is. Getting children to games/events that don't fall on school days has been a challenge for our family. The unique needs of my children with special needs are being met _____ . Prairie Valley School Division cares about my children. Our local School Board Representative cares about my children. Please respect a system that is working for our family, local schools and School Division. Thank you

You're heading in the wrong direction! Another amalgamation?! Bigger division areas again?! When did you drop the slogan "Students come first"? Here are a couple scenarios for you to ponder: Which one will have a better outcome? A young child having difficulty understanding the concept of adding and subtracting fractions - teacher takes a chair, pulls it up beside the student and spends some time, one-on-one, helping the student to learn the process OR: A young child having difficulty understanding the concept of adding and subtracting fractions - teacher gives the student more sheet work to practice on his own, because the teacher has no time. This teacher has to travel to 3 different schools during the course of the work day and covers a student population of maybe 80 students. Too many to really care about individually." It doesn't take a Philadelphia Lawyer to figure this out. Stop the madness and get back to REALLY teaching our children! Use common sense! STUDENTS COME FIRST!

Personally I do not like the idea of one provincial school board. I do not believe this would best serve individual areas equally. The divisional model would best serve the unique areas within our province with equal opportunities for our individual schools.

I am writing as a parent and as an employee I strongly feel that the province should not amalgamate school divisions. I suspect doing so is putting projected cost cuts and publicly declared budget savings before the needs of the children who attend our schools. If the government can clearly demonstrate to the public that this kind of scheme not only saves money, but also improves educational outcomes, perhaps they have a point. However, all I have seen or read on this issue points to the need to save money, possibly through layoffs and changing the nature of positions, and not to the guaranteed success of our kids. How will the division I work in seamlessly amalgamate with a division that covers the town of Maple Creek, or the northern community of La Loche, serving ALL the students' and employees' needs in a robust, equitable, efficient manner? Every community and every division to which a community belongs has unique needs and should have an administration and governing body that is intimately familiar with its demographics in order to facilitate the best possible programming and to appropriately delegate funding. Yes, money is a crucial issue for governments - but not at the expense of our kids' wellbeing, and at the wellbeing of increasingly strained school staff. I am deeply concerned that my son will lose out on his long term educational outcomes, and that my own employment may be endangered as a result of using education as a pawn to improve the financial record of the Saskatchewan Party's time in governance. Please bring my words to your upcoming meeting; even if it does nothing in the end, I appreciate being able to make my opinion known.

As a parent I am very concerned about the options being considered by the Government of Saskatchewan. I believe that amalgamation of our school divisions will have a negative impact on our school and our students. I understand that there are financial challenges, but I fail to understand how changing the manner of governing, or how amalgamating school divisions is the answer to these financial challenges. Locally elected school boards matter, they are the voice of parents and communities, especially in rural schools. We will lose our voice if a board is appointed! We believe our students education matters and you should too!

I'm already highly annoyed with the lack of programming for students who require extra help. That speech therapy ends when they are 10? How does that make sense? I'm annoyed about the idea of making one large school division just as they are doing with the health region. Brad wall is about himself and how he can make bank. The ones suffering here will be the students. If my daughter falls through the cracks (which she won't because I'll be fighting for her every step of the way) there will be hell to pay.

I hope that the government puts a lot of research into how we change for the better not just how we change to save money. We have neglected our school system for way too long. I am all for change that helps student learning outcomes. I am a teacher and know that the system has flaws, but simply amalgamating and not addressing other concerns will paralyze an already lame system.

As a parent I want to see a focus on student teacher ratio remaining low and decreasing the ratio that exists in many classrooms already. No classroom should exceed 20 children per teacher. To achieve this cut unnecessary positions within schools divisions, if there is no direct in class support then it should be considered open to cuts. I am aghast at the money spent on the school division office in Regina for PVSD and the plush offices (leather office chairs, beautiful desks) I am disappointed these funds are spent on our schools or playgrounds or on more teachers and support services. Also get rid of so many consultants and get back to the basics- teaching! In terms of school boards we need local viewpoints and voices

It is important that we maintain our local school divisions and elected school boards as they best represent the people of the community. Our students are our top priority. Maintaining more school divisions (option 3B) ensures that the needs of our students are addressed. It doesn't make sense that decisions are made for us from a central area as the needs of students differ from one region of our province to another. Also, I am quite concerned about how restructuring school divisions will affect things such as student-teacher ratio. We have an enormous job as it is to ensure that our students become independent, confident, well rounded and productive members of society with the class sizes as they exist currently. If staff is allocated on a provincial basis, areas with high levels of need such as my community, may suffer. Children who have high needs (poverty, violence, neglect, etc.), require more individual attention. The larger the class size, the more challenging it is to meet everyone's needs. This is especially true in an all-inclusive learning environment. Our local school divisions have become quite proficient at offering local professional development that aligns with the Ministry's Education Strategic Plan as we strive for excellence in our classrooms and for every student. Our students are moving towards meeting the goals as outlined by the Ministry. Our local school divisions facilitate that for us. I also question the reason that this restructuring is only now being presented to the people of Saskatchewan. Why is the government rushing to make change? What is the financial gain for the people of Saskatchewan? Is the savings worth the upheaval to students and staff? We should always consider what is best for our students. Is this it? I would strongly encourage people to consider Option 3B if changes need to be made.

After reading the report developed by Mr. Perrin I feel there are too many "unknowns" to rush into the restructuring process. The main intent seems to be the cost savings that would come from streamlining and reducing duplication of services but the report lacks a more comprehensive cost analysis. I am strongly opposed to appointed school boards and feel that elected and accountable school boards are needed to support and represent the needs of students in their local areas. Finally, I was surprised to see that school support workers and their unions CUPE and SEIU West were not listed as "Other Partners in Education" although they represent over 7,000 people who work in the pre-kindergarten to Gr. 12 education sector.

Dear Advisory Panel of the K-12 Education Governance Review, I am a parent and a member of SCC. I have read through the Educational Governance Review Report. I do not understand the reasoning for the proposed changes outlined in the report. I live in a rural community where we care about our children and our education. We need a local voice in an elected board as they know what our small community's needs and priorities are. Is it not our right as taxpayers to have a say in what our children and grandchildren's school future brings? Also, why such a short time frame for changes of this magnitude?? Why mess with what's not broken?! There is NO WAY that the changes listed would be able to provide better care than our locally elected boards. The models presented in the Education Governance Review Report will not only impact our schools and our children, but our families, our businesses, our volunteers, and our communities. I DO NOT support any of the three models presented in the report. It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community!

As a parent of a student attending our junior high, I am not in support of a centralized government-ran board. We in the north will see our children's educational needs suffer without local involvement from a local School Board. This proposed plan many look good financially, but it is our children and their education that will truly be paying for it. Already rural communities have challenges from not being geographically close to major centres. Do not do this to our schools. Good rural schools need to be run by good local people who understand the culture and challenges of their community.

Things are working well as they are. Change is not needed. Thank you.

I do not agree with Forced amalgamation of the school divisions. As a resident of Grand coulee who grew up going to a rural school, I chose to live in Grand Coulee with my own little family primarily because of the fabulous school, its smaller classrooms, and close proximity. I think it's important the board be made up of local voices and not provincially appointed individuals who have no vested interest in our students. High school transportation is already an issue in our town and I do not want to see it become more of an issue with longer bus rides. Decreasing education resources is not a strategic way to eliminate our provinces debt.

I support locally elected school boards and I feel they would be better equipped to tend to the needs of the schools they support. I also very strongly believe in keeping school boards separated i.e. Catholic and Public, having one governing body would jeopardize our Catholic values and would be against constitutional provisions as per the provincial agreement of 1905 where rights and privileges of religious minorities were protected and preserved.

From my understanding of our education system, the government always wanted the absolute best education to be given to students across the province. You guys obviously decided that this isn't a priority for this province anymore because of the changes you want to make! Maybe you need to take time away from your offices and actually go sit in a classroom so you have an idea of what it's like for teachers! You will change your mind on certain decisions pretty fast!

To Whom It May Concerns, I wish to express my sincere desire for the Government of Saskatchewan to keep school boards local. I deeply value Catholic education for my children growing up in our Province. I respect and honor the Government's decision to look towards fiscal efficiency in the Education sector along with striving for quality education for our children. That said, I question, based on a previous attempt to amalgamate, the positive outcomes for all. Again, I wish to promote and recommend that Catholic Education continue to be offered to the families of Saskatchewan and that school boards are kept local. It is very important to me and my family to be able to vote for local representatives who become the voice of our children's needs. Sincerely,

Teacher with Greater Saskatoon Catholic Schools.

As a committed, passionate teacher, I strive each and every day to fully meet the vast needs of my students. Everyday, I feel more frustrated that I simply can't "do it all by myself" and don't have the help I need. My staff is awesome; however they, too, are stressed as their efforts are being stretched too thin. The past amalgamation only served to cut supports to the students where they needed it most: in the classrooms, and this will be repeated with this round of amalgamations. Each school division knows what's best for their students, based on the needs of the communities in which board members live. Keep it local and keep it democratic!

My name is _____ I have _____ children in the Lloydminster public school division. The Sask government's recent decision to consolidate 18 separate and well ran school divisions into what is proposed is frankly a reckless and insulting decision. As one of the 20,000+ Alberta residents of Lloydminster whose children attend a school governed by the LPSD I am horrified at the fact that these changes will remove our local board but also my right as a parent and taxpayer to have any voice or say. Contacting Regina or Saskatoon for a problem happening down the street from me seems pointless and unnecessary. Not to mention if a real problem was to occur my concerns will fall on deaf ears. I suppose I could reach out to an Alberta MLA who would be powerless to do anything Saskatchewan related, or the Sask MLA who could care less of the concerns of someone who can't vote for them. I urge you to reconsider, and leave my school board that has run flawlessly for 84 years alone. If something isn't broke, why try and fix it?

I believe that locally elected school boards are very important to the success of the children and students in our communities. I don't think that what is right for one community is necessarily right for the next; nor do I think what is right for one neighbourhood school is right for the neighbourhood school across the town/city. Locally elected school boards are better able to make decisions for those schools and students that help them become successful and efficient. As a teacher I feel as though the amalgamation of the Saskatchewan school boards will affect our students' future education in a negative way. Please, please, consider the children and students who need their local community to make their educational decisions to ensure their success!

I'm very disappointed with the decision to consolidate our public school boards. I feel that if this happens it will affect my kids' education. The system that we have now in place is good. I can't imagine having appointed school boards in a different location. I also can't imagine the money our community puts into our schools being spent elsewhere. Our community needs the transportation, prekindergarten and other services that are available in our system. I vote for option 3b Division Model of realigning boundaries; this would have the least amount of disruption to our school system.

Amalgamation would be the best thing for divisions. We need to get rid of the board and the high salary central office people. We cut teachers yet no cuts to central office.

I want to keep elected board members over appointed ones and suggest that certain qualifications /training are necessary in order to run. This gives a voice to the community and honours religious rights and freedom Like standardized education that is universal among all regions as well as public and private divisions Like Increased transparency and accountability in spending and distribution and ensuring qualified people are doing the job and held accountable Recommend that whichever option is chosen that it be the least disruptive and cost effective weighing heavily the impact on the short term and its impact on the everyday operations. Perhaps breaking the change down into "phases" will alleviate a total disruption.

To whom it may concern, Hello! I just wanted to take a moment to share my opinion on this. As a mother to 5 kids who have or are attending the _____ school division I think it's vital to keep things the way they are. Having each individual school board assures that all areas and divisions are ready and able to address each and every issue. Also that everything can be dealt with quickly and efficiently without missing things along the way. This way everyone has a voice and all communities work together to assure all divisions give every family and child the best they can for their education system. Knowing things get addressed and things continue to grow and flourish in each division/community. Without these things in place I feel that many smaller communities will suffer from the lack of supports and priorities. Slowing down the time it takes to address all issues and lessening the effectiveness of all schools. I wouldn't want anyone to be deprived the very best of their education and the effectiveness of the current divisions. Thanks for your time!

We want to keep local voice in our communities. None of the options will work for us as presented by Dan Perrins. We need a better option. Leave things In education alone. Our school division is one of the top in the province why would we want to be combined with one whose achievements are lower. Please leave our education system alone. Why should our children pay the price of our provincial deficit??

We see homeschooling as a great option for both families and government, in that it greatly reduces the fiscal load on the government, and it offers a wide variety of options for students to pursue unique talents and interests within a fully customized education plan that meets their needs. With the abundance of online materials, information, and courses, homeschooling options have increased even more. We would like to see SHBE (Saskatchewan Home Based Educators Board) represented in the list of stakeholder groups involved in this discussion with the government. In this way, the government would consider the needs of home educators and affirm their valuable role in the province's education plan.

It is indeed very interesting to discuss the significance of education for the implementation of K-12 governance review. Since we are new in the community, we've got a long way to go to learn more precisely the issues. Thank you.

Essentially anything that gets done affects everything and everyone. There are poor divisions, rich divisions and divisions that stretch through the province. What I would like to see is equality! As long as the kids get a good, safe education I will be okay with things. Schools need upgrades and possibly new schools but then the schools get shunned. Where there are not schools needed new ones are built and old ones not used any longer. It's a shame. The schools my 2 kids attend are falling apart and sinking into the ground. The School division does nothing. It's sad. Safety and education should be a high point on minds. Upper echelons of the division get raises and then wonder why there is no money. There has to be accountability too. Instead of just making a choice, maybe get the people to vote on it. Make the choices easier to make as that report is a lot to take in and digest. Not an easy read for most people.

The math program that is implemented is terrible they need to get back to teaching proper math. There are far too many days off for students and that is why they are rushing through subjects. There is also not enough focus on Phys Ed. Busing needs to be looked at if they can't run in the city when the wind chill is -45 then they are not fit for the road. I am a mechanic and the only reason something won't start when it is cold is because of a lack of maintenance. I can see when the country busses don't run because it takes longer to get to a downed bus but in the city there should be no problem.

Hello, I understand changes are being considered in our education system. As the MLA/Premier/Advisory Panel who represents our interests as citizens and taxpayers, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community. Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support the Chinook School Division and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature: 1. Locally accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities 2. Consolidation will set back the advancements that have been made in literacy and numeracy for years. 3. The NDP promoted consolidation held back education for at least 5 years and cost money rather than saving money. 4. This would be the second time that forced amalgamation excluded Separate School Boards, firstly in the NDP action and now in the Sask Party proposal. 5. It took at least 5 years for the Boards, formed only 10 years ago, to become accepted as the community's school system. Significant improvement in learning is just beginning to be achieved in the last couple of years. 6. A large percentage of the funding for education comes from local property taxes still. While the Province sets the taxation rate, the local taxpayers still pay the toll. This is different from Health where all funding except portions of capital come from the Provincial budget. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

I feel very strongly that amalgamation will NOT benefit our students! We need focus on general education and not higher government. Please leave school division work for each student in our respective division. We know what's best for our kids.

I would like to start by giving my background, I myself have attended schools in Prairie Valley, Regina Public and Regina Catholic systems and when I went from Prairie Valley to the Regina schools I was grade levels ahead! So it made sense when my kids were old enough for school I would place them in Prairie Valley! And it still shows in all the studies I've shown! Not to mention how great the schools are for children with higher needs than others! I've seen so many kids slip through the cracks in the public system! Why do we want our working and growing system to be changed to be less?

I prefer Options 3A or 2.

We need to keep our school boards represented locally. The needs of one school to the next are different based on the children and town/city that school is situated in. Please do not generalize something as important as our children's education.

I feel this process has been moving so fast it makes it hard to believe there is really enough time to weigh the four options and make informed decisions. We are all searching for efficiencies but no one really knows how much any of these options will cost or save. No one really knows what any of these options will look like as already Saskatchewan has the fewest number of divisions in western provinces. We have nothing to compare these options to. It feels reckless, especially if options 1 or 2 are chosen. Personally, I would like to see our current divisions left alone to find their own efficiencies before we make hasty, expensive and disruptive decisions that will potentially save nothing and cost more. I also want to add that I feel very privileged to be a newly elected trustee. I can say that what I have experienced firsthand sitting on a diverse board of elected people is that I am surrounded by intelligent, dedicated, passionate and heartfelt people. These people are approachable and respectful and were chosen by their communities to represent them for a reason. They are committed to the students they serve and take it very seriously. I respect and value them as they each bring a unique voice to the table. Our Director and Senior Staff are completely invested in our students and schools. I believe that being elected gives a greater sense of responsibility to the stakeholders. I fear we will not have such a compassionate local voice with larger divisions and appointed boards.

To Whom It May Concern: I am writing in regards to the current Governance Review. We are a home educating family in the beautiful province of Saskatchewan and as such we believe in the benefit of representation of the home educating community in any stakeholder groups. We believe that valuable input can be made from a representative of our group and we believe that SHBE and the HSLDA should be involved in the re-evaluation. We ask three things of this Governance Review: (1) We ask that SHBE be counted as stakeholder in these discussions, (2) We ask that the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students; and (3) We ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators. Thank you for your time and we look forward to achieving a positive outcome with this review.

I would like to see home-educators represented at any proposed advisory board and specifically that SHBE and HSLDA are allowed to represent us. I would like to see the separate and public systems in Regina remain separate entities. I would like to see the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students. And I very strongly want to see board members remain as elected officials, not appointed.

Let me start by saying that I am a proud Union construction worker, and I am appalled, and completely disgusted with the Sask Party. First it's private liquor, next.... sell off some of our crowns. Oh, and then let's not forget about private healthcare. Yep, that's right... a private hospital being built in Regina. Let's squash the education system as well, to try and put more money into the hands of the province. Those hands are the hands of the Sask Party. Short term. Yeah, it shrinks The provincial deficit, but that's SHORT TERM. What in the heck is the government going to do in the future, once all this money is gone. Sell now, fix our deficit, and then who cares. We will leave a mess for the next people to fix. But look how well we did. That is complete crap. You shrink the provinces school decisions and make cuts to save money. The federal Government is going to cut the funding that they provide to our education system. You privatize health care. The federal government will make cuts there as well. I say let's take more money from their pockets and make better schools and better hospitals and pay proper wages to those that work in those fields so that our children and families have the education and healthcare that they deserve from NOW, and into the future. Think about all the continued funding that comes from the crown corporations that all pay taxes just like you and I. What about federal government money that you and I pay for that comes back to us through our healthcare and education systems? How about our roads? Sarcasically saying, why don't we just hire the next cheapest private company to maintain them for the province so the Sask Party and the Liberal government of Canada can line their pockets some more. They give themselves raises and then ask the "people" to pay more taxes, because we have a HUGE deficit. I think it's time the people of this province and country wake up and see what is happening right in their own back yards.

There is no subsidy for high school fees available for single parents.

Please don't make these school districts too large they are large enough already. Some kids are being bus 1hour to school and 1 hour home for total of 2 hours on the road already(which can be very hazardous in winter conditions) for sport activities these distances are already extreme and if made bigger these activities would end up being dropped and increase of obesity in our children. Also factors of local health care need to be considered as in rural areas these can be few and far in between. Therefore I feel that Option 3b is the best.

Hello, we have homeschooled our children since the start and have appreciated the level of commitment the school div has given us. Our liaison is there to answer any questions while guiding us on what is expected. I have also greatly appreciated the money we get each year for our homeschooling. To me this makes sense as I pay taxes to the public school board and my children are technically enrolled there so there should be some financial help. My concerns with the recent statements being made are that homeschoolers would loose their voice and their independence that we currently have. As we as I would be concerned that the funding I receive would be lowered. I choose to homeschool my kids. I follow all guidelines, and in the cat test that is done each year they are excelling compared to peers. If the freedom and financial ability to teach my kids the way they require is taken away or made more stringent I'm concerned that they will not be able to continue to excel

I would like to see more involvement with parents. Also, a second language like French integrated into Balcarres school. At least I would like our Spirit Builders After-School program to get better support from the school and PVSD.

I would like to see homeschoolers represented in this way. 1) That SHBE be counted as stakeholder in these discussions, 2) That the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students, and 3) That any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators.

I would like to see homeschoolers represented in the following way: 1) That SHBE and HDLA be counted as stakeholders in these discussions, 2) That the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students, and 3) That any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators.

I truly believe that education needs to have a local voice and that can best be done by elected trustees! I also believe that it is important to keep the current number of school divisions. This way local and regional issues and concerns can be heard and addressed. The larger the size the harder for that to happen or even feel heard. Education is an extremely important to our society and economy and as such we need to make sure that we continue to put the education of our kids as a high priority!

Communities all over Saskatchewan are diverse. We cannot paint everyone with the same brush when there are a variety of student differences. (Race, socio-economic status, family, values, learning abilities, etc.) As an educated teacher, I am expected to adapt the curriculum to meet the needs of my students. I'm required to differentiate instruction and outcomes to meet each student's individual needs. How will this be possible if we amalgamate? Our Northern community does not have the same issues and goals as other Southern communities. Our population is different, and cultural diversity plays an important part in our communities. Some communities have 10-20% Aboriginal students and others have 60-80%. Those communities will have different needs and goals. Each community will have different strengths and weaknesses. Our community members need to be able to have input just as a parent should have input with helping their child succeed in a school. Our goals in the Northwest are different then some southern, high-class communities. People working in education should have a vote and our government needs to realize that we are knowledgeable and know what our communities need because we have worked in education for years. Thank you for your time.

To Whom It May Concern: I recently learnt that McLean School may be closing. As someone that attended McLean school from K-9 I think this is devastating for the families and the community. McLean has one of the more updated schools around and it's also used as the community hall to take this away from the families and the community is going to be a ticking time bomb for this community. People will also have a hard time selling their homes with no school in the community or attracting new people to the community. Please do not close a school I once attended and that the community needs for their families. Thank You.

The school system is in desperate need of increased Speech Language Pathologists and Occupational Therapists. We have a child with special needs and it was drastic the change in supports when he entered school. The health system provided speech/language/therapy services until he entered pre-kindergarten at which time you lose those services through the health care system as they are supposed to be offered through the school. The services through the school are so scarce, it is grossly inadequate for the needs of kids like ours. Young children who have need regular, ongoing intervention to help develop these skills and it is in the early years that this is the most vital. We have been pressured into paying for regular private appointments to meet the needs of my young child. It not only is expensive, but sad that if we didn't have the means to provide this for our child, he would not receive the services he needs.

I feel that the best option is just to realign the boundries for the school divisions. The second best option would be moving to 14 school boards (please note I did NOT include any number smaller than 14 in fact 20 may be even better!). The other 2 options are just too drastic. I feel that the least amount of upheaval would be best as city boards/administration have little in common with rural boards/administration. Kind of like the story of "City Mouse/Country Mouse" they have 2 very different perspectives. Local boards/administration can keep the proper perspective for their respective schools which ultimately affects all students and staff.

The level of our concern with this item is beyond comprehension. We have finally started to see continuity and a level of education that we have been seeking since the last amalgamation. There may be some benefits to the options proposed but the challenges heavily outweigh them at this point. Why doesn't the government take more time to assess the options as well as lay out a better platform for what the detailed plan would look like? The options are quite vague at this point and quite honestly, for a Province that portrays itself for the people of Saskatchewan, this severely portrays a Province for the business end and removing all the locality and community assets that education bases its foundation on. We strongly urge that the Government take time to measure these assets as they are not measurable on a balance sheet.

This will be the worst thing to happen to our children. They deserve their needs to be met and their individuality to be celebrated. It is important that we keep our a pointed trustee's local. Every school division has different needs and these needs should be trusted to someone who understands.

I have 2 children in the RCS They have been in the same school since pre-k and I wouldn't think of moving them to a public school for the following reasons: 1) smaller enrolment totals and class sizes. My children get more one on one focus. 2) Care and attention. It was our teachers and principals who pointed out our son's lack of focus in class They now provide him with coping skills in the classroom. 3) Community and church involvement. Our school has a strong belief system and encourages students to live positively and to share with others. 4) Communication. I have access to our school staff via phone, emails, and blogs and in person. Being a smaller school I feel we are a closer knit group and that makes communication between everyone so much easier. 5) Safety. I'm aware of the procedures taken in case of emergency. My children are taught what to do to protect themselves. And there's very visible supervision on the school grounds. I feel my children are safe at their school. I'm alerted via phone calls and via email immediately if there are any threats. In conclusion, I think there is a necessity to keep public and catholic school systems separate from each other. My children's belief system is rooted firmly within their school family. To take that away from them would be detrimental. They thrive in the catholic school environment. From the curriculum to community involvement to the extracurricular activities. It all involves their faith.

Good morning, we find ourselves in a time of constant changes and demands taking place in our world. It appears that as ignore everything we do is no longer our say; everything is being forced and mandated for us by "the powers that be." We are people, not assets, no data on a spreadsheet. We elect officials because we believe they will be who will best represent us. We do not put them there because we are particularly keen on being told we will have to financially make up for their mistakes and take any changes they come up with lying down. I have worked for the public schools and my children are nearing the age where I will be placing them in the catholic system. All these mandated changes coming our way are to say the least, scary and disheartening. Moving towards a giant conglomerate of a school board takes any chance of having our voice heard even further away. We elect our trustees because we choose and trust them to represent us as families and employees. At the end of the day, I always remember that as an employee of the public schools I work for the families, same as our elected officials work for us. It's time we are included in having our voices heard. The last thing our education system needs are words like "CEO" and "mandate." We need to teach the children that they can make a difference in our world and not to just lie down and take what is told to them if it goes against what they believe in. Please consider your duty to the public as officials we elected and let our voices be heard in great disagreement with this decision.

We currently have a son . During this school year he has not received speech through the school system. We were ensured that once he started going to school he would receive regular speech and this has not occurred. We have been forced to pay for private speech which puts both a financial and time pressure (parent taking time off work to take child to speech) on our family. All everyone wants is the best education for their child and we understand that each child experience through school differs, the essential services such as speech should be provided.

Hello, Thank you for the opportunity to express my thoughts on this issue. I hope you can put your politics and talking points aside, take a step back, and look at what you're trying to accomplish. Think of the future, not just the short term. Use common sense. Key parts of the Perrins report proposals are lacking in that. Maintaining elections of the school trustees is very important. The diversity of communities across Saskatchewan is surely better represented by local, elected members, rather than government appointed members who would undoubtedly be a second voice of the government, rather than the voice of the community. The proposal of appointed school trustees is shameful, and makes little sense if the objective is to save money and increase efficiency. Cuts to education classroom support is also not a viable option. Saving dollars by cutting EA's? The need for their support is higher than before, not less; given the increasing diversity of students (both culturally as well as differences that arise from various social issues). A starved education system will create lasting issues for everyone in this province for many years to come, whether they have kids in the schools or not. Hopefully the decision that this government makes regarding this issue, will be still fresh in the minds of voters by the time the next election comes.

I do NOT want to lose our locally elected trustees. I do NOT want to have one amalgamated school division.

A big concern for me is possibly losing our French stream in the future. With locally elected boards, the importance of French education is well-known in our division and community. Without the voice of our elected board members, the decision to cut our program may be deemed "fiscally responsible." With larger school divisions, or worse yet, one main school division, we will be the needle in the haystack. We need the voice of our elected representatives-especially in rural Saskatchewan.

Please proceed with the Perrins report and greatly re-structure the school boards in Saskatchewan. According to the 2015 PISA report, Saskatchewan is in last place in Canada regarding math, science, and reading. I trust that your committee recognizes this sad statistic on Saskatchewan's current-state of education. Currently, Saskatchewan provincial education money is not efficiently reaching students in the classroom or improving student learning and outcomes. According to a 2016 Fraser Institute report, no other province spends as much per student as Saskatchewan, and no other province (from 2004 to 2014) experienced a percentage increase in education spending as high as Saskatchewan. The education problems in Saskatchewan are not rooted in a lack of funds. Please disregard the strong education lobby who are trying to protect their own self-interests in opposing any serious restructuring of school boards in our province. Those persons are not putting student interests first.

As it stands there really isn't a justification for there to be any changes to the school system as it exists. This is about the Saskatchewan budget deficit. If the Saskatchewan government is looking to cut costs they should start from the top MP's and work their way down the list of politicians that are not needed. Also money could be directed from the crown corps revenue to sustain education if it was necessary. Another suggestion would be to take from the millions of lobbying money revenue the Saskatchewan party has obtained from donars and use it for education. I can see closing schools in remote towns with no kids in them and that don't relly serve a purpose anymore but that would only be a small few.

My greatest concern with a huge amalgamation of our school divisions is student learning. Having worked through the amalgamation 10 years ago the focus shifts from learning to reorganization. We have spent the last ten years creating strong systems focused on learning and ensuring that all of our schools have equitable access to resources and supports which definitely wasn't the case prior to amalgamation. The last amalgamation improved our schools. I believe becoming bigger will not improve our schools but will make it more difficult to meet the unique needs within our huge province. My fear is that decisions will be made so far from the school with very little understanding of those unique needs. Please don't lose sight of the learning agenda and strong systems that currently offer students the same learning opportunities. Reorganization means our focus will have to shift and energy will not be focused on learning for several years.

I am a Special Education Assistant

and very thankful for my union and our collective agreement. I am very concerned about the recommendations/options that have been put together and such a rushed fashion. I don't see how these options, and I quote, "Will focus on student success while ensuring accountability and efficient operational structures within the education system". The government gave Dan Perrins three weeks to study the amalgamations/restructuring and write his report. Why did Mr. Perrins recommend reduced school divisions and appointed trustees? There has been no meaningful public consultation, and a change of this scale has the potential for many errors. Why is the government rushing this? There's no evidence or report that states amalgamated/re-structured school boards and government appointed trustees and CEO, will save money. It will only guarantee that the parents, workers and communities have no voice. Please stop this! The public feedback supports our existing school division boundaries and keeping our democratic process of elected school boards. Why would the government want to change this? Why was this not brought up during the elections? I love my job working with students and they are my priority every day when I go to work. Why did the report not reference how this change will impact the students and their learning? Students are not a priority in this report! This is a business model, with government appointed school boards; Communication and feedback to and from parents/communities will be negatively impacted. I love my democratic right to elect a school board trustee who will be accountable and represent my community. Elected school board trustees have a vested interest in my community, not the government's mandate. How fast can major decisions, such as school safety issues, be made if there's no local contact or voice? I am asking that you hear the deep concern in our public voices... that our local democratically elected school boards are the best choice for my community. Local accountability comes from locally elected board's making decisions for local communities.

I am opposed to Option 1 Provincial and Option 2 Regional governance models. These proposals will strip away local needs and requirements in the education system. Thanks

Wrong! This is completely unacceptable! Do not compromise our children's futures and their education because you overspent! There needs to be local input and accountability within our local school boards, somethings just can't be done with a long arm, situations unique to areas require hands on/eye on representation. Rural versus urban differ vastly as does the support and leadership requirement for each. There has to be a different way for the Sk Party Gov't to save money - NOT on the backs of our young people. This idea is one that can not happen!

To whom it may concern: These are my thoughts based on experiences as a parent with children in kindergarten and high school. First and foremost, the policies and procedures on dealing with a child or children in the school division need to be changed. Parents, staff and students need to be educated. There needs to be emphasis on consequences of not taking the allergy serious. There also needs to be consequences for anyone, including staff, even during extracurricular activities that the same 'no peanuts or tree nuts ' or whatever the allergy be, still applies. If a parent is inconvenienced by having to pick up a child, they will pay more attention to packing lunches. As a parent, when my child is away with a team sport, I expect the coach (school teacher) to not order food with nuts intentionally on the item. This happened by students and staff during volleyball. Same rules should apply on or off school property during school activities. If a child has An anaphylactic reaction and epi is given, of there is confirmed cause, the parents of the students who caused the allergy or the staff, should be responsible for the cost of the epi-pen and other meds. Secondly, the new math program is failing. It needs to be changed back to the ways it was in the 80s. Where we understood money, had the multiplication tables drilled into our head, where teachers taught and there was a right and wrong answer. No guesstimating or estimating. Saskatchewan students are being turned away from our own universities and many are due to the lack of Math marks. Sad. Thirdly is the intern situation. I am completely for interns in our school. (I come from a long line of educators, both current and retired.) That being said, however, of an intern is teaching a class and is obviously failing at it, horribly, where the class average is 31%, then the teacher overseeing the intern needs to step up quickly and efficiently and reteach the unit and give the students another test. It's unfair to students especially in grade 10-12 where grades matter. I have much more to say, but I will leave with one final thought. Report cards nowadays are a complete joke. Go back to percentages and marks, more effective. As a parent we look at these report cards and think they are a crap. Grades are important not this mastering, achieving crap. Grades make honour roll, grades make students work for recommends (which we no longer have), and honour rolls get scholarships. When a student leaves high school and enters the real world, no one gives you a ribbon for participating in Life. A person must work hard to achieve their goals and receive acknowledgment, even if it's self-recognition. Smaller schools seem to be the worst, and it's not about grades, it's about names and favourites.

Honourable Mr. Don Morgan, Deputy Premier and Minister of Education Dear Sir: Thank you for the opportunity to offer our thoughts on the Educational Governance Review Report. Although the time period open for public feedback is brief we trust that you will receive sufficient information to assist in making the right decisions. We believe that Division Model 3B "Realigning Boundaries" is the option that would best meet the objectives for our education system. Firstly, we believe that there is no need for further amalgamation of School Boards. They are large enough now and any cost savings anticipated by further consolidation would be offset by inefficiencies in a larger bureaucracy. Furthermore, school division amalgamations are disruptive and time consuming for staff and communities. We need to keep the focus on math, writing, graduation and attendance... issues that matter to students and families and the future of our province. Secondly, we feel that there are different challenges in delivering education between rural and urban communities. For example, in rural areas it is not practical to transport students into urban centres for specialized learning. Instead other methods are required to deploy specialized programs to students in these rural schools. Thirdly, we have seen in our own community the importance of cooperation between the local school and the community. This provides opportunities for students to learn outside the classroom by sharing the use of facilities, and working together to create a strong and vibrant community. We feel that this relationship would be at risk with a more remote School Board. Finally, we believe that the school board representatives must be elected not appointed. This is essential to ensure that there is a local voice in the education of our children.

I am not in favour of amalgamation of our school districts and boards. I work in the health care region for SCHR and have seen numerous failings over the years as a result of centralizing services. I fear the amalgamation of health care services will allow more patients and residents to fall through the cracks of the system, and am also worried that the same could happen in the education system. Every school is different because every child is different. And every educator does their very best to structure their curriculum in order to serve their students in the best possible way. I'm afraid that an already financially strapped system, amalgamation will make things worse. I worry that my child will not get the best public education due to budget restraints. Currently teachers are doing the best they can with little help from the provincial government, often paying for educational tools out of their own pockets. This shows the care and the lengths educators will go to to provide EVERY child with an excellent education. Cutting of services to save a budget ensures that students will flounder and fail more often. And in today's competitive business world, that will ensure that we will be behind the rest of the world. That will ensure that our young people have little to no chance to succeed. All in the name of digging the province out of a disgusting debt that the Saskatchewan Party has put us in. It is not fair to place the responsibility to fix these mistakes on the shoulders of public employees and thus the children of this province. Their futures are at stake.

In my opinion, the Saskatchewan education system cannot be run as a business. A business operates with fixed goals and an eye to the financial bottom line. Within Saskatchewan we have a wide variety of social and economic situation, depending on where a school is located. And so a sensible business decision in Regina, for example, could be a devastating decision for Buffalo Narrows. The resources required in each school are also dependent on the individual needs of the student bodies. If you have a year where more students require additional help (due to either physical or learning restrictions), the staffing levels determined by a governing body far removed from that location are more likely to not be sufficient, resulting in reduced education levels, increased frustration by students struggling to learn, and therefore increased possibility of them dropping out. Local school boards should be more conscious of the needs of their local schools, and more able to accurately determine needs and staff accordingly. I am opposed to the appointment of governing bodies by the government, as in my opinion, this always appears to result in cronyism. Even stating that an open and transparent appointment process based on skills and qualifications would be applied does not reassure me, as I see every day how that can be easily circumvented to achieve the appointment of a specific desired candidate. My additional concern is that appointees would not represent all the areas of the province sufficiently - candidates from remote areas may not be able to take the time off or afford the trip to the major centers for regular meetings and so may not even apply, resulting in a skewed representation and inappropriate decisions being made as a result. People who have serious concerns about education do not always possess a degree, or have a history of working within the education system. I know plenty of farmers, oil field workers and mine workers who are more than capable of identifying areas of concerns and developing cost effective options for solutions, both with and without letters behind their names. Qualifications (letters behind one's name) do not define intelligence or ability. I would like to see some way to address the inequality of options offered to students across the province. The cities offer children band, multiple field trips annually to things like Agribition, participation in hot lunch programs (special lunches), while rural areas get few if any of those benefits. These value added activities do much to improve engagement levels of children with regard to continuing their educations. Unfortunately, particularly in times of economic downturn, rural areas are not able to fund these types of activities through fundraising efforts, whereas the parent base in cities is able to enjoy a more stable economy due to the wider employment sector base and therefore is more able to provide additional funding. This results in a 2 tier education system - the haves and the have not's. A single board might be able to address those inequalities, but is far more likely (due to the representation issues I foresee) to result in the have's getting more, and have not's concerns being lost due to under-representation since the bulk of the population is concentrated in the major centers. I am concerned regarding the payment structures, however. They should be standardized at an annual salary, with a set minimum number of meetings/school visits to be attended annually as part of that salary. Failure to do so should result in removal from the position with an explanation of why they are being removed. I disagree with additional payments for attending each meeting above and beyond the annual salary. Attending more meetings does not necessarily mean they are more engaged or doing a better job than the member who attends fewer but makes more thoughtful decisions. Teachers don't receive an additional bonus for being involved in their communities as coaches and Sunday school teachers above and beyond their salaries, but they do it anyway.

To whom it may concern: We feel our education system should remain as it is currently. It is working well for the vast majority of those involved. The changes being proposed will pose a major problem for teachers, board members and yes the students. Small rural districts not close to the major centers will really suffer and by that we mean the students mainly will suffer. We realize it is a problem financially but are certain there are many other areas that could be revised leaving education and health as they are.

I hope that the local school board keeps control of what is happening with our students. A remote controlled board that doesn't work or live in local communities that they are controlling is not something that is beneficial to anyone. More money taken from public education and teachers with less say. My teacher gives all she has. My son has learning disabilities. If a remote control board needs to make a decision regarding education in a school, most have probably never visited, keeps my son's education waiting on them. And in reality unless something is happening in your backyard, no one pays attention so to speak. Not to mention overlooking that already our future is paying the price to overwhelmed teachers, no funding for anything. They do pretty much most of it for free FOR THE CHILDREN. Not to mention extracurricular activities. Keep our local voices, so we have a say now and in further generations.

As a parent I really hope the government focuses its resources directly towards students in education. I came to Canada 5 years ago and one of the things that surprised me was the amount of money that gets spent on administration that doesn't really have much of an impact on students. I think there are a lot of good things going on in Saskatchewan education but it could be even better if the ministry of education and school divisions throughout the province could be better streamlined to provide more direct assistance to students.

Expecting more for less. Demanding more for less. Sounds rather like entitled teenagers doesn't it? Teachers knowingly commit to doing more than we are paid for. It is at the heart of our vocation. We give of ourselves: our time, our talents, our family time, our recreational time. We stay at school decorating classrooms and marking until the sun has set. We teach ourselves sports so that we can be coaches. We learn about theater so we can direct musicals and plays. We correct assignments in the evenings sometimes during dinner, sometimes instead of putting our own kids to bed. We sacrifice for our students because they are the reason we are teachers. Yet this sacrifice is not good enough according to the Government of Saskatchewan. A growing population means more students in classrooms. Increasing immigration means students with diverse needs. Advances in the diagnosis of learning disabilities and special needs means more students with specialized learning plans. And yet, we are required to do more. Now I am pleased to live in a province that has a growing population, that welcomes immigrants, that supports specialized students however, I don't know how much more I can do. How can I deliver curriculum, foster learning, and inspire students to strive for change in an Environmental Science class of 27 where 20 of those students have learning disabilities, language barriers, and sometimes both? What more can I give? What about those 7 students who are fortunate to not face those difficulties and yet will be hampered by them just the same since they are in the minority? Before unwise decisions are made, I implore those in Government and the general public to spend some time shadowing a teacher. Spend a day experiencing our world, our reality. Be in the classroom with us. See how and why we do what we do. And then see if we can possibly do more with/for less.

I believe the current government word "transformational change" is a ruse designed to hide the fact that the government wishes to drastically cut funding to education due to their mismanagement of government funds. Instead of focusing on amalgamating school boards, the government should focus on increasing funding to schools to alleviate high teacher/pupil ratios, to provide better and more current resources of which our teachers so desperately need, and to improve facilities that are dated and falling apart. As an education system, we have not yet recovered from the last round of amalgamations. We have a generation of lost students who were pushed aside as the government focused on saving money with these larger divisions at the expense of improving education. School division amalgamations are the last thing our education system needs. Bigger is not better. Our education system has not improved and as a province we have saved no money with these larger divisions. What the government has done has taken the focus away from the classroom and focused their attention on mega school divisions where learning takes a back seat to the almighty dollar. Please do not let this happen again! Instead of amalgamation, we should keep the current system of school divisions or create fewer more local school divisions. We have such a huge diversity in our province that we need smaller school divisions focused on the needs of the area. Look at the current situation in La Loche. Our large school divisions have failed the people of La Loche. It is my opinion that the best decisions for children are made by responsible, accountable local people elected at a local level. My experience, and understanding of how boards, and schools work leads me to believe one centralized board of education situated in Regina and directed by appointed members would not be sensitive to the needs of children in the numerous locations in Saskatchewan. The appointed members of the board in such a situation would be responsible to the government of the day, and not the ratepayers. This would be disastrous for education in the province. In closing, the government should not focus on restructuring our school divisions. Nor should they make a deal with the devil and go to a system of appointed board members. Our children are too important. The government should focus its time and energy on the learning in the classroom and not on ill-advised mega divisions which will only cost our society much more than money.

Our SCC feels very strongly that a locally elected Trustee is crucial for ensuring the needs of our children in the Public School Division are being met. We question the savings of creating one division in our geographically large province. We feel that a local voice who can speak to the specific needs of our students is worth more than cutting a few costs. Rural vs Urban, North vs South have very different needs. We question how appointed trustees will have the understanding of communities they don't live in. Our SCC feels very strongly that we need our locally elected Trustee to share our thoughts regarding our children's education. We worry that amalgamation of the existing school divisions in our geographically large province will not benefit the individual and diverse needs of the children throughout the province. We urge you to consider the needs of the CHILDREN, our future leaders, in your decision making process.

As a home educating family, I believe we need to be represented in these discussions. I request that SHBE (Saskatchewan Home Based Educators) be counted as stakeholder in these discussions. I also realize the importance of the province appointing registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students, and request that you do so. Any governance model must be transparent and include the participation of home educators. Please do your best to ensure this happens! Thank you.

Dear Minister Perrins, I ask that the amalgamation not occur. I grew up in a hamlet in Saskatchewan and went to my local small school and it was wonderful! I have not seen a benefit over the years to kids where small schools are shut down and they have to take the bus for many more hours and are then expected to learn. Also the small schools lose their voice when an amalgamation occurs no matter what anyone says! It always ends up benefiting large cities the most since that is where the headquarters will be because of centralization. Isn't education in our schools the most important aspect to focus on? Therefore stop spending and wasting money on amalgamating as the school system has done in the past, and spend it on the kids!

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report, I would like to offer the following feedback: My family is in support of maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). Therefore we feel it is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! We do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. We do not support any of the three models presented in the report. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support that change to governance or further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. We have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold we are legislated by. We need a permanent high school plan, including transportation, to accommodate the best interests of our students, their families, and our community. - Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in.

As a parent of 3 children, I believe this will truly affect the lives and education of RURAL Saskatchewan schools! We live an hour and a half from our major city and we will feel the effects of amalgamation of school divisions further! I lived through this once in the 1990s when all divisions combined to larger ones and it really hurts the children. They get lost through the cracks and that's when the small schools started shutting down and kids had to be bused further and further to attend school. My children already travel close to an hour on the bus and I would hate to see this being pushed further. As a cattle rancher, we do not have the option to pick up and move our lifestyle at a major city so our children can have a better education. We would most likely have to homeschool. My oldest daughter already had a good friend home schooled because our education system. Pushing the school division boundaries will hurt funding to smaller schools who need it and to those families who have children with special needs! We will speak and have our voices be heard!

Please do not rush this decision for the sake of taking action. If the goal is to improve student achievement, I am not convinced without proof that larger school divisions will change that for the better. By eliminating local boards we silence voices that speak for the needs of individual students and communities, and will not improve morale in our teachers. If the goal is for our province is to save money, I would appreciate data showing how the last amalgamations saved money. What are projected costs and savings? Please keep the status quo until there is convincing evidence that change is needed for improvement. It's not fair to make our children pay for the consequences of our rushed decisions. Thank you!

Dear Sir/ Madame: Thank you for including public consultation for the inquiry into responsible educational governance. I am writing from the point of view of a home school educator in the province, to improve responsible home education governance. (1) First, I would encourage those who are engaging in this process, to include SHBE, (Saskatchewan Home Based Educators), and HSLDA, (Home School Legal Defense Association), as stakeholders in the discussions. They have adequate responsible governance and unique specialization in home education to engage in discussions effectively, on behalf of home educators in the province. (2) I think it reasonable too, that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators. (3) Regarding funding for home education: The current model creates different parameters across school divisions to use the funding as they see fit. Some divisions give \$1000 and others nothing, to home educators, with different parameters to receive the funds. I would appreciate a model that is fair and reasonable. There should be clear and fair guidelines in regard to funding and governance for home educators and school divisions across the province. I hope these suggestions will aid in improving home education governance.

I am a Lloydminster resident and the Perrins report concerns me as an educator, tax payer and parent. Lloydminster is a unique city and our education system has reflected that. We have always fought for equal services for all children in LPSD. I do not believe any of the models in the Perrins report will allow for Lloydminster to provide seamless services to our children. I want a local, elected school board. That is necessary for education to be successful in our city. I recognize the 5 challenges listed in the report are real concerns but believe they can be met with new regulations and expectations.

Provincial amalgamation needs to happen so local boards don't make terrible decisions such as spending \$1,000,000 on a change room for Yorkton Minor Football. This does not benefit learning of all our students in the divisions. It's one of many local examples. We need appointed boards.

Since the last school division amalgamation PVSD and other divisions have completed a Herculean task by cutting cost and reorganizing to make us one of the most efficient divisions in the province. Now we are threatened with more cutbacks and layoffs. Have they once stopped and thought about how this affects students. Overcrowding is now a way of life for most schools and we have adapted. It has been proven that massive amalgamation into one super division does not save money, which seems the government's only concern, and does nothing but further remove students and parents from those that make the decisions. We have faced massive cutbacks to our funding and we have adapted. Now we are being told not enough. Saskatchewan is in the midst of an economic downturn and those in power are hitting every other antic button available. Education is the key to this provinces success or ultimately its failure. Do not cripple the efforts of those who are tasked with turning the youth of this province into tomorrow's leaders. Leave the divisions alone. As hard as it is to believe for those in charge at the government level, we cannot do any more with less. We do not ask for extravagances, all we ask is to have the tools available to keep the lights on, the classrooms warm, and not to have to constantly worry about whether we have enough resources to continue to teach. Education is a jewel in the crown. Do not pluck it out to sell for the short term relief. Instead polish it, admire it for what it is, and constantly remind yourselves that this now beautiful jewel was once just a rock that somebody saw potential in.

Horizon already encompasses a huge area, which increases some costs for transportation (student activities, staff activities, administration travel time and costs). The Catholic divisions are no longer a requirement particularly in this area, as that religious faith is not the minority. Although I do question why the government preferentially supports one specific subgroup of a faith, yet cut back on funding minority language and cultural groups. I think that removal of the separate school divisions would be most economical. Locally determined options could allow for unique French programming schools and those students that require the Christian Ethics class to graduate can program that through their own churches (similar to a Special Credit Project, that is available already).

We are a homeschooling family and would ask that SHBE (Saskatchewan Home Based Educators) be counted as a stakeholder in these discussions, to make sure students who are being educated at home have a say in how the Ministry makes its decisions. We would hope that the province would appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students, and we ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators. Home educated students are often overlooked for both services and funding so our hope is that we would be included in these discussions to minimize exclusion of these students. Thank you.

As a teacher in an all-First Nations School, I plead with you to take a second look at the business-like structures that you are trying to apply to our school system. Education should be one of our top priorities. Other countries used to look to our country as a leader in education and here in Saskatchewan. We are falling behind. I for one need my Educational Assistant. Having a class of 21 students that are all at least 4 or 5 levels below where they should be as far as math and reading levels. It's hard alone. My students need mental health supports and these have been continually cut. I need resources and with more countless budget cuts and teacher cuts in my school - it is getting tougher. I pour endless hours and my own money into my classroom. Don't make it harder on the teachers that are trying their best to make a difference. I need the support of my Language, Technology, Cultural and Math consultants. They help me out so much when it comes to the diverse needs in my classroom. Combining our school divisions even further will put these types of supports further out of reach. Collaboration is key to working in our current world. I teach this to my students every day. When we increase the area between me and colleagues for Professional Development, costs don't go down, they'll go up. I hope that you hear my thoughts and respect them. The more cuts made, the harder my job becomes. I did not go through the efforts to get degrees and be the best educator for my students, for nothing. I am paying my loans back - not the government. If I make that investment as a Saskatchewan Citizen, you should respect and support me by giving me resources that I need. Teachers like me, we have plenty of opportunity - we choose to stay here and work in the trenches where students need the supports to help build up our province. Help us.

Locally elected school boards are and should continue to be, an integral part of the education system. The farther away people are from the services they provide, the less aware they are of the ongoing problems and concerns of the people. The divisions are large enough as it is and at times right now, the voice of the child may not be heard! Rural vs Urban. This has always been an issue and always will be. Therefore, they will continue to have different needs that will not be met by amalgamation. Education will always cost more than the revenue it can generate. That doesn't mean amalgamation will fix or fill the gap.

I graduated from Saskatchewan's Teachers' College and have been active in the education system in Saskatchewan, Alberta and BC. I once again reside in Saskatchewan and have grandchildren and great grandchildren who will be affected by the proposed changes. My youngest daughter and her husband home educate their children. It has come to my attention that the review panel that the Minister of Education has appointed has no one from the homeschool community sitting on it. These changes will most certainly affect those who home educate, would it not be equitable to include them in the process? Three things to come to mind as I consider the possible option: 1) That SHBE (the Saskatchewan home educators advocacy group) be counted as stakeholders to represent the concerns of home educators. 2) That those who chose to home educate have only one registering authority to answer to. 3) That any new model be transparent as to where taxpayer monies are spent. As a former teacher I have observed the close attention to academic excellence and the one on one instruction received by my grandchildren. Home educators need to be acknowledged as stakeholders along with the Public, Catholic, French Language and First Nations students.

As a Regina-based home school mother of 3 children, I support and agree with the recent SHBE/HSLDA submission made to the K-12 Governance Review Advisory Panel.

I want to keep locally elected school boards. The people we elect are members of our communities and therefore they understand the needs of our schools better. We participate in Magnet classes which I feel work very well for rural schools. Teachers have different areas of expertise and this allows them to do more teaching in these fields and to a larger group of students. I think it is beneficial for teacher and students. I have children who have graduated and are hard working members of society, some are furthering their education and some are in job force. The wonderful education they received at school played a big part in shaping them into who they are today. Smaller rural schools are very beneficial to all and I do not want to see any of them close.

I am not in favour of further amalgamation. Locally elected boards are better able to address the needs of a school community.

Local democratically elected school Boards are the best choice for our community. Local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities. School boards make planning, staffing and budget decisions close to communities with the resources made available. It also encourages civic engagement in education. Based on past experience, amalgamation will put the focus on governance, administration and change in management. Students will become secondary focus setting back the advancements that have been in literacy and improved graduation rates. The previous NDP amalgamation caused disruptions for at least 5 years and education spending continues to rise. Economies of scale have been realized. This would be the second time that forced amalgamation excluded Separate (minority faith) School boards, firstly in the NDP action and now in the Sask Party proposal. It took at least 5 years for the boards, formed only 10 years ago, to become accepted as our community's school system. Significant improvement in learning is just beginning to be achieved in the last couple of years. A large percentage of the funding for education still comes from local property taxes. While the Province sets the taxation rate, the local taxpayers still pay the toll. Taxpayers deserve local representation for education. This is different from Health where all funding except portions of capital come from the general revenue fund of the Provincial budget. Locally elected boards are responsible for placing student needs first when making decisions, and are accountable to their electorate. They are responsible for ensuring all students within their jurisdiction have equal opportunities to reach their maximum potential. This may be lost with larger elected boards or appointed boards who may be influenced by politics because they are responsible to the government who appointed them.

It would be a mistake to implement anything but a division model. Keep the governance close to home. Education is not a one-size fits all option, the governance of it shouldn't be either. An appointed board would be less engaged and would treat their appointment as "just a job", where an elected board is engaged and passionate about their role.

I strongly disagree with a larger school division. As a parent and a volunteer it is tricky enough trying to get extra circular activities organized with busing. A great deal of thought needs to be given to not having elected officials run the school boards. Having appointed officials really takes the ground away from local initial consultation on programs and where organization can occur. I would not support of appointed school board officials. Or larger school boards. Right now the school boards are too large to get cohesive organization of band, math and drama programs. Please keep school boards as is with elected officials and consider smaller school board areas as to larger ones.

Please get rid of our current board governing system which doesn't look after the needs of ALL students. Local board members look after their own interests and then only their one community. Central office staff increases in numbers and salary. Teachers and EAs get cut. Support is not with the schools and students in our current system.

vWe at Kelliher School have been very fortunate to have excellent local representation to PVSD. I am very concerned that with the proposed changes to the Divisions. We will lose that local voice. Our school is also in a remote location and I fear that our needs will not be met due to distance challenges and lack of voice. We have special needs children in our school that require specialized support. In a large division we may not appear to have the numbers to justify the resources. This will be detrimental to all students in our school. With major changes to structure, the time it will take to get the new structure up and running efficiently will result in loss of focus on education which will ultimately negatively affect the children. We need to focus on how can we make the current structures work more efficiently and work together to improve the level of education. Making decisions in a difficult time financially usually results in rash decisions being made for short term results. The long term vision should be on producing production citizens for the province of Saskatchewan. PVSD is exceeding all provincial averages for education. This should speak to the success of the structure! Please do not disadvantage my children!

In my opinion the current model we have is too large and disconnected from the needs of the schools, the board now won't listen to the local administrator on what they need in their schools and they(the board of directors) use useless formulas to target staffing needs that make no sense and this causes hardships for the students. As usual the larger things get, the more disconnected management is from the everyday workings of the front lines and this will not get better if this amalgamation goes forward. The letter of transmittal submitted by Mr. Perrin in my up opinion is correct and I am against the movement towards one large unit, especially when you are going to appoint persons to run the system, this is not giving the people of the province a voice, it will just create a larger, non-accountable group of people who think they are entitled to their position and this will make the system way less effective because they know they can't be fired for incompetency.

Dear, Mr. Morgan and Mr. Perrins. We are a family who has chosen to home educate our children, and as such we believe that representation of the home educators community in any stakeholder groups is very important. We believe that SHBE and the HSLDA add value to the relationship between homeschooling families and the provincial bodies and should therefore be involved in the re-evaluation. We ask three things of this Governance Review: 1) We ask that SHBE be counted as stakeholder in these discussions. 2) We ask that the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students, and 3) We ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators. Thank you for taking the initiative to ask for public consultation and we are looking forward to the conclusion.

I support Locally elected boards who have listened to my concerns and have brought French Immersion to Lumsden Elementary. The renovations to the elementary and high school has been a great improvement under the current governance. I do not agree with changing governance or amalgamating school divisions is the answer to the financial challenges that we face. School division amalgamations are disruptive and time-consuming for staff and communities. I believe the government needs to allocate more money to schools in order to decrease the ratio of students to teachers, not amalgamating school divisions.

I support Locally elected boards who have listened to my concerns and have brought French Immersion to Lumsden Elementary. The renovations to the elementary and high school has been a great improvement under the current governance. I do not agree with changing governance or amalgamating school divisions is the answer to the financial challenges that we face. School division amalgamations are disruptive and time-consuming for staff and communities. I believe the government needs to allocate more money to schools in order to decrease the ratio of students to teachers, not amalgamating school divisions.

We request our provincial government would allow SHBE and HSLDA be counted as stakeholders in the discussions regarding education in the province of Saskatchewan. We request also that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators.

So if there is unanimous support to keep the status quo in school divisions, why on earth did Dan Perrin recommend reducing school divisions? Is he considering students first? Is he considering how this will impact student learning? Have we the public been consulted on these changes? This was not brought up during elections! As a tax paying citizen, I have the right to elect my own school board trustee that will be held accountable in my community! Quality of education is at stake here and it is abundantly clear that this government does not care about students and their learning environment! Schools are not a business. Put students first!

I have read Mr. Perrin's Letter of Transmittal, I agree with his findings that there is no support behind these proposed changes. A locally elected voice is important for the future of our rural schools.

I would to express my complete disapproval of the current amalgamation process! It has been struck out of desperation by a government who has mismanaged our economy and resource revenues and now seeks ways to decimate the services provided to the residents of this great province in order to cover their own exorbitant mismanagement! How can any competent Saskatchewan government possibly, in one year, miss projections by ONE BILLION DOLARS? Shameful! I am not adverse to change, but I also believe it should be thoughtful and purposeful! My children's K-12 education was through PVSD and their undergrad education at the U of R. This school division has done an awesome job providing for my children's learning experienc

, the current structure is successful even though this province has placed many roadblocks for this success like removing the SD's ability to set local mill rates in support of local education!!! The comment that an appointed board would do a better job at running the SDs is a slap to democracy. Elected SD officials are the balance required to provide the local guidance and representation of the taxpayer. The comment that this government could appoint a board that could do a better job is laughable given this government's deficit situation and track record. This government needs to get its own house in order before it goes after the institutions that have been successful while living within the meager means provided by this government. I know this is not the forum for this, but I would be remiss if I did not mention the residents of Saskatchewan, the voters, we are talking and questioning circumstances regarding the GTH, the land deals, the by-pass, and the P3 direction, that all other jurisdictions abandoned, yet we pursued. This government is bleeding jobs and revenues out of this province through the P3 model. As I mentioned, I am in favor of progress but it must be good for the residents of the province with the goal of IMPROVING the delivery of education, not as the scapegoat for the mismanagement of funds by the current government! This at a time when our children's education ranked lowest across the country. The province should be doing more not less!!

1. Where in this report does it show how this will affect the education of the students? It is not spoken to directly. The government is not allowed to directly impact their education and by changing the model it may cut teachers and admin staff which will make for larger class rooms causing less one on one time with students in need. 2. This is more of a business model. 3. Boards of trustees are elected and if this is over turned by the government will they. To be violating our rights as Canadians and a fair election process. Will you be setting yourself up for another constitutional battle which will cost tax payers more money for you to lose? 4. Appointing trustees just sets up the issue of Political patronage appointments. 5. Why was this not brought forward during the election? Because you wanted to hold back yet another secret? 6. Clearly some of the proposed options would still cost the tax payers money with costs of more advisory committees, equity councils, 4-6 service areas, executive regional directors? 7. Where is the actual cost analysis showing the possible dollars and cents that may or may not be saved? Show us the possible actual savings without hurting the bottom line and that is the education to the students. 8. Nowhere in this document is there anything showing that by doing this business model we can take Saskatchewan from the stats of 2015 last in math, reading and science? You speak of this in the report but don't show how making these changes can fix that. You can fix that by having more teachers so they can spend one on one time helping students with these issues and students with every increasing learning disabilities.

I would like to see SHBE be counted as stakeholder in these discussions and a part of the advisory committee. I would like to see our province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students. I would also like to see that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators.

I think it is ridiculous that kids are not held back or held accountable for late or missing assignments. In Saskatoon, SK I was told by my son's vice principal that he was not ready for grade 9 but they would put him through, so he would need to work harder. Now he is 22 and has not received his grade 12. He was not taught the skills needed and then put into a higher grade, only to fall more behind. They kept passing him until he got to a grade where he had to earn his marks to pass. However he had already been taught that he didn't need to hand in assignments or do well on exams to pass. I now have 2 in school who are doing relatively well, but I hope they never need extra help. There isn't any help provided for kids that don't have special needs. Average kids make up the majority of the school system but they are on their own. There are so few EA's now, and classes are so big, that teachers and support staff do not have any time to help a kid that doesn't understand a question, when they need to focus on the kids who are highly special needs. This is reflected in our low success rates.

Locally elected boards are accountable to us, the electorate, and help hold the provincial government to account. They are important advocates for ensuring excellence in education. I believe these boards, elected by our community to represent our community, best serve the needs of students and of education in Saskatchewan.

This is not a good idea. Small towns are going to be disappearing as schools are being combined with other schools. The idea of community is a big part in Saskatchewan and the fact we won't be able to have someone from the community speaking on behalf of our school will have a huge impact on relationships with the school and the school board. Bus transportation in rural communities will not benefit from this change because students will be sitting on the bus for at least an hour to get from school to home and vice versa. This is not an efficient method for students and families. I say we leave it the way that it is, because it's working. It is in the best interest for our children and communities. Don't change anything.

I believe in saving the tax payer's money, but as an EA I'm concerned about the future for some of our most vulnerable students. As we downsize our school divisions we need to keep the future for all students at the forefront. If we increase class sizes and reduce EAs for our special students, we put our children at risk for a poor education. A teacher can only do so much in a day and already works long hours. The ministry is asking more and more from our teachers and it's exhausting. People don't realize that teachers only get paid for the days they are in contact with students. All holidays are non-paid days. A teacher can put in 60 hours per week. Any other employee would get paid overtime if they work over 40 hours per week. So as the government makes their decisions please remember the children needs should come first!!

To Whom it May Concern: We are very disappointed in the approach to mathematics at the elementary level. We have had to supplement our children's education in math because the public school system is not teaching math to our children, as reflected in our low national math scores. Other parents as well have had to send their children to Kumon or hire a tutor. Teachers need more time in their curriculum and the base ten math system should be scraped with a return to the traditional way that math was delivered to the students. The parents are left to teach kids math at home because it is not being taught properly in school.

I would like to offer my feelings about further school board governance. I have had experience in this matter as I was a school trustee when a previous government mandated amalgamations. As a member of the Indian Head division board, we decided to amalgamate with Buffalo Plains and Cupar school divisions. We were involved with the legal aspects and over a period of several months, we managed to negotiate common agreements with all three teacher locals-- no small feat. When the dust all settled, we had a working school division, but there were significant costs involved. I think that any cost savings were eaten up by upward renegotiated administrative salaries (employees expect to be paid more for additional responsibility). The only real benefit that I could see was the standardization of services offered. The down side was the loss of local input. When the government then removed the ability of boards to apply taxes, they also removed local accountability. In effect, with minimal savings to be achieved; what would be the purpose of even further amalgamations, unless the government wants total control of our school system?

As a home educating family we have chosen a path that is less well travelled than most. We are thankful to live in a country and province where our family choice is legally supported. It is our hope that these freedoms to home educate our children will be maintained -- the many freedoms of choice of curriculum, materials, time, style of learning, subjects, ability to cater the learning to the individual student and more. We enjoy the time to build the skills and character into our children so that they in turn will be an overall asset to society as adults. We request that home educating parents be part of any stakeholder groups such as the proposed provincial advisory board to the Minister of Education. We feel there is a great benefit in hearing our voices along with public, Catholic, First Nations and Metis, and Francophone students. We request that Saskatchewan Home Based Educator (SHBE) and Home School Legal Defense Association (HSLDA) represent home educating parents as part of any stakeholder groups such as the proposed provincial advisory board to the Minister of Education. We request that home educators register with one province-wide registering authority (as opposed to the current local school divisions), and that SHBE have input into the selection of that registering authority. Additionally, SHBE suggests the province allow SHBE to approve the ministry's choice, or to have the ministry choose from a list of nominees provided by SHBE. We request that there be a re-evaluation of home education funding in Saskatchewan with the purpose of ensuring that funding be directed toward home educating families. We request that SHBE and HSLDA be involved in the re-evaluation.

As a former member of the Regina Public School Board I am deeply concerned regarding the direction the Provincial Government wishes to take in respect to School Boards. Members of School Boards receive very little financial compensation, thus, the savings eliminating 16 elected Boards and replacing them with a single appointed Board would be practically non-existent. Accessibility to a single Board would also be so difficult that it would deter most parents, teachers and members of the community from even trying. The fact that the single Board would be appointed and be accountable to no one destroys the very concept of Democracy. Are we heading towards a dictatorship where elections become non-existent and all facets of our lives are determined by Government appointees?

I have 3 kids and one goes to school right now. We are 15 minutes from our school but my daughter is on the bus for 45 minutes.

If all school boards are consolidated under one umbrella how are the smaller schools going to be heard? Can you hear us over the larger schools in Regina or Saskatoon? Do our schools remain open? Are funds represented equally....probably not! I am totally opposed to this option. It is the most unfair option. If this the chosen way shouldn't you wait to see how the health care system runs under one board? Review all of their trial and errors through the process they are going to take in the next year. Now, if there has to be a consolidation than a regional board is a little more acceptable but here I fear our small school will be left behind again and the education of my kids is in jeopardy. I just want every child in Saskatchewan to have the same educational options and support. Just because we live in small town Saskatchewan because we decided to feed the world doesn't mean our children should get educational neglected!

With respect, one thing that I would like to share is that while employed at a different school division, while as a principal, it was stated at a principal's meeting, that finally, in 2014 the principals at their meetings finally felt that they were working as a team and not as five different teams. They finally felt cohesive. It took a long time to for the principals and senior leadership team to feel that way. If school board areas become larger, I would guess that that cohesiveness and team-like feeling will be absent for a longer period of time. I would want to be sure that we are considering what is best for all students and their learning in every decision moving forward. I also wonder about the voices of smaller communities being lost if the move is to fewer, larger boards. Thank you.

I am very concerned about the direction our education system is headed, both as a parent and as a substitute teacher. The amount of support teachers get is not remotely sufficient. There are many learning challenges in classrooms today. I subbed in a Grade 2/3 classroom of 25 students; five of whom have learning difficulties/challenges. I suggested the classroom needs an EA. I was told you only get an EA if there are safety issues or someone has physical needs (such as helping them in the bathroom). Then do not call them EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS!!! Therefore in this classroom the learning needs of those five students are suffering as well as the other twenty who still need ATTENTION! Give us the adequate teacher/student ratio. Let's eliminate split classes! Pay a teacher appropriately. These people are affecting the future of our children! A person working at Costco should not make more money! These are just some of my concerns.

There has been no meaningful public consultation, and a change of this scale has the potential for many errors, why is the government rushing this?

As a home educator, our family would like to see SHBE and HSLDA be contacted with any and all changes being proposed by the government in regards to education. They need to be given the same respect that is upheld for the Catholic, First Nations, Metis, Francophone, etc. Secondly, we believe it would be more efficient for there to be one facilitator for all families to register with. This person should have home education experience and understand the needs of the families choosing to educate their children in this manner. SHBE should be consulted and approve of the person in charge of registration for home education. Finally, Home Educators should be granted transparency to understand how the funding is being distributed for each of their children. All families in the province should have consistent, fair, and sufficient funds to educate their children. As the funding is being re-evaluated, SHBE and HSLDA should be contacted and involved, and the final decision should only be concluded when all parties agree. Thank you for transparency and keeping democracy true, by involving citizens in making decisions that affect their lives. SHBE Representative

I cannot support any of these recommendations. I see them as undemocratic, expensive and not entered on students. The goal should be to improve delivery and quality of education to students. These recommendations are not cost effective and are completely disruptive to student learning! Prairie Spirit has overall low admin costs and is one of the highest performing school divisions in the province. I believe local accountability, community voice and a local culture of learning would be lost given the proposed changes to the system. If the goal of the report is to improve efficiencies within the education sector- shouldn't all school divisions be included in the restructuring process. Appropriate funding levels need to be allocated to education- even in difficult economic times. I see no evidence that these proposed changes will be a cost savings measure or an improvement to student learning or outcomes.

I do not want to see this happen. Rural and urban both have different needs and challenges on a day to day basis. Lumping us together someone is going to lose a voice and it will be rural. We all pay taxes for this service

I do not support the abolition of elected school boards. This would compromise Saskatchewan's deeply held belief in transparent and accountable representative democracy.

I am very disappointed in the limited length of time that parents school community councils and the community has been given to respond to this review. This crucial type of change deserves more than 4 business days to cascade information to all the stakeholders and those affected by such a massive review and change. I do not feel that we have been given enough time to properly discern the impact the proposed changes will have and come to a proper opinion accordingly. My opinion is that the decisions have already been made and the consultation of the parents, especially with this timeline, is just for show. The opinion of the parents, whose children are at stake, is irrelevant. So much for having a voice in the education system that we are entrusting our children to for hours every day!!! I have sent the comments below to the premier, minister of education and local MLA's and can only pray that someone is listening! I understand changes are being considered in our education system. As premier of our province, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community. Education belongs to the community and I want you to know that I support North East School Division and ask that you share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature.

1. We need to keep our school boards locally elected:
 - a. locally, democratically elected school boards are responsible for placing student needs first when making decisions, and are accountable to their electorate. They are responsible for ensuring all students within their jurisdiction have equal opportunities to reach their maximum potential.
 - b. This may be lost with larger elected boards or appointed boards who may be more influenced by politics because they are responsible to the government who appointed them, not the public who elected them.
 - c. Locally elected boards make planning, staffing and budget decisions close to communities with the resources made available and tailored to the community specific needs.
 - d. Locally elected boards encourage civic engagement in education and are the best choice for my community. "It takes a village to raise a child"
 - e. A large percentage of the funding for education still comes from local property taxes. While the Province sets the taxation rate, the local taxpayers still pay the toll. Taxpayers deserve local representation for education. This is different from Health where all funding except portions of capital come from the general revenue fund of the Provincial budget.
2. We need to keep the momentum going
 - a. The previous amalgamation caused disruptions for at least 5 years and based on past experience, amalgamation will again put the focus on governance, administration and change management, instead of student achievement.
 - b. It took at least 5 years for the Boards, formed only 10 years ago, to become accepted as our community's school system. Significant improvement in learning is just beginning to be achieved in the last couple of years.
 - c. Economies of scale have been realized with the previous amalgamation and the existing school boards have been and continue to work together to achieve further efficiencies. Students will become secondary focus setting back the advancements that have been made in literacy and improved graduation rates. It is my strong belief that students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

I would prefer to have it run by our local board and not by the government for they are in charge of enough things the way it is. We don't need them being in charge of our schools. I totally disagree with the government.

As a parent of students in the Prairie Spirit School Division, I cannot see how the proposed changes to the governance of education would benefit student learning or decrease costs. If locally elected boards move to government appointed local voice is removed from education. Local boards are accountable to government and their communities presently. Large scale changes is not cost effective and is largely disruptive to learning improvements in school divisions. More evidence is needed before a decision can be made that will affect the entire province. I am also concerned about the timeline of when this material was released to parents and when feedback was due back to the government.

I do not agree with this amalgamation and do not support this idea whatsoever.

I am very frustrated with the current government's announcement of possible amalgamation. Rural schools have very different needs and requirements compared to their urban counterparts. I moved to a rural area for both the small community and for the education. I absolutely do not want my division to be amalgamated with a city public system. If you will allow the Catholic division to remain independent the rural should also be left as an independent governing school division. The structure of these divisions are unique to the people with whom they serve. I am absolutely disgusted with the current state of education and cuts to education that this government has already done and is threatening to do more of. Our children are our greatest asset. It's time we treat them as that. Allow us to remain our own division where the best interest of those that it serves are met.

I think our school division does a fantastic job and is worried that should we become part of a larger school division, the wonderful changes at our school may be lost to further cuts! I feel there are plenty of areas in which a governance review may turn up further funds for the government. I would fully support a review on how education is implemented and how we can teach our children to become the thinkers of the future. Our children deserve the best!

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input in the governance review process in the province of Saskatchewan. As a non-educator who has now worked in the education field for 14 years after 15 years in the private sector, I have a few observations about the role of elected boards and expenditures in public education. Demystifying Education – educators have a tendency to speak in jargon and acronyms that can be intimidating and at times indecipherable for parents and members of the community. Locally elected trustees play a key role in translating and understanding the core elements of education that would be lost in appointed and/or province-wide or large regional boards. Pillar of Democracy – one of the cornerstones of our education system is the development of future citizens who will contribute to the future of our province. To remove the democratic election of trustees would remove a clear local example of democracy in action. Sectarian Divide – to move towards appointed boards for public electors and elected boards for catholic electors is simply untenable in a modern democratic state which purports to be based on the separation of church and state. Sector Wide Efficiencies – Having worked in human resources in the private sector for half of my career, I can categorically state that fiscal prudence is much more evident in education than in the industries in which I worked. There simply is not nearly the amount of discretionary revenue to be played with. There likely are areas on the business side of education where efficiencies can be made. A province-wide business plan similar to the Education Sector Strategic Plan would be a good place to start (similar to suggestion on page 21 of the Perrins report). Stability vs. Wages – One of the main differences I have noticed in my career is that employees in the public sector for the most part trade off compensation for job security. When times are good in the private sector, wage increases and bonuses tend to flow to workers. One year I received a 25% wage increase as a retention bonus when a firm was sold, on top of an annual bonus that took my family to the Caribbean. Two years later the company was sold again and I was looking for work. Public sector employees do not receive the same luxury of variable compensation but generally enjoy a higher level of job security and hence commitment to their organization. There is currently a high level of anxiety amongst employees in the sector. Increased incremental costs - the sector will need to be careful to avoid collective agreement creep in eventual amalgamations. For example, support staff positions in Prairie Spirit are paid in the range of \$3.00-\$5.00 less per hour than similar employees in Saskatoon. Amalgamation or province-wide agreements will result in additional wage pressures at the collective bargaining table.

I am a support person at a community school where the large majority of our students are FN and Metis. Our students typically have substantial social and familial issues that make our efforts especially important and challenging. If staff numbers are reduced or if morale is affected, our efforts will certainly be affected negatively as well. The staff in our school is already stressed to a high degree but we do our best to support one another and to focus on the wellbeing and academic progress of the children. This continues to result in positive development for our students. To impinge further on our resources, after Regina Public has initiated a number of cost cutting measures over the last few years can only result in damage being done in the classroom. This cannot be allowed to happen. There is too much at stake. To freeze teacher's salaries when they already spend money out of their own pockets to offset money no longer available in the budget for important classroom work, in addition to the many unpaid hours they volunteer to benefit student and the community...would be inappropriate and an additional signal that their hard work and sacrifices have little value to government. Support staff have fallen further and further behind the cost of living...even through the oil boom. Teaching assistants and associates provide a critical role, especially in community schools. Associates are mostly made up of FN and Metis employees. Without them there would be a loss of role models for our aboriginal students. Teacher Associates play a large role in the engagement of FN and Metis students. Associates often act as a bridge and a comfort for students who seek identification...which leads to greater engagement. School divisions have been cut to the bone while still making progress in the classroom. I don't see that much more can be taken away unless government is willing to sacrifice student achievement.

I sure don't like finding out the government has plans to completely overhaul the education system and we find out about it on Friday January 20th and our comments are expected back in governments hands by January 23rd. You may think consultations have been open since December 16 or whenever but my notice came in the mail on Friday January 20 sure a lot of time to study the different options and think it through. And then you guys will go ahead and do whatever it is you plan on doing and let on to everyone you had full detailed discussions with the public. This is the same scam being pulled off with the Potash environmental study for the proposed Solution potash mine at Southey

I do not agree with amalgamating the school boards in Saskatchewan so that there are as few as 1 to 4 boards within the province. The options I am most in agreement with are options 3A and 3B. Rural schools need to be able to keep their voices heard. The students in these schools are just as important as those in urban centres. I feel that one board for the whole province, or even four, will not be able to meet the needs of everyone.

I have read the report. As a former trustee I see many things in a different light than most individuals. As a parent of a 7 year old I believe I can relate to the challenges that our students face today. We do have a concern that our students face in that our students are rating last in the areas of study compared to other students in other provinces. It was a belief that issues and problems will manifest themselves and show themselves quicker because of the size of our schools and classes' sizes and of our students' reactions to the instructors. When we operated the smaller school divisions before the major amalgamations in mid 2000's we could react to any needs that were requested upon boards. We had discretionary powers to tax and the trustees were fairly responsible. I support Option 1. The amount spent now on trustees and administration is outrageous. Those resources could be more efficiently used and directed to be used more directly to the benefit of the students and people that deal with them named the professional people like the teachers and aides. The one stipulation is that there be a rural oriented administrative section and one administrative section for urban centres. Even though there are larger school divisions now, they combine larger centres with rural and the in my opinion the resources they use are not directed efficiently. A separate administrative section focused primarily on rural services would be much better use of resources than a mixture of rural and urban. This can only be achieved through Option 1. It is much more fiscally responsible and would be more attentive is delivering the services because they would not be encumbered by having to deal with the smaller urban centres like Moose Jaw , Swift Current or Yorkton as examples. In these challenging fiscal times one board that can consider all facets is the best use of our resources.

I am not in support of amalgamating all of the local school boards into one board. Each local school board has more acute knowledge and connection to its students and communities. If the government wants to cut down on spending, taking it out on education is the wrong avenue to pursue.

Greetings. My husband and I fully support compulsory education, but we do not support it in a compulsory manner or a compulsory location. Each child is a unique person and should not be offered a generic education created for every one of the same age. We choose not to delegate this responsibility out to a third party. That being said, we would ask that SHBE be included in these discussions. They represent a vast group of us within this province. Overtime, they will in all likelihood represent even more of us. Based on personal experiences that are far from encouraging, supportive, or inclusive, we would also ask that the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students. We have been home schooling for six years and this is the first year our family has received a single dollar of funding. This is only because we moved from our local school division in Meadow Lake and contacted a very supportive group of people in Lloydminster. However, I would have moved for no financial compensation just because of their attitude about our choice to home base educate. I feel it is unduly unfair that the division in which you register dictates what compensation you can be offered. I would recommend consistent application of funding across the province. We did not have a productive or supportive relationship with the principal of the school within our community and this was not regarding financial support. It was regarding what I would consider a lack of respect for our choice and a lack of understanding and knowledge with respect to what supports we were entitled to as being registered in said division. It was a very lonely and frustrating experience. I would recommend a registering authority that was trained in their role and familiar with the education act. A registering authority that was willing to work with us and our children. And finally, we ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators. I feel as a citizen of Saskatchewan and a tax payer, that transparency promotes unity. Thank you for asking for our input.

As a retired educator , and having spent 37 years in the profession, the last as an administrator, I truly feel what is being proposed for education in Saskatchewan is dead wrong. Simply put, bigger is not better!! Some of the most efficient years I was directly involved in was before the prior amalgamation happened. Budgeting was much more directly involved locally and effective as boards were able to prioritize and determine importance around them. Now lots of excessive expense occurs in travel and upper administration, with little consultation. Services were shared between divisions then so there was no need to amalgamate to obtain. Larger will cause even further travel expense, and much less local involvement in the education of their children. I urge to reconsider and leave divisions alone. Take the lead in neighboring division discussions and ask the front line staff (teachers) for their input on how to make things better. They are professionals. There are too many decisions being made without by people that really don't understand the complications and effects. Evaluate curriculum of successful provinces and make changes to ours as necessary. Yes there are ways to further save some costs in the present system, and collectively, they can be found; not forced upon them. Above all, listen carefully to what the public is saying!

I don't agree with this proposal because it will let the government take control of the schools . I believe it should stay within the community to have the say with their schools.

I think lack of elected trustees will negatively impact students. Local representation is essential to a diplomatic society and is something I strongly feel should be protected. Each area in this province has different challenges and local boards are positioned to respond to these differences already. They cannot be lost. I don't believe appointed trustees will have the same passion for students as the ones we currently have, they bring a non-partisan voice to the table in favour of accountability for student services. I think additional structural changes at this time to an overly stressed system is absurd, leading to more years of upheaval and diverting support from classrooms for years to come. All school divisions have just spent the past few years adapting to recent amalgamations and it would be like starting over. Put that same time, money, attention into the students instead of overhauling the system in a time of panicked spending cuts. I do not support further changes to the structure of our provincial education system at this time. I have three children currently in the system, and I want the system to be looking to their needs, NOT burdened with the additional responsibilities of restructuring. I do not believe there are any more cost savings to be had with any of these approaches. They all divert funds away from the classroom to a greater degree than is current practice.

I have attended a meeting with Lloydminster Public School Division last week. Currently, Lloydminster has health and school system with Saskatchewan government and City Hall and other stuff governed under Alberta. I understand that there are issues due to biprovincial nature of Lloydminster. In my opinion, to serve better and save costs, less school boards or status Quo is a great idea. I have seen a few cases where school board did not really help. I think, Lloydminster should have Saskatchewan side schools under Saskatchewan government and Alberta side Schools under Alberta. This will keep things more transparent and will save costs.

I am very concerned about the proposed possible changes that have been outlined. I believe that Saskatchewan's education dollars should be spent maintaining our current schools and school divisions, rather than spent conducting ways to change our school system; put the money where it matters....directly towards our children's education. We are Saskatchewan; when people think of us, they think of flat lands, farming and SMALL TOWNS. The term 'small town Saskatchewan' is one known nationwide. My family, like so many others I know, have made the move from the city, so that their children can have this 'small town saskatchewan' way of life. Our rural communities are a very important part of what makes up our province, and I strongly believe that our education system needs to accommodate for this. Any further amalgamations hinders our rural representation and threatens to hurt all of our small towns. We, in rural communities, need to be recognized and heard. Please don't take our version of Saskatchewan away from our growing children by further amalgamations. We are proud to live here; we are proud to have our right to vote, we are proud to have so many great rural communities to raise our children in.

As a personal properties and business properties taxpayer, I request that my tax dollars are used to support the home based education children in accordance with the fairness and equality for all students as stated in the Sask. Education Act, Regulations and policies and that the education tax dollars would be used as they would be used in a reasonable, fair, and equity society. Furthermore, that education acts, regulations and policies would be changed and created to be in line with what a reasonable, fair and equitable society would implement. I strongly support the fact that home based education is a great way to educate our children. I do not have any opposition to persons that choose to relegate their education responsibility for their children to other parties, i.e. to the province. The home based education children are also represented by SHBE (Saskatchewan Home Based Educators) and HSLDA (Home School Legal Defence Association) Canada, I hereby request the government to remember that parents have the foremost right to choose the kind of educational opportunities that their children shall have. We chose to personally educate our children because we simply declined to delegate that right, responsibility and joy to anyone else. Therefore... a) I request that SHBE be counted as a significant stakeholder in these discussions, b) I formally hereby request that the province appoint a registering authority who is specifically accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding (tax dollars) specifically provided to support home educated students, and c) I request that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home based educators.

I don't want the government to run our school boards. I support our education and locally elected boards of education!

We really haven't heard much about what's happening.

We live in Waldheim Saskatchewan. We move here to raise our children in a community that shares a strong sense of the same morals and values that we do. Our only concern is that our school would be forced to adopt policies that we and our community believe will create hardships for our children later in life. Thanks for taking input on this subject.

I think having a government appointed board is a great idea! Local people that are voted in as board members have many times put what's best for themselves first instead of students. Board members have also used their authority to go on a power trip and even bully us parents which directly hurts our children. Board members do not always have the education and skills that should be required to run a school division. I also feel paying all of these board members is a huge waste of money! Too often only one person on the board makes all of the decisions anyways so why pay the rest of them. With all of this being shared I hope vibank school will stay open for a long time and the government people can do what is best for us parents and children.

As a personal properties and business properties taxpayer, I request that my tax dollars are used to support the home based education children in accordance with the fairness and equality for all students as stated in the Sask. Education Act, Regulations and policies and that the education tax dollars would be used as they would be used in a reasonable, fair, and equity society. Furthermore, that education acts, regulations and policies would be changed and created to be in line with what a reasonable, fair and equitable society would implement. I strongly support the fact that home based education is a great way to educate our children. I do not have any opposition to persons that choose to relegate their education responsibility for their children to other parties, ie. to the province. The home based education children are also represented by SHBE (Saskatchewan Home Based Educators) and HSLDA (Home School Legal Defence Association) Canada, I hereby request the government to remember that parents have the foremost right to choose the kind of educational opportunities that their children shall have. We chose to personally educate our children because we simply declined to delegate that right, responsibility and joy to anyone else. Therefore... a) I request that SHBE be counted as a significant stakeholder in these discussions, b) I formally hereby request that the province appoint a registering authority who is specifically accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding (tax dollars) specifically provided to support home educated students, and c) I request that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home based educators.

As parents, we undertook an active interest in placing our children in an elementary school setting where the French program was available, classroom sizes were smaller and added resources were available (such as Educational Assistants, Library Technicians, etc.). Since our first child began grade 1 in Saskatoon the classroom sizes have ballooned to almost twice the size and more split classes have become their reality. There have also been a large number of kids enrolled who do not speak either English or French as their first language. However, in talking with parents who have children in the public school system, our separate school system continues to have more resources when it comes to Educational Assistants and the like. Given that we are not Catholic, the added religious studies component has been accepted by our children (while not fully embraced) as a requirement to be in the separate school system. However, in 2009 when we lost almost 350 Educational Assistant positions in the province, this loss of resources hit the public system hard. Our conclusion is that the separate system is obviously better resourced. We believe that all children should have an equal opportunity to thrive in their school environment. We also believe that the community in which a child lives needs to be connected to the education programs, services and resources offered. Local and diverse needs can presently be accounted for within the current democratically elected board model. Creating fewer boards will not assist and it appears that this process of change is driven solely by cost. Appointing boards creates an artificial reality. If the government wants to make decisions to the detriment of our children and their future they should be transparent and accountable (take responsibility for their cuts), not appoint a board to blame for their decision-making. It also seems like Mr. Perrins options provided in his report are directed solely at the public school system. I wonder if the government is attempting to offload their incumbent responsibility to provide our children with a K12 education. In our view, the forecasted changes will only contribute to further abandonment of the public system. Furthermore, we question why the government funds boutique private schools to the tune of approximately \$31 million annually. Perhaps this ought to be reconsidered in an effort to achieve cost savings rather than dismantling our current school division structure. Restructuring or transformational change within any public service (health or education) should only be undertaken where research supports an improvement to the quality of the service being delivered. There is no evidence to rationalize any change in the school divisions that exist today...so let's leave the kids 'off the table' when you are looking for cuts to cost please. If you are truly interested in cutting government costs, perhaps you could reverse the decision to have 3 added MLAs in the province of Sask (which you described a need for - based on increased population) and we could have enough teachers, educational assistants and safe learning environments with adequate resources for our kids.

As a "2nd generation" home based educating family in Saskatchewan, represented by SHBE (Saskatchewan Home Based Educators) and HSLDA (Home School Legal Defence Association) Canada, we hereby request the government to remember that parents have the foremost right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children, based on constitutional rights and freedoms. Home educating parents must have a voice when decisions are being made about education policies in Saskatchewan. We request that SHBE and HSLDA represent home educating parents as part of any stakeholder groups, such as the proposed provincial advisory board to the Minister of Education. It is reasonable to ask that the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students. Any funding provided for home educated students should be spent on those students in a transparent and accountable manner. Whatever governance model is chosen, it must be transparent and include the participation of home educators. We also request that home educators register with one province-wide registering authority, and that SHBE have input into the selection of that registering authority. We choose to personally educate our children because we simply decline to delegate that right, responsibility and joy to anyone else.

Education belongs to the community and I want you to know that I support North East School Division and ask that you share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature: We need to keep our school boards locally elected: (1) Locally, democratically elected school boards are responsible for placing student needs first when making decisions, and are accountable to their electorate. They are responsible for ensuring all students within their jurisdiction have equal opportunities to reach their maximum potential. (2) This may be lost with larger elected boards or appointed boards who may be more influenced by politics because they are responsible to the government who appointed them, not the public who elected them. (3) Locally elected boards make planning, staffing and budget decisions close to communities with the resources made available and tailored to the community specific needs. (4) Locally elected boards encourage civic engagement in education and are the best choice for my community. "It takes a village to raise a child". (5) A large percentage of the funding for education still comes from local property taxes. While the Province sets the taxation rate, the local taxpayers still pay the toll. Taxpayers deserve local representation for education. This is different from Health where all funding except portions of capital come from the general revenue fund of the Provincial budget. (6) We need to keep the momentum going. The previous amalgamation caused disruptions for at least 5 years and based on past experience, amalgamation will again put the focus on governance, administration and change management, instead of student achievement. It took at least 5 years for the Boards, formed only 10 years ago, to become accepted as our community's school system. Significant improvement in learning is just beginning to be achieved in the last couple of years. (7) Economies of scale have been realized with the previous amalgamation and the existing school boards have been and continue to work together to achieve further efficiencies. Students will become secondary focus setting back the advancements that have been made in literacy and improved graduation rates. It is my strong belief that students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

The amalgamation of school divisions into one will hurt the Qu'Appelle Valley students and parents. The whole reasoning to live outside of the city was to send our kids to a small town school. The locally elected boards that currently reside for our region work because we know who is on the board and they also live in the areas that they pertain to. I find it hard to believe that one board would know the daily problems/issues/obstacles that would pertain to a rural setting and vice versa. As a parent I feel that my children will feel the most negative impact if the board decides to amalgamate the school division into one. Lets really think about what is the best interest for the education of our kids and future generations. I understand the financial constraints that the education sector struggles with every year but I don't believe the amalgamation of one board is the best way to do this.

In light of reading Mr. Perrins study, I have felt that there are few concerns that need to be addressed. In my opinion, there have been no meaningful public consultations, and to change this at such a huge scale has the potential for many errors, my question is why is the Government rushing this? It has been noted that there has been a lot of public feedback supporting our existing school division boundaries and keeping our democratic process of elected school boards, why would the Government want to change it? Besides it has been shown that the Divisions have found their own efficiencies...in fact three times more than the Governments' mandate, why is this being done? Centralized services of any kind don't mean cheaper, better or even equivalent services. In this study, it appears that our students are not a priority and that is very disturbing. This appears that is a business model that will ensure small communities will have school closures and that is terribly wrong. I am a tax paying citizen and I have the democratic right to elect a school board trustee who will be accountable and represent my community. I pay the taxes for this right and responsibility. One more item to be addressed, my question is why was this not brought up during the elections?

As a home based educating family in Saskatchewan, represented by SHBE (Saskatchewan Home Based Educators) and HSLDA (Home School Legal Defence Association) Canada, we hereby request the government to remember that parents have the foremost right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children. Home educating parents must have a voice when decisions are being made about education policies in Saskatchewan. We request that SHBE and HSLDA represent home educating parents as part of any stakeholder groups, such as the proposed provincial advisory board to the Minister of Education. We ask that the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students. Any funding provided for home educated students should be spent on those students in a transparent and accountable manner. Whatever governance model is chosen, it must be transparent and include the participation of home educators. We also request that home educators register with one province-wide registering authority, and that SHBE have input into the selection of that registering authority. We choose to personally educate our children because we simply decline to delegate that right, responsibility and joy to anyone else.

The priority of any changes to the current educational system in Saskatchewan must be to increase resources and supports to students and teachers of the province. Any changes that are only about saving money at the expense of students and teachers would lead to higher costs in the justice, social -service, and health-care systems.

Seems to me that the needs of kids across the province vary greatly whether you're in the north or south, or whether you're rural or urban. My concern is that by amalgamating school divisions, our children will lose more of the local voice that has a greater understanding of the challenges of the area they represent.

I understand the changes being considered in our education system. As an educator and as parent I know that we need to keep our school boards locally elected and we need to keep decisions regarding the education of our children close to the community. Local voice and community are imperative to the success, growth and overall education of our students. Furthermore, one of the scariest aspects of these proposed changes is the timeframe. Parents, educators, communities, SCCs, school boards, etc. were not allowed the time to educate themselves and reflect. Was there even enough time for the government to consider and evaluate all the possible outcomes of the proposed changes and how they will affect our children? Several other important questions come to mind when considering the proposed changes including: Will parents feel comfortable expressing concerns when they were not given the opportunity to elect their school board? Will parents feel comfortable expressing concerns if they do not have a local division office to contact? How much will these changes cost? How much money will these changes save (if any) and, are those savings worth risking the quality of our children's education? And, most importantly, will the unique geographical, cultural and educational needs of students in all areas of the province be met if their school boards are not locally elected and/or if their division leaders are not local? As an educator I see the detrimental effects that education budget cuts have on student learning but these proposed changes cut deeper than that. These proposed changes will divide education and community. As a parent, I am extremely concerned about the future education of my child. I also understand that our province needs to cut a deficit. Surely there are options that will allow Saskatchewan to save money and cut the provincial deficit without directly hindering the education of our children and the education of the future of our province. Our children should not have to pay the price for our provincial debt.

I disagree on this because it affects the students and the teachers during the transition.

I commend Minister of ED. Morgan on valuing the Constitutional Right to have publicly funded Catholic schools in Saskatchewan I strongly believe that the focus should be on student achievement. I strongly believe for parents to have a voice, local trustees must be elected. I applaud Minister of Education Don Morgan on affirming the Constitutional Right of the catholic people in Saskatchewan to have publically funded Catholic Education in our province. Also, I strongly believe that the priority in our schools should be on student achievement. School trustee should be locally elected if parents are to have a voice in their children's education. I do not believe that bigger is better or what is good for one is good for all. Geographical regions should be considered. Relationships with parents, the community, and the first nations and metis communities are extremely important.

Do not want or schools changed to go to Regina they keep closing schools an most schools are so over crowded that the students are not being taught with no chance of help from some over worked teachers.

There isn't one thing that I agree with in the educational reform report. I believe that it will be the small rural schools that will suffer. Our school has already had families /students go through school closures and I believe that would be extremely hard for the students to adjust to once again. I believe that the education budget should see an increase not a decrease. I'm sure that monies could be pulled from somewhere else. Why try to fix something that's not broken!!

As parents who have chosen home education for our children, we want to express a desire that home education in the province of Saskatchewan be given thoughtful consideration in this period of reassessing how the education system in the province is structured. 1) We ask that SHBE (Saskatchewan Home Based Educators) and HSLDA (Homeschool Legal Defense Association) be counted as stakeholder in these discussions, 2) We ask that the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students, and 3) We ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators. Home education has been a wonderful choice for our family. Our children are thriving and we want to make sure that our ability to continue, as well as the freedom for others to choose this option, remains.

I truly believe the twenty-eight school boards in the province of Saskatchewan have served our most precious possession our children very well. The cost of governance to each of the boards is a very small percentage of their total budget. Trustees in rural Saskatchewan are always very frugal and make decisions around governance costs always with the best interest of the school division. The cost of professional development for trustees is critical to be able to stay abreast of new research and the better methods of learning for our students to be successful. Trustees are logical thinkers. The meaning of logical is making decisions that are sound, well-thought out, sensible and understandable. School boards shield schools from provincial politics and allow trustees to act independently. School trustees are important for the public to express their views and concerns about how schools are operated. School boards are an avenue for the general public to be actively involved in the school community. The transformational change that has taken place with the Educational Sector Strategic Plan has been a very worthwhile endeavour for the sector. All school divisions have worked together to assess the needs of the students in the province and an improvement has been recognized. This is the transformational change school boards should continue with going forward into the future. Eleven years ago school divisions were amalgamated. The process took five years for school divisions to streamline the operations of the division and the schools. In my experience it has only been in the last three years where students, parents, teachers and community members have been able to come together in their respective schools and create a positive culture for our students to learn. A positive school culture is paramount to our students becoming successful. I fear if more amalgamations were to happen the work all school divisions have done to improve school community culture would be lost and our students learning would suffer greatly. Education transformation change should not be about saving dollars it should be about what is good for students. I believe elected trustees are the ones who truly do care for their students. As you deliberate....please keep in mind....we only get one chance to education a student in this province and I believe the current structure of elected trustees in twenty-eight schools has served each student well. Thank you.

Thank you for the opportunity for the public to share their thoughts and concerns. The following outline some of my initial concerns. Will a new governance structure ensure that Saskatchewan and/or rural areas and/or Northern Saskatchewan have mechanisms to ensure recruitment and retention of the best teachers new to the profession? Locally elected boards are the lowest paid position within any school division. Their services are considered volunteer. I do not believe that appointed officials would be more invested-in and more informed in the best practice, well-being, and direction of our rural schools. Further these board volunteers set a tone of volunteerism and community engagement and participation. I believe the loss of local boards will result in the beginning of less parent engagement. The removal of local boards will most likely direct parents to MLAs with concerns. While a MLA may have intimate knowledge of best practice in education, it is more likely that a local board member, who has had the opportunity to access professional developments specific to division goals, would be better informed to direct and respond to parent concerns. Why wouldn't the province undertake this change in governance when there was extra funds to support the development of new systems in the background while the current systems is allowed to operate until a role-over can occur into a structure that is ready. Sheltering school administrators and teachers and most importunately students from the extensive effort needed for restructuring. I understand that with government distributed funds comes the need for government to be accountable for the funds. I believe the public is happy with the current accountability in the hands of teachers –in school administrators –division staff –locally elected boards (who live, work and visit schools in our communities). A government appointed board will not know how to affect positive change and growth because they will be too far removed from the front line teachers. Thank you for reviewing my concerns.

School boards must be elected by the community that they are a part of. A candidate who is willing to represent his/her community, and the opportunity of the electorate to vote, is based on democratic principles. We do not want the government to appoint (give jobs to) persons to be the "school board". There has already been enough amalgamation of school divisions. Leave divisions as they are now.

Dear Minister Morgan:

have great concerns of the changes you want to implement to school divisions. This could impact rural families and devastate our children's learning as we know it. Please hear our voices. RE: Transformational Change = Provincial Commitment to Innovation = Personalized Learning. The term 'transformational change' has been often employed in recent months by politicians and bureaucrats alike, but the intent or the definition of that term has not been made clear. We understand that there are processes in place to ensure that the people of Saskatchewan have a voice in shaping that change. The School Community Council would like to add our voice to the conversation. For Sun West families, transformational change means: Personalized learning. It works and we are watching it happen in our classrooms every day. For the past number of years, students and staff in Sun West have been enthusiastically pioneering this innovative educational path, which is based on the belief that students - each with their own unique strengths, weaknesses, interests and preferences - need a voice in determining how and what they are learning. As our schools have come to embrace this way of thinking, we've seen wonderful changes in how our classrooms look, in the language that our children use at school and then at home, and in the choices that our children have in regards to their own learning. In this personalized environment, kids get to take charge of their learning and can learn in a way that best suits them. Also in line with personalized learning, we have witnessed the creative integration of technology in our classrooms. Our children have regular access to computers or tablets and a limitless library of digital resources to help them explore topics of personal interest to them as they develop the fundamental knowledge and skills mandated by the Province. And because students can work at their own pace, there are opportunities to succeed and grow in ways they cannot when expected to keep up or wait for their peers. Through the implementation of these innovative practices, we are creating young citizens with the character and critical 21st century skills – leadership, technology, collaboration, and social accountability – necessary to excel in the workplace and contribute to successful communities. The work of Sun West School Division and other entrepreneurial divisions must not be left to scramble for the crumbs that fall after a massive restructuring. There is great work being done - using lean and efficient processes - to personalize student learning in our schools. We very much hope that this continues regardless of the organizational structure of the education system. We wish you well in your deliberations.

Having read the Perrin report twice I do not see how amalgamating the province into one school region and appointing the school board members will save money. Appointed school board members will require enumerating these people at a substantially higher level than the elected school board members. Adding the layers of advisory councils etc. will add expense as well. It took 22 years to reduce the size of the health care regions to one provincial one but the public is not ready for the education system to follow suit. People have become used to poor health care service in the rural areas but they are not ready to have their young children bused long distances. Politically there will be significant backlash. The school boards are maintaining that they will only be satisfied with the status quo. I assured them at our meeting the other night that the status quo is not an option as the decision has been made in Regina that change is going to happen. Reduce the number of school regions to 10 or so according to geographical features so that winter transportation is not overly hazardous. Wait several years for the reorganization to smooth out before making any more large moves. Accounting accommodations can be made for transparency and oversight of the expenditures by the school boards. A 3S model can be implemented for payroll etc. to have some cost savings. Questioning the qualifications of incoming school board members is not appropriate as they are usually business people and other professionals, so are not without higher education on a whole. Asking the teachers to take a wage cut is not appropriate as this will only encourage your more experienced teachers to leave the profession and the loss of experience will be detrimental to the education of the future of Saskatchewan. Lowering the wage scale will discourage our brightest students from entering the education field and that will have long term implications for the future of the province as well. If the reading levels etc. of the students are being compared to other jurisdictions then we need to retain and attract the best educators. I grew up in New Brunswick where we lost our high school and had to be bused an hour each way for grade 10 to 12. This increased the dropout rate as it was pooling several very different communities into one building that housed 1100 students. We generally lost 20% of our students by Christmas. The majority of these drop outs being from the rural areas. This is the exact opposite effect as what was cited as a goal. Yes, some of the really small schools need to be closed as it is not financially feasible to keep everyone open but large scale change is not advisable. I understand that the optics of cutting expenditures of the health and education portions of the budget because they are the two largest chunks is tempting but it is not going to achieve the long term competitiveness that the official government releases expound on by gutting the education of our future leaders.

We are not in favour of amalgamating school divisions , eliminating elected boards of education and replacing them with government appointed boards Local boards are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. They are advocates for ensuring excellence in education. The needs of students are better served which are unique to each division and each school within the division. They are elected by our community to represent our community. If a division or divisions have abused their use of government dollars then take them to task. Make them accountable! Also have concern that this gradual easing toward government control could jeopardize the rights of religious freedoms which our forefathers have fought for in our past. Education belongs to our community. Our youth is our future. We hope much thought and prayer goes into this before decisions are made. Also think that this action could influence the next provincial election Thank you for your consideration.

I have a child in elementary and one in high school. I'd like it if their pd days could coordinate. I'd like start and end times to be the same accross the city. I want more EA's hired, trained EA's with a certificate. I want the provincial govt to recognize the depth of talent in out teachers and recognize this through pay and through funds to each school. A mega school board is not the answer. My kids are not cogs in an education machine, nor are the teachers.

I currently have 3 children in this school division. I do not agree with this change and I hope others feel the same way. I would rather have local voices leading the way and people who "actually care" about what happens to my children. So in short I do not support this decision.

Dear Sir: I do not have much faith that you will even read this, as it seems to me that only lip service is being given to "public consultation." I will be shocked if you ever actually do reply to this email. I apologize for the preamble but I feel it is pertinent. I am a Saskatchewan educator in a number of aspects.

I have corresponded with individuals from every continent and most countries in most of those continents. I am shocked and appalled that a government that almost always has the interests of its citizens foremost in their plans would stoop to even contemplate such Draculan and undemocratic changes to education in our province. My immediate response when I heard of the proposals was that I am powerless. Despite my lifelong commitment to education my comments will be ignored. Despite that, I decided to poll my contacts throughout the world to determine how large their school districts are, and how their Boards of Education are chosen. The responses I received have overwhelmingly supported my suspicion. No other jurisdiction around the world is following a system that our government is advocating. Not one! Nowhere are school boards appointed. (I am aware of the isolated situation that occurred in Vancouver last year.) I will admit that I have not received many responses from people who live under a dictatorship or in a Communist country, although it appears to me that is the model our government is suggesting. Here in North America, from my research over the last while, no province or state appears to have even considered appointing a School Board. One educator in New Jersey told me that when he eluded to the proposal the fellow educators he spoke with actually laughed in disbelief that a democratically elected government in North American would even suggest such a move. It was also evident that most school boards are far smaller than what we presently have in Saskatchewan. In fact in one European country each public school had its own separate Board. Of course innovative ideas can always be healthy for a province, state or country. You will be aware that the first rural automatic dial telephones in North American were installed in Saskatchewan and in 1944 the CCF Government introduced what amounted to Medicare. But while this move was unique it was done only after Saskatchewan citizens had the opportunity to voice their approval through an election. "Public consultation" is a far cry from a democratic election. I see no value in voicing my reasons for my strong opposition to both aspects of your proposal. People far more eloquent than I, will I know, have already overwhelmingly conveyed their opposition to these ludicrous proposals. For that reason and because of my somewhat unique advantage in being able to contact people from around the globe I hope you will be aware that these proposals are not at all similar to something as beneficial as universal Medicare. I cannot believe that our government has even thought of such undemocratic and unworkable proposals.

I have many fears and concerns in the face of amalgamation and "transformation". - I have worked in rural and urban schools and I the fear of loss of community. What is best for one part of the province may not be the best for all. We are one province, but we are unique in our needs. - I have concerns over the respect of teachers as professionals. - I am greatly concerned as a parent of the class sizes and workload of my children's teachers, schools, etc - I fear that we are looking at education as a business, one which is not as profitable as the government would like. Children are not products, they are the future of our province - our world. They deserve to be educated among the best in the world. We have the potential to be the best. - This school year, we heard divisions were making cuts that would not affect the children in the classroom. Any cuts affect children and their learning. The bottom line is our education system is constantly being asked to do more with less and we cannot continue to ask schools to do this. Consultants get cut = fewer supports in the classrooms, technology budgets gets cut = fewer computers, smartboards, updates to equipment, hiring freeze along with new schools and increased enrollment = bigger classrooms for our children= less attention, less support and huge workloads for our teachers - I fear that my children will have a special need, learning disability, or other need that would require support for school success. I fear for the education of my friends' son with autism. I think supports for these children are suffering and will continue to suffer. - I fear my workload with more children, fewer supports, and a feeling of overall lack of respect. What will happen with our profession in this time of transformation. When it comes down to family vs work on my time, my family will win. - Our system is turning away from what is best for the child to how much can we stretch a dollar. Will this be a worthwhile investment or one that we regret?

As a parent _____, I do not support any further amalgamation of school divisions. I live in McLean SK which has a K-8 school. These amalgamations will put our community school at risk at being shut down. This would kill our town. There would be no incentive for young families to live here and also hinder new young families from moving here. Also, I really don't agree with appointed school boards. I believe these positions should be elected. These people could make wide sweeping changes without having to answer to people in their jurisdiction. This is wrong. These officials should be elected from the divisions they represent because they will have a better understanding on how their decisions affect their communities and their schools.

To the Saskatchewan Government: I am a Lloydminster resident that lives in Alberta. I have children that attend public school in Lloydminster. As a resident of Alberta, I am at a disadvantage concerning my children's education as I am unable to vote in Saskatchewan elections and voice my opinions on how pressing issues should be handled. When it comes to education I place a lot of trust within the Lloydminster Public School Division as I feel that if there are concerns, at least I can speak to someone who can address my concerns or advocate on my behalf if necessary. I am afraid that if the Saskatchewan Government pushes ahead with the proposed changes in education I will lose the small amount of voice that I currently have. My concerns are: (1) You cannot take away the voice of the Alberta residents. (2) The public schools will be left at a disadvantage if the Lloydminster Catholic School Division has elected officials that have an office within the community and the public system has elected officials that reside in a community in a place other than Lloydminster. (3) You cannot take away our ability to elect our officials. I do not believe that an appointed official will have the best interest of my children's education at heart. They are accountable to the government rather than to the people. (4) The needs that each school has cannot be adequately determined by a governing body that is hundreds of kilometers away and is responsible for a large number of schools with very different needs. I'm not sure what the governments reasoning is for changing up the divisional boundaries within the province, but I feel like it is going to cost millions of dollars and I must ask - what for? Do you seriously think that my kids will receive a better education if you redefine boundaries or do away with them altogether? Will it actually save any money? Will my child come away better prepared for a post-secondary education? I applaud the government for looking into our educational system and trying to make us a better province with kids that can compete in a global market, but I do not believe that cutting down on the number of school divisions is the answer.

Individual school divisions should continue to have their own boards. Each school division has unique needs and likely has their own method to deal with those needs effectively. Every place is different; and the experts at understanding what is needed will generally be the people who live and work in that community. Getting rid of these divisions, in favor of a generalized approach, could mean that individual schools might lose programs and resources that work for them. Also, elected officials have more accountability to the communities they serve than appointed officials; and that means they are more likely to make sure the voices of their community are heard. And, if appointed officials replace elected ones, individual schools may lose the support they need to create meaningful educational opportunities for young people.

Where was the concern for rural education when you shut down the Gray Elementary School to amalgamate with PVSD?

The concern the I have with the 4 options around re-organization of education within the province of Saskatchewan is the amount of resources that will be devoted to the changes at outlined. Amalgamations take time and resources, often years to get back to the level of previous divisions. In particular, the work and manpower that must be devoted to having the new divisions work in a high achieving cohesive manner in monstrous. Around the idea of having appointed boards rather than elected boards, I am in complete agreement. The current system of having lay people in the top of a hierarchal system is ridiculous and seriously impedes the education of our students within the province. To think that laypeople should be directing and shaping education in of province rather than trained professionals with extensive backgrounds and knowledge in education is absurd. The schools will still have local voices from their SCC's. I am confident in saying that every board in the province has some of the division members sitting on the board for self-serving reasons. I am very concerned about how trustees have been working so hard to save their jobs. If we go to a system of appointed members then those who have the qualifications may still have the opportunity for appointments and if they are concerned about the schools having a community voice then they can sit on the SCC's. It is a win-win situation for those really dedicated to improve education and for the students.

Local democratically elected school boards are essential to making sure the needs of communities are identified, accurately assessed, and met in the way which works best for those communities. Elected school boards also keep our educational systems working independently and in the best interest of students, not centralized governments. By this report all stakeholders consulted in the production of these options supported elected boards as the only way to ensure local voices are represented. Please recognize the rights of parents and communities, and their elected representatives to speak and work on behalf of their students.

This is crazy. Bigger isn't always better. Bigger districts mean that our local concerns won't be heard. It means that our children will lose their voices. If you want to amalgamate, then ONLY do Human Resources, Finance, IT. Those do not directly affect our children. Our education system is a mess, the curriculum is downright laughable and this is how you want to fix it? Take a look at Europe - see what Finland, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Germany are doing. Model us after them. They are the BEST. Do not model us after the US, the evidence shows that there educational system is in trouble. Someone must have some common sense in the ministry , USE IT, or is it a flower that doesn't grow in your garden? Prove me wrong. And by the way, can't wait until my kids are out of the public system and off to university.

PLEASE Read this! I don't understand why people in rural areas are being treated unfairly. We generate a lot of money in taxes for education but only get a fraction of it back to our areas. Why do we have to fund urban areas when it causes rural areas to die. Why is there always a recommendation to send rural kids great distances on many buses than to send urban kids out on one big bus to a rural school. We are a rural based income generator with oil farming mining etc. mainly situated in rural areas. There is such a widening gap between rural and urban life. Why does it have to keep increasing? Why not decrease the gap and get the kids out into small areas do some learning about rural life so they can make better choices in the direction they want to take in life. These changes that are being considered will end up costing more money. Some things are worth more than a loonie. Why not reverse trends and spread education to the rural areas. It will help to spark the economy and kids will be better educated to make decisions about their life. Don't have to build new multimillion dollar schools just have to send some kids to the country. More kids will be active and will be able to participate on sports teams instead of sitting on the bench or not making the teams. It is a winning solution rather than having rural kids on buses for one to three hours a day going to big schools getting bullied, getting into drugs, not getting much physical education, too tired to do their homework cause always on the road. What about bus maintenance costs and fuel as well. Might as well kiss the savings goodbye with that. One big bus coming out is cheaper and less hours for kids on the buses. I understand the easy solution all the time is too shut down. But in this case it will hurt the rural economy big time which in turn will hurt Saskatchewan's economy even more!!!

As a taxpayer of Lloydminster and a Lloydminster Public School Division rate payer I want to add my voice to the discussion of the Perrins Report. I moved to Saskatchewan as young woman, raised my family and saw my children educated in Saskatchewan schools. I now have 2 grandchildren attending a school operated by an elected Saskatchewan school board. I feel strongly about protecting the democratic right of parents and community members to elect a board of trustees that is responsible to us, reports back to us and is available for consultation at the local level. Clearly efficiencies need to be found but I believe this can be done through school boards working with the guidance of the Ministry.

The school system we have right now has been worked for my children and me for years. Children are safe and enjoy every singly day in school. I would be happy to see the upcoming years without any changes.

To Whom it May Interest, I understand the need to streamline services and eliminate redundancies in order to allocate funds more appropriately - and with today's current economy and government - to save money. However, there is always a cost associated to downsizing, streamlining, amalgamating or eliminating processes, procedures and ultimately, people. It is in my opinion that the provincial model as outlined in Mr. Perrin's report would be most detrimental to the cohesion of the teaching community and to the positive work environment that is afforded by the human touch associated to smaller working groups. A provincial model will have front line workers feeling misunderstood and unsupported by the top-of-the-chain administrators that will have a very limited understanding of what is actually going on in the schools. When will this small contingency of employees have time to visit schools? Meet teachers? Understand what services are required by students with physical disabilities, anxiety, and special learning needs? Each school has its own unique needs and trying to address them in a personal, well understood and timely manner using a large provincially appointed governing body is going to be impossible. Mr. Perrin and the current Minister of Education may feel that education can be structured as a business, but it cannot. Option 1, a Provincial Model, will result in cold, impersonal, business type transactions between the governing body and individual schools. One size fits all remedies will be blanketed over hurting organizations that need individualized solutions to sometimes simple and sometimes complex challenges that ultimately shape our children. If one of Mr. Perrin's options MUST be chosen, I feel most comfortable with Option 3A – Restructuring Public School Divisions. This option provides direction for making significant changes to meet the Shift in Governance suggestions without causing the mass chaos and devastation that Options 1 & 2 would cause. I particularly can agree with the recommendation of balancing the number of students within each school division with respect to land size. Continuing with a smaller governing board will maintain a personal touch and continue to allow for quick access to decision makers by parents, teachers, support staff, administration, etc. Individual school community councils will continue to be the voice of the individual schools and the lines of communication are multitudinous versus singular as option 1 would suggest. I strongly encourage the Ministry to remember their Education Sector Strategic Plan. I am going to assume that all goals are made equal, except for those directly relating to student achievement. Those goals naturally hold more weight as improving the outcomes of education is of the utmost importance. We want Saskatchewan students to be well educated, graduating and becoming high achieving members of society. As such, four out of the five goals are relating to student achievement. One goal – the goal subject to this debate – has the potential to significantly impact students both positively and negatively. In the short term, a massive change is only going to be detrimental to four out of five goals. Therefore, a less dramatic, yet significant change to the current system may provide the efficiencies the government is looking for without completely decimating the quality of education and supports currently provided to our children. My vote goes toward Option 3A as the best option detailed by Mr. Perrin.

I am asking that SHBE be counted as a stakeholder in the following discussions. 1)The province should appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home education students and that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home based educators. 2) Please include a re-evaluation of the home education funding in Saskatchewan with the purpose of ensuring that the funding is directed towards the home educating families. 3) Since the school unit that the family is living nearby receives a great portion of the funding for the student who is a home educated student, the families that are opting to home educate their children should also be compensated for the costs associated with the education of their children. 4) Our children are our responsibility and if we feel due to religious beliefs or any other belief that we want to home educate our children that should be our prerogative. As tax payers if funding is being issued out for a student who is not enrolled in a school, then why isn't funding also issued out for a student who is home educated? Since we live in a democratic country, we should receive a comparable amount of funding to further the education of our most important asset; our children. I am asking that SHBE be counted as a stakeholder in all these discussions. I ask that the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students, and I ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators. I do make request for a reevaluation of home education funding in Saskatchewan with the purpose of ensuring that funding be directed toward home educating families. Thank you.

We would like to see the differences between city schools and PVSD remain the same. I think it's a shame alot of the city schools have taken things such as sports, holidays, learning cursive ect. out of their curriculum. Please keep the values of our small town children the same for years to come.

Our interests are best represented by those who know our community. Please keep elected school boards local.

To Whom It May Concern, as new governing systems are being considered for the education system across Saskatchewan, it is my hope that the government of Saskatchewan will include representation in the decision making process by homeschooling advocates. Three important advocates include SHBE (Sask Home Based Educators) as well as the HSLDA (Home School Legal Defense Association) and homeschooling parents directly. Home based education is an established part of our educational system and a growing choice by many families. Families of this educational choice need to be considered as decisions are made that will affect them and their children.

With a province as diverse as Saskatchewan, it defies logic to imagine that further centralization of power in Regina over schooling best serves the needs of K-12 students across the province. Can such one-size-fits-all governance possibly address the curricular, administrative and staffing needs of particular schools in far-flung areas of the province — for example, in areas where the local language may or may not be English or French (to mention just one possible scenario). The progressive weakening of local school governance under the tenure of this provincial government has resulted in more red tape for school administrators to deal with, not less, and the imposition of onerous "accountability" requirements by Regina in the wake of this weakening harms administrative flexibility and efficiency at the local level. There is little practical justification to recommend the naked power grab contained in this proposal by the provincial government.

Simply put this is not what is best for the students. This is a way for the government to correct their mistake at the consequence of education. How can one board make so many decisions when each school and school division has various needs? If this happens it is at the expensive of our students, our future leaders, doctors, teachers, etc. Already there is not enough funding. It is so frustrating that this is happening in our province. We have a shiny new stadium for those that can afford but underfunding and overcrowded classrooms. I would like to see the government take some ownership on how we have gotten here. To cut all things, it has to be education? Are our MLA's and premiers taking salary caps? It is very disappointing that our government does not value our education system. This is not a business. Perhaps Brad Wall should try being a teacher for a week?

Hello, taking away local control away from our schools will not improve our school. I agree with standardizing basic running protocols but each school is unique in its needs each year as the children enter the school system and grow in it. As it is, schools are aging and population is growing, and we are not keeping up. Teachers are stretched as they are supporting those who need extra assistance and trying to support those who are excelling ahead of the class. We need local and connected team members to govern and support our schools individually not by one board that only sees numbers.

I am not in favorite of any of the proposed options. Any of them will decrease the voice of the rural population. Amalgamation has been a disaster in other provinces. Please consider finding efficiencies in the current system before taking the drastic measures that are proposed! The cost savings are there if you look hard enough.

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report we would offer the following feedback: We do not feel that the options presented in this report will result in significant cost savings without negatively impacting the quality of education for our students, eroding community voice, and affecting the sustainability of our community. We support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for students and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). We do not support the concept of an appointed Board of Education. We believe local voice is an essential part of a successful school-community relationship. We do not support any of the 3 models presented in the report. We feel forced amalgamation puts our school, and many like it, at risk of closure. We want to know what potential changes there will be to the rural school closure thresholds that are currently legislated. We feel this is a critical consideration in evaluating the options. We would like to see a permanent solution for high school transportation and are concerned what impact forced amalgamation will have on bus ride times for our students. We believe that further progress can be made in existing school divisions to find sector-wide efficiencies and cost-savings and recognize that the government may need to be more directive in requiring these sector-wide efficiencies to be realized. Our community and the integrity of our community are of the utmost importance to us for our kids as well as everyone else's children.

Locally elected boards have the best interests of the students and community at heart. They are a valuable resource for our schools. Keep it local!

I would like to see the system to remain as is, with separate school boards, public and catholic, and the government accountable to them.

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report we would offer the following feedback: We do not feel that the options presented in this report will result in significant cost savings without negatively impacting the quality of education for our students, eroding community voice, and affecting the sustainability of our community. We support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for students and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). We do not support the concept of an appointed Board of Education. We believe local voice is an essential part of a successful school-community relationship. We do not support any of the 3 models presented in the report. We feel forced amalgamation puts our school, and many like it, at risk of closure. We want to know what potential changes there will be to the rural school closure thresholds that are currently legislated. We feel this is a critical consideration in evaluating the options. We would like to see a permanent solution for high school transportation and are concerned what impact forced amalgamation will have on bus ride times for our students. We believe that further progress can be made in existing school divisions to find sector-wide efficiencies and cost-savings and recognize that the government may need to be more directive in requiring these sector-wide efficiencies to be realized. Our community and the integrity of our community are of the utmost importance to us for our kids as well as everyone else's children.

I am very concerned with the options presented by our government regarding school reform. I am concerned that other options have not been fully explored, such as amalgamating public and separate school systems or cutting upper management costs within each current school division. This reform is moving so quickly that I find it impossible to believe that the long term repercussions have been adequately considered. As has been the pattern of this government, they are completely ignoring the opinions of the professionals in the field. Education is an investment in the future for our entire province, and making a decision based purely on the budget bottom line is irresponsible. As it stands now, educators in the schools have the ability to effect change for their students through the somewhat easy dialogue between them and the school division and local school boards. These changes often have nothing to do with an increase in budget, but rather the expertise and support that those school division and school board officials can bring to the table. Further amalgamations threaten that collegial bond that the education sector currently has. Decisions made from a great distance, with no personal connection, will not be responsive enough for our students. If this government continues to slash and cut the education sector, removing educator's voices as well as the more recent call for wage roll backs, I am afraid that you will quickly find higher teacher burn out due to reduced job satisfaction. You will lose many dedicated, experienced and passionate educators who feel that the benefits of being a teacher no longer hold enough value. Smart, innovative and otherwise talented people will take those talents elsewhere.

Education is not a business. This report has nothing to do with learning. We have a rural school that needs to be governed differently than a city school. Our school has already cut back for the past 3 years. We have cut expenses enough. This idea is not going to save money.

I encourage Saskatchewan NOT to amalgamate the school divisions. Education is supremely important to everyone and as a result requires constant discussion and considerations. Reducing the number of people responsible for those decisions will also reduce discussion and representation. We've too many services stagnating under the apathetic eye of a few senior administrators. Without a set of school divisions to bring up problems from different areas and keep discussion going, our future could be schools that don't so much educate children, but teach them to fill out paperwork enough to barely function in society.

I am a homeschool mom with 5 children. We've homeschooled for 5 years. It is our hope to establish a better working relationship with the authorities, and promote a healthy interaction with local governing authorities. We believe this can be achieved by: 1) SHBE considered a stakeholder in these discussions. 2) Assigning registering authorities that are accountable to the homeschool educators for the use of the provincial funding provided to support home educated students, and 3) the governance model be transparent and include the participation of the home educators. Our goal is the same, to produce healthy, well-rounded, contributing members of the community. We simply ask support in achieving that. Thank you for your consideration!

We need to have local input to School Boards as well as local School Boards. It is important the parents have input into their children's education. Having a single board in the province would put the quality and importance of the whole education system at risk. We do not want our education system to be downgraded as has happened in other provinces and countries. Education of our children and youth should be of utmost importance to our government and we should find other places to make cuts to our spending. The future of our Province depends on giving the best education to those who will inherit the future.

Honourable Brad Wall, Premier Government of Saskatchewan 233 Central Ave. N Swift Current, SK S9H 0L3 Dear Mr. Wall: Re: Educational Governance Review Report We understand that the provincial government is considering major changes to our education system. As parents of young children just entering the public education system, we want to voice our concern over the proposed changes. We strongly believe that education belongs to the community, and we support the direction of the North East School Division. Please reconsider amalgamation plans and the "bigger is better" philosophy. We respectfully ask you to consider the following points: 1. locally elected school boards are the best choice for our community. Local representatives know the needs of their communities and are best equipped to respond to those needs. Local boards are accountable to their local communities ensuring our students receive quality education. Murray Scharf, former U of S Dean of Education, recommended larger school divisions twenty-five years ago, but now worries about the impact of further restructuring and possible government-elected boards by stating, "They haven't been elected and they become political appointees that are the danger of centralizing too far, that you remove it totally from the community." (Regina Leader Post, November 28, 2016) 2. Local responsibility for education is part of our history. Saskatchewan has a long tradition of being highly engaged in the delivery of local education. People are passionate about education and expect a local voice. Moving the decisions further away will result in a certain loss of connectedness and civic engagement. 3. Not all areas of the province are the same. The province of Saskatchewan is quite diverse and local issues will not be met with a larger entity. The North East School Division has developed policies and partnerships (i.e. with Saskatoon Tribal Council and Kinistin Saulteaux Nation) to enhance local education. The provincial government respects the autonomy of the Separate School Boards by excluding them from amalgamation discussions. The same consideration should be given for locally controlled divisions. 4. Funding for education primarily comes from local taxes. Although the Province sets the taxation rate, local taxpayers still pay for the majority of education funding. As a result, taxpayers deserve local representation for education. 5. Amalgamations are not cost effective. Previous amalgamations have not provided significant savings. Although larger divisions could result in initial savings with cuts to senior management and board costs, those savings are not typically realized as larger divisions tend to spend more on senior administrators. With amalgamations one can expect increased costs such as transportation and travel. When discussing potential school division amalgamations, John Wiens, educational finance expert stated, "If it's about money, I think there is actually no evidence to show at all that anybody has saved money by doing this!" (CBC News, November 18, 2016) 6. Another amalgamation will result in years of disrupted service to local education. Previous amalgamations focused on governance, administration and change management, which put the needs of students as secondary. It takes years to develop organizational design and rebuild a sense of trust within the community. 7. Education is not corporate business. Not everything should have a price attached. Education should not be viewed from an economic perspective but by the social impact. Having one Director of Education is not the same as having one CEO of a crown corporation. We are dealing with people, not a commodity. 8. No evidence to show amalgamations benefit students. Providing quality education for students in this province should be the priority and there is nothing to suggest larger school divisions will improve the educational experience for students. How will outcomes such as literacy and graduation rates be improved within a larger system? 9. Amalgamations will impact rural students the most. The proposed changes will not affect urban students to the same extent as rural students. Given the larger geographic area and lower population, the voices of rural students will be diminished. Students do not benefit when decision-making is further away from the community. For the sake of our children, please keep education a local responsibility with locally elected boards.

cc: Honourable Don Morgan, Minister of Education Kevin Phillips, MLA Melfort Don Rempel, Director of Education, North East School Division

I am a teacher and a parent in the Sask. Rivers School Division. I am very concerned that our province would consider option 1 or 2. How can individual student needs be heard with this plan? I teach at a school with almost 100% First Nations students. I know that the students and also their families already feel like outsiders in their child's education. It takes a great deal of time and effort to make connections with these families so they feel welcome and an important part of their child's education. We have students who have given up on their education by grade 6. How will this plan help these children to take part in education so they can have a positive future? How can I assure parents their child's individual needs are going to be met in a huge 1 or 4 division system? I have 3 children enrolled in Sask. Rivers. They have had classes with up to 36 students at the elementary level. How can I be assured this new plan won't result in more large class sizes like this? I understand that this is a difficult financial time and I agree that we should streamline in places that don't affect the classroom, like payroll. I also agree that money could be saved by looking at school boards and making changes around the amount they are paid and whether they should be elected or appointed. Thank you for taking the time to consider my thought.

I disagree with a Provincial model for education I would support a division model.

We the parents of student at _____atholic school, are happy in the present rules and regulations policies of the school, and we must keep it in control, if there are better improvements needed that the government could do for the school, I am sure the school board members could do it better without taking it over in control by the government. We want to keep tracking our children's by communicating to their teachers. We don't want this opportunity taken away to us. As a parents of a student at _____Catholic high school, we do not agree to any changes of authority of the school.

The current system of education does need transformative change, but taking away local governance is not the change required. Instead, school boards need to look at innovative ways of educating the whole child. Organizations such as the private, Prairie Sky School, do a fantastic job of this on a shoestring budget. And, their middle years program has students out of the classroom and into the world for their education. It's ideal.

RE: INPUT - K-12 Education Governance Review. Locally elected school boards are important to ensure the education is properly delivered. Locally elected school boards are important advocates for ensuring excellent education. They do excellent work. Why to change something that really works. Keep the elected school boards.

The proposal of the government appointing directors to the school board smacks of communism. The government is not there to tell us how to educate our children. We have public and separate school boards to accommodate our beliefs. We have long supported our children with upright and broad outlooks on community and family living. We treasure this and desire to uphold this education. Elected board members are put there by the parents not the government dictating what their belief system is.

Keep our school boards locally elected and keep decisions close to our community.

I think creating one school division, or even 4 province wide, is going to severely hurt the majority of rural schools. I feel urban areas will get the focus and allocations and rural areas will be completely forgot about. Families in rural Saskatchewan are providing the bread and butter of this province, yet get the short end of the stick when it comes to many things, such as access to adequate health care services, specialists and if this all goes to one or 4 divisions, education will be added to the list.

Way too much cash spent on Directors/Superintendents who are basically bean counters - who come up with paperwork for others to fill in - to justify their own jobs. They do very little for the actual classroom teacher/student. Teachers get more useful info directly fr curricula/SK ed sites/subject meetings/fellow teachers than from the school board offices staffed with pencil pushers. Dump a majority of those administrators, sell the expensive real estate the division board offices are in.

1. Local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities 2. Consolidation will set back the advancements that have been made in literacy and numeracy for years 3. The NDP promoted consolidation held back education for at least 5 years and cost money rather than saving money 4. This would be the second time that forced amalgamation excluded separate school boards, firstly in the NDP action and now in the Sask party proposal 5. It took at least 5 years for the boards, formed only 10 years ago, to become accepted as the community's school system. Significant improvement in learning is just beginning to be achieved in the last couple of years 6. A large percentage of the funding for education comes from local property taxes still. While the province sets the taxation rate, the local taxpayers still pay the toll. This different from Health where rally funding except portions of capital come from the provincial budget. STUDENTS DO NOT BENEFIT FROM MOVING DECISIONS FURTHER AWAY FROM THE COMMUNITY

As past president of the _____ School and Community Council, it is my duty to share my concerns with the lack of credibility and viable options presented in the Perrin's report. 1) None of the options presented in the Perrin's report describe how our student's learning will be positively impacted. 2) The Perrin's report does not compare the options to the current structure/organization 3) The report does not include separate school division. How can we look at improving efficiencies without considering separate school divisions? 4) The Perrins Report identifies the strengths of the current governance model, including local accountability, communication, strong local voice and a local culture of learning. These strengths would be strikingly absent in the proposed governance models presented in the report. 5) The report ignores the high level of accountability embedded in the current governance model My children no longer have EA's in their classroom, they are both in split classes, and teachers and administration are expected to make it work. It is an annual struggle to provide deep and meaningful learning opportunities with regular cuts to our teachers, EA's, and staff. When will our children's education be a priority? Frankly, I expected more from the Brad Wall Government and the Educational Governance Review. The report and the process were both flawed. How can students, parents, and educators truly be heard and considered in the approach? Why is such a fundamental change to the administration of our education system being pushed upon us without an appropriate timeline or consideration of ALL options (including separate schools)?

Greetings -- I do not think that changes to the existing education system would be productive or useful at this time. Premier Wall's answer to many things is "Now is not the time", and I would say that applies much more to education than to other issues. Education has just undergone transformative change, and teachers, administrators, and school boards are just getting used to the new size of boards. We are still working through all of the kinks. Local input is much less than it used to be, and if there are more amalgamations, there will be none. People care about their local schools, and they want to have some input in how their children are educated. Here, in rural Saskatchewan, children attend some very small schools. Our local board tries to be responsive to their needs and tries to work with the local communities to maintain their schools. I do not see how a province-wide board and administration will have time or commitment to do that. This sort of province-wide board will look at nothing but economics, and will quickly shut down all those small schools and shove those children on buses to ride for hours on school buses, because they will have no concept of how this impacts children, their parents, and the communities. Consultation for these changes will be non-existent. I do not believe that there will be economies to be found in the offices of the administrators. As teachers, we did not see reduction in the number of highly paid administrators that worked in the office. And, as we all know, the bigger the organization, the larger the salary of the top administrators. There are no economies to be found there. What we did see was the opportunity for a mid-level administrator to bully teachers and pursue his personal agenda without regard to any educational goals, without any consideration for the schools, staff, or students, and without any consultation with anyone. A larger organization with more levels of administration would only allow for more opportunities for little despots to pursue their bullying agendas. Smaller organizations are able to respond faster to these sorts of "bad apples". The biggest savings in education are made with teachers' salaries, and we already bargain provincially for those. This government has already shown that they are not prepared to honor those contracts with teachers nor fund those contracts with grants of tax money to the local divisions, so they have betrayed both partners in the agreement. A larger amalgamation is not going to fix that. Returning the power to local divisions to levy their own taxes as they used to do will, but, of course, we are not going to see the Sask Party do that sort of thing! Tax increases to fund education -- don't be silly! If there are economies of scale in purchasing of supplies to be made, surely that could be done with a purchasing board at the provincial level. Such a board could also be utilized by separate school divisions. Do not they also need to save on paper towels and copy paper and dry erase markers and computers? Appointed boards for education are a bad idea; people want to have input on the local level, and they want that input to be meaningful. We already have a provincial representative (an MLA); what we continue to need are local representatives from smaller communities -- people who have the time and commitment to listen to concerns. School councils will not serve that purpose as they have no actual clout and are often volunteer. They are good at organizing events -- teacher appreciation day, welcome to new school year breakfasts, and raising money for playground equipment. They provide a forum for discussion for things like school closures, but their voices would be lost if they had to deal with a large provincial, appointed school board. At least now they can liaison with locally elected school board members who can take their concerns to the regional divisional school board. There has been no grassroots movement for change in education. The Sask Party government has just pulled this out of a hat. No consultation with any interested parties has taken place. There are no models of successful systems elsewhere where this sort of giant school division has saved millions of dollars and elevated the graduation rates of students or improved their test scores or improved morale of teachers and students. There is no evidence that this will improve educational outcomes nor save money. There is no need for this at all. If government debt is the problem, education is not the place to find savings. (Of course, I believe P3 schools and such are bad deals as well; short term gain for long term pain.) Education should not have to pay the bills for boondoggles such as the GTH and the exorbitant prices paid for land. They should not have to pay for bills run up over the carbon capture experiments that have failed to produce either savings or less pollution. Teachers have not received windfall salary increases as have other workers. Teachers and children should not have to suffer because the government of Saskatchewan thought the oil boom would last forever, and failed to save for less bountiful times. Putting janitors or secretaries or teachers out of work or lowering salaries will not improve the economic conditions of unemployed oil workers nor support local small businesses better. More unemployment and lower salaries for necessary jobs are not the answer. This government has a history of non-consultation with regard to education (and other sectors). The changes to the school act with regard to number of days attended, for example, (change to hours rather than days) did not address the concern that people had at the time for fewer "days off" for kids. If anything, it has made the problem worse. The change to make all school divisions start after Labour Day was another silly, unnecessary, and hasty move that was made with no consultation with education partners, nor, apparently, with a calendar, as we saw in 2015, where that had to be amended. This is the sort of hasty unplanned moves this government does. These were fairly minor, but the move that is being suggested now is not. Please forget this foolish, hasty, unnecessary "transformative change", and preserve the status quo. There are no

millions to be saved in this venture; it will likely cost millions. And it will certainly cause disruption, lower morale in educators, less input from the local level, and this will result in a less effective education system. In the long run, the children of the province will suffer. Is that the transformation that this government desires?

After reading Mr. Perrins recommendations, I believe that option 3 A or B are the best options. I do think that some of the school districts need to be held accountable for their expenses, but I also believe that the people in each of the school division need to have their voice, whether through elected or appointed boards.

Over the years, the rural towns have slowly been dying off and the K-6 school I once attended closed and kids now are bused to a larger school K-12. Now the closer of that school would see kids being bused anywhere from 30 to 130 miles to school. After having moved to rural Regina area I chose to have our children go to a rural school because it not only takes parents to raise a family but I believe it takes a community to help raise your children and you get to know not only the kids your child goes to school with but you get to know their families as well. I would hate to see this and the opportunities our children get growing up in a rural community jeopardized or taken away. Closure of schools and amalgamation will lead to more small towns and communities dying and what happens to our Agriculture? Farmers do not farm in the city and we certainly are not going to have or see our kids spend 3-4 hours in a bus per day when that time should be spent with or kids and doing what they love to do as well, "grow up on a farm"! I hope when decision is done I hope you take into consideration who supports this government and what it could potentially do to our rural communities and towns. Closure and amalgamation of schools is not the answer for our future here in this province!

Hello, would just like to say that living in a small community we need to keep our elected boards so we have a say in what happens to our schools. Appointed boards will ruin rural Saskatchewan schools. I have saw amalgamations in health care and school divisions over the years and all that has done is cost more money and gave the government more power and taken away our local voice with appointed boards. I am strongly against any more amalgamations.

Locally elected school boards ensure some level of accountability and should not be eliminated. The fact that the government would like to eliminate locally elected school boards is disturbing as it erodes the right of the public to have input.

I feel that the Province needs to take some time to consider what you are actually proposing. You are trying to rush this through to save money, however, you are forgetting about the students. They are not machines. They all require specific educations that cannot be dealt with by one school division. Please do what's right for the kids. There are many other places where funding cuts can be made.

I feel that amalgamation of the school boards would only harm the education of our children at this time. Having a local school board gives the students and parents the voice they deserve

Re. Saskatchewan Educational Governance Review. Dear Mr. Morgan: I am greatly concerned with this government's plans to once again reorganize school divisions within our province. I understand that the intent is to save money and provide equal opportunities for all students, but there are several reasons why I would hope the government would proceed with caution. Our province has gone through major amalgamations of school divisions as recently as 10 years ago. The process was time consuming and disruptive for teachers, parents, and communities, and did not result in financial savings. In some cases, school closures and longer bus rides were the result. Such school closures are a major factor in the decline of smaller communities. In cases where rural and urban school divisions have been combined, rural schools often lose their voice in policy matters, due to lower numbers. The questionable benefits of amalgamation have not outweighed the costs to rural Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan already has the lowest number of school boards and trustees of all 4 western provinces, and the largest average physical area per school division. School divisions are already physically large enough for efficient management. In the report by Dan Perrins, there is repeated mention of various options involving public schools, but Separate Schools are not mentioned. I believe that Catholic schools meet an important need in our province, as evidenced by the significant numbers of students enrolled. These parents have made a conscious choice to enroll their students in a Catholic school, and have chosen to pay their property taxes to a Catholic school division. I would strongly caution against making changes that would threaten the opportunity for so many students to receive an affordable Christian education. This government's short timeline for feedback has me concerned. I hope the government will take public concerns seriously and proceed with caution. If something isn't broken, it doesn't need to be fixed.

I would like to start with I am shocked by the lack of information in the report that has been put in this report. With only seven days to respond I am assuming that our government is banking that no one will have time to respond. There is a lack of information on how any changes will actually save money on education. I still question a government that treats education as a place that cut backs should be made. Education for our province is an investment. The better educated our population is the longer they will be able to productive tax paying community members helping us progress and develop industry. The current changes this government has made in have so far been a detriment to our system. The rubric's system was discarded by the Ontario government, only to be adopted by ours. As a parent, my student is contently frustrated with the lack of direction as to what his grades actually are. This system that we have in place (that Sask Party developed) is meant to push kids through who need actually need more assistance than they are getting. Pushing through for larger school boards will take away from the community of education. Children need the community support and recourses. "It takes a Village" With centralization of board there detachment from these.

My family and I would like to see one school division where each school would have equal access to educational materials and resources. At present inequality exist in funding and resource access to many schools, especially rural schools. I have been on local teacher executive boards and teaching for over 26 years and I have seen inequality between schools in many divisions. There seems to be the 'have' and 'have-nots' in divisions. Children need one voice to create an equal dispersion of resources between all schools in the province. Why should a school with a higher economic history review new equipment and resources and a smaller rural school receive the 'hand me downs' of the other school or no regular update of its educational and student programing hardware and furniture? This is just one small example of inequality in school divisions. Native education has also been denied the same access to educational opportunities. The northern schools of Saskatchewan are in crisis. Drugs, suicide, and lack of opportunities have led these students to feel undervalued. One school division would send a message to schools that you are under one decision making body and monitoring of decisions by government agencies could be made more efficient and accountable. Students in the North must feel the same chance for a positive and accessible education experience as students in the rest of Saskatchewan.

I am concerned with the proposed changes to the education system in Saskatchewan. We went through an amalgamation 11 years ago. If we go through another amalgamation it will only waste more money on administration instead of focusing on students and unfortunately this will take several years, not months as we found out with the amalgamation of 11 years ago. We will lose our local voice if we amalgamate and trustees become appointed. Appointed officials will put very little effort into understanding rural needs and our children's quality of education will be compromised. Our community enjoys the benefits of a 4 day school week. This extra day off gives us the opportunity to schedule medical appointments on these days, older students can help out on the farm and younger students have fewer hours riding the bus. As a parent and taxpayer, I am extremely opposed to the proposed changes to the education system, in the end it will cost more money , take away the focus from education and students for several years while administrative issues are sorted out and most importantly, our rural voice will by lost.

As a parent, I am not in support of the additional amalgamations of school boards that the Province of Saskatchewan is currently considering. Schools rely heavily on the support they get from these locally elected board members. Each school division in our vast and diverse province has its own set of unique needs and with that should be met with its own voice. To disrupt, or worse yet remove this local support, I believe would be a great disservice to our schools. Initially it may prove to be cost effective to make this transition, however these changes could come at a greater cost which may put limitations on the quality of education our children receive. Our children's education should always be the core element in which we should invest in, not detract from.

I am disappointed that a panel was called together to review the process which was called implementation panel than a few days later it was called consultation panel. Really proves Don Morgan should set down. I am against the amalgamation of school divisions and the rollback or freeze in wages. As a political party you better have a huddle and figure out why you caused this situation. I am tried of Brad Wall hiding behind the carbon tax while all this is happening locally. Enough

I strongly and firmly support the Locally elected boards that are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. They are important advocates for ensuring excellence in education, who better to serve the needs of students—which are unique to each division, and even each school within divisions—than those elected by our community to represent our community and I strongly and firmly support and believe in Catholic School education in Saskatchewan. Do not replace them please

Don Morgan states in his letter to School Community Councils dated January 5, 2017 that “the goal of this review is to ensure that we continue to provide the highest quality education to our students” and “to ensure that the resources provided are used in the most effective and efficient manner possible”. I don’t believe that restructuring the school divisions will improve quality of education to our students. For the past several years our school division has been asking the government for additional funding for operating costs. The quality of education is directly affected by this funding. I agree with the points listed in Dan Perrin’s letter to Don Morgan: I support elected boards to represent the local voice. The 2006 amalgamations have created school divisions that are large enough, and any additional amalgamations will not improve student outcomes or result in other savings. As a member of my local School Community Council, I believe that it is important to preserve and strengthen parent and community voice in matters related to education – providing advice and participating in decision making. It is unfortunate that due to changes to taxation in 2007 the funding model hasn’t been fair to all school divisions in the province and that the government hasn’t been more responsive to the needs of school divisions who are requesting additional funding for operating costs. The government requested a review of the funding model in 2015 and stated that “this review is nearly complete”. Interesting that the process takes so long when school divisions are requesting more funds, however this current review process to change the governance and restructure school divisions is happening very quickly (started November 15, 2016 and the review panel will present their findings to the minister in February 2017.) School divisions have been finding ways to be more efficient – “\$8 million in efficiencies were achieved by August 31, 2016”. I agree with many of the points listed on p. 20 of Perrin’s document regarding Shifts in Governance – for more strategic direction and accountability, effectiveness, efficiency, consistency/standardization, and participation. These goals for shifts in governance could also be achieved within the framework of our existing school divisions. It was disappointing that of the options listed, keeping our existing school division structure was not considered as an option... the analysis seemed incomplete without showing the benefits and challenges of achieving shifts in governance within our current structure. The current cost of governance is \$11.3 million or 0.6 percent of the total operational funding. I’m not convinced that there will be any cost savings by reducing the number of school divisions. There will be additional costs associated with any restructuring of the school divisions. And there will also be costs associated with maintaining larger school divisions. Improvements need to be made. However, another restructuring of our school divisions is not the answer. School divisions are working to be more efficient. I would like to see a better relationship between the school boards and our government where accountability and responsiveness go both ways. Focusing on restructuring will compromise the focus on student outcomes; it is more important to work on these shifts in governance within our existing structure to minimize any negative impact to students.

I believe that education needs a rural voice and belongs in the community. Previous amalgamation under the NDP government caused disruption that affected our students and teachers. NESD is doing a good job working toward the goals of the ESSP, they should be given the opportunity to finish the plan. If you are going to amalgamate school divisions it should include ALL school divisions. Excluding the separate school divisions is not fair to the students, teachers and administrators in the public sector. Lastly, I do not want to see rural versus urban division when it comes to the education of our students. The challenges facing school divisions are vastly different depending on geography, and amalgamation will not help to tackle the challenges. Thank you for your attention to the concerns of all of the stakeholders in this very important decision.

To Whom It May Concern, School divisions have worked tirelessly to create inclusive, quality education for the unique and diverse students within their regions. As a friend so eloquently wrote, "Reorganizing will set us back years! There will be turnover of personnel and leaders, loss of leadership, loss of connections and relationships, confusion in regards to new processes and procedures, probably new report cards to roll out and different technology and policies for everyone not to mention the thousands of hours developing new documents, manuals, vision and purpose. Every hour spent focused on reorganization is an hour stolen from our students." The idea of moving to one school division is troubling. It causes me great concern for my current and future students. A "one-size-fits-all" model neglects that students are diverse and have needs which will go unmet as a result assuming that one central body can meet those needs. While it may look appealing on paper, in action, it will have a great number of negative consequences. Thank you for your consideration.

It is my understanding that there is a possibility that the school divisions may be amalgamated and the elected boards of education be replaced by government appointed boards. I strongly believe that our locally elected boards are the best advocates for the educations of our students. Each school division is unique therefore a local board would best address the needs of the student within that school. We are very pleased with the present system and would like it to continue.

I would like to go on record as deeply opposes to Minister Don Morgan's suggestion of abolishing locally elected school boards and replacing them with government appointed boards. I have supported the Sask. Party in the past but am starting to have misgivings about the policies they are pursuing. I want to be able to hold my locally elected trustees to account. This will be entirely impossible if they are centred in Regina and appointed by the government. I strongly believe that the further decisions are made from the people they impact, the worse the result or service will be. I am reminded of a so appropriate quote: "Governments and baby diapers should be changed often and for the same reasons". Something is starting to smell.

Making any kind of change on the assumption of cost-savings or student/staff/community benefit, without providing the taxpayers of Saskatchewan with FACTS, is a act that would be dismissed handily by any business person that you would approach with this kind of proposal. Unless this information is made available in a TIMELY manner to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, most will assume that this consultation process was a sham and question really whether this government understands the interests of the people of Saskatchewan. The lack of leadership by the rural caucus of SK Party MLA's is also a troubling sight. There is no chance that all of this caucus whole-heartedly supports this process without any concerns. This vital link to the tax-paying people of the province is absent in all of this process and, again, makes this process appear to be a sham and a fait de complet.

I feel this process is being rushed. The provincial government needs to listen to communities and educators and students. We cannot have the most vulnerable students suffer more. Perhaps take a took at reorganizing the RMs to save money. Educators cannot be pushed much more. This will affect the province and its people for years to come. It is time to start looking at ways to cut money that do not affect such vital services so greatly.

I wish to object to this plan to change Saskatchewan public education. I fully support our school boards stand. Representation must remain local with locally elected school boards. Local representation is a must for our children's education, and for the parents ability to have a say in their children's education. A local board creates an opportunity for the public to create relationships with the board members, which is essential for communication, to have input and understanding of what is happening in the local public school system. The options of this plan seem to want to take this away from the people of the communities. The separate school system will remain with locally elected boards, why take this right away from the other schools in the communities? Lloydminster is a unique community which has worked hard to get our local schools both on the Alberta and Saskatchewan sides of our community to a high level of excellent service and excellent education with excellent student results. I have been through the Lloydminster public school education system, as well as my children, and now my grandchildren. Do not jeopardize this with causing the education system to focus on structural changes instead of our students and staff needs and education. Please listen to our school division, and our citizens, and do not force this change.

As parents and educators, we are passionate about the future of the education of our children and future generations. Thank you for taking our concerns into account. 1) We ask that SHBE be counted as stakeholder in these discussions, 2) We ask that the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students, and 3) We ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators.

I want my children to continue to learn about our faith through the Catholic school system. This is very important to me and my family.

I firmly think school trustees should be local and elected. Always to be safeguarded is the right of parents to be the primary educators of their children. Local and elected trustees is best suited to keep parental involvement in the education system while professionals are entrusted with the instruction of students. Education, as all government services, should be organized on the principle of subsidiarity, which means leaving a function to the lowest, least centralized competent level of authority possible. Direction and accountability MAY be somewhat harder to achieve, but they do not justify the abandonment of fundamental values. (We do not abandon a democracy for gains found in a dictatorship either). For the most part, Mr. Perrins's specific options address only the public education system. I do not think a centralized organizational model should be adopted for the reason above While I am a separate school supporter, and the report's options do not include the separate system, it would be quite easy to conclude that if a centralized model is desirable in the name of efficiency and effectiveness for student performance in the public system, it should be done for students in the separate system as well. Indeed, we educate all students to participate in one economy and one social network. Today's students will be the parents and the professionals of tomorrow, and we will want them to retain and protect the fundamental values associated with our freedoms.

Minister Morgan I am an 18 year old girl,

. My teachers are great! My school is great! I love going to school! But I have seen my resources slowly go away over the years. My teachers do a great job even though you don't give them enough money to properly educate me! And now I hear you want to take away my voice in my education! What right do you have to do that?! I VOTED this fall for my trustee. I VOTED for someone to be MY VOICE in Prairie Spirit. And now you want to change that?! Why? I would like to tell you that I WILL VOTE IN THE NEXT PROVINCIAL ELECTION AND IT WON'T BE FOR YOU IF YOU DO THIS!! You say you want to save more money because you have none. But why do you look for more money and risk my education...my future? I didn't spend your money stupidly! Our government did! Prairie Spirit has spent its money well, and even saved some! You say that you want to see more people finish grade 12. Prairie Spirit has LOTS of students finish grade 12...more than other places. But you still want to change MY school division! If you change my school division you will once again, change my education! I say NO! NO MORE CHANGES THAT IS BAD! If you want to change something, give my teachers more money and ways to help teach kids like me! I DO NOT WANT YOU TO CHANGE MY SCHOOL DIVISION OR TAKE AWAY MY RIGHT TO VOTE FOR MY VOICE!! I hope you listen! :(

I am as informed as I can be, and I still believe that amalgamation, taking away more boards and removing other jobs and programming is NOT the answer. Being a small town mom of four, we have different needs than the bigger centres and amalgamation will destroy our kids. Please listen to the people; we are the ones that have to live with YOUR decisions. We are the ones that will have kids that suffer because of the decisions you make. Please listen to us as we have listened to you

Creating 1 school division for Saskatchewan is not appropriate. Standardized education is needed for all children across the province. But a rural school has needs that are much different from the needs of an urban school. Frustrating that teacher & teacher aid positions continue to get cut, while administration positions continue to grow. By the way how many administrators does it take to "run" a school division in comparison to how many teachers are actually on the job teaching our children!?!? I'm sure the answer would be shocking! Quit messing with our children's education & our future!!!

I am concerned with the proposed amalgamation, but especially alarmed by the timeline of the government of Saskatchewan. Any of the proposed options are going to directly affect my own children. Local boards provide accountability, direct and effective communication and a proactive approach to local issues. They are in touch with the needs of our students. A representative in Regina or Saskatoon is not going to know or appreciate our local community concerns. If the Saskatchewan Government cares about the future of education and the future citizens of our province, they hear our voices.

Dear Mr. Wall, I am writing to implore you to reconsider your plans to amalgamate school divisions.

I am passionate about children and learning and give it my all every day knowing that students benefit when we put them first. They deserve our focus each and every day, and as administrators, we remind ourselves daily to maintain our focus on kids as we can easily lose focus and concentrate instead on administrative tasks that have little effect on their success. I am extremely concerned about the current plan to amalgamate simply because of the immediate and long term effects that reorganization will have on student learning. Currently, all staff at Chinook School Division, including superintendents and coordinators are focused on learning. They are constantly researching and studying best practice for educators, forming and coaching teachers and assessing student data and how we can improve. My superintendent is at my school weekly meeting with us and observing and coaching teachers which has a direct effect on teacher effectiveness. It took 10 years to get to this point in our school division and in the last 6 years, we have seen student success soar in Chinook because of our focus on learning and our commitment to try to not let any one of them fall through the cracks. Now, Chinook is leading the hoshin on reading and the province's school divisions are beginning to implement the strategies in Saskatchewan Reads. Reorganizing will set us back years! There will be turnover of personnel and leaders, loss of leadership, loss of connections and relationships, confusion in regards to new processes and procedures, probably new report cards to roll out and different technology and policies for everyone not to mention the thousands of hours developing new documents, manuals, vision and purpose. Every hour spent focused on reorganization is an hour stolen from our students. I urge you to reconsider this decision if you value the continued improvement in reading and math as well as an increase in graduation rates. Thank you for taking the time to read this email. I trust that you value the opinions and feedback of your constituents.

I am writing in support of re-alignment of school division boundaries where they may be necessary due to changes in population and traffic patterns. I am not in support of a provincial or regional education model. First and foremost, our education system needs a strong local voice. Community needs have to be heard, understood and reflected in programming and decisions. Moving to a provincial or regional model will greatly diminish that voice and have a negative impact on the student experience. Secondly, divisions need to be accountable to parents and students and not be merely enacting the short-term (4-year) vision of the government. Moving to a provincial or regional model would mean that accountability would shift away from parents and students and towards elected officials. Thirdly, rather than provide efficiencies and cost reductions, amalgamation can increase costs related to travel and transportation; this is particularly salient in our sparsely populated province. The report highlights a few areas where school divisions have cooperated to seek efficiencies on procurement solutions; I would suggest that this can be built upon and the government can assist the school divisions by setting in place a mechanism to encourage on-going collaboration on procurement and potentially shared services of some sort where it makes sense. The problem of financial accountability that is outlined in the report can be fixed. Divisions should be given autonomy to function within budget, and a mechanism to seek provincial approval to exceed planned budget should be created, much like how a private company operates. This could find a balance of autonomy and accountability from a financial perspective. School divisions have shown much greater success in finding efficiencies than the health regions have demonstrated; the government should not attempt to take a blanket approach to these significant public services. What is right for health care is not necessarily right for education. The education system appears to be doing well on the initiatives put forward in the ESSP and I do not see any argument or information compelling enough in this report to justify moving forward with drastic changes to the structure of our education system in Saskatchewan. The pains of transition, the stress and uncertainty that would be thrust onto teachers, students, parents and administrators and the potential negative impacts on student education over a 2 to 4 year period are simply not justified. As a public engagement practitioner, I am extremely disappointed at the Government of Saskatchewan's poor attempt at broad public consultation on this very important manner. A principle tenant of proper engagement is that multiple channels and tools be used, and that these are chosen with the stakeholder network in mind to ensure accessibility and fit which encourages the broadest possible participation. The government has chosen to use one tool and one channel (a poorly designed and very flawed one at that) with very limited communication to the stakeholder network about the process. The fact that this is a "form" with one section for comments, no questions or statements to assist stakeholders in their response means that the vast majority (of those who are fortunate enough to know this is even available) will likely throw up their hands in frustration and say "why bother, they won't be listening anyway". Another principle tenant in public consultation is letting stakeholders know how their feedback will be used. There is no information offered as to who will analyze this information, how it will be used, and how/when stakeholders will be informed as to how their input affected any decisions made. There are vague comments about further consultation, but absolutely nothing of substance. Finally, these comments will be published online along with names and affiliations of individuals. This will only result in discouraging input from individuals who are reticent to have their views and even perhaps their writing skills exposed to the broader public. Rather than encouraging transparency, this process discourages participation.

Allowing christmas celebrations in the school, especially due to the fact that canada was founded on christian values and they still have prayer in parliament so why not have it in the schools ,and needs to be a repeat of the singing of O CANADA AND THE STUDENTS SHOULD BE SINGING. There's so many things that disgust me with these schools. I grew up in the same school and nothing is the same. I understand the multi cultures but it's so sad that our own children get put last in everything we believe in. They came to our country for a better life etc. We shouldn't have to adapt to their needs. They should have private schools if that's the case.

As a Catholic ratepayer, I definitely do not want the government appointing members of a board to govern our schools. We have no reason to hope that they would look out for our best interests. I want to personally vote in the board members I want.

We do not agree with the governments opposed changes!

My son enjoy his bus ride and having fun in school. The school officials and his teacher are very friendly and professional.

I am opposed to the proposed amalgamation of school divisions and government appointed boards. Our school divisions are too large already. Education needs to remain at a local level where stakeholders can have a voice in how their schools are run.

I believe strongly in the importance of local elected boards of education What has happened in Ontario can happen here. Who will advocate for us locally if we are not part of the decision making process? Please support locally elected boards.

I do not believe there should be only one school board or one division. School boards should not be government appointed, they should be elected by the community. Having appointed boards will result in a loss of a public voice, a loss of input by parents toward their child's education and a loss of relationships and communication between parents and schools. A change to becoming one school division will have a negative impact on rural schools and communities. School boards and divisions are good just the way they are.

Hello, As a home educating parent I would like to ask for the same three points that SHBE also asks for: 1) We ask that SHBE be counted as stakeholder in these discussions, 2) We ask that the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students, and 3) We ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators. Thank you, I look forward to seeing home based educators be a part of this important decision making process.

Minister Morgan: As a parent with three children currently enrolled in a rural school within Sask Rivers SD119 school division, I am alarmed at the proposed realignment of the governance structure. The province of Saskatchewan covers an immense, extremely diverse geographical area. That area is home to an equally diverse cultural community that defines Saskatchewan's unique history, strong values and identity in Canada. I cannot imagine, in any scenario, how a centralized, government appointed board of trustees could effectively administer the diverse educational needs across the province. It is no surprise that a government appointed board would be partisan, whose only function would be to implement government policy with no regard to the unique needs of different communities. The stated goal of the government, as I understand it, is to find financial efficiencies in the education system. I understand there are a number of ways to realize efficiencies that will have financial benefits to the stakeholders. I believe the primary stakeholder in our education system is our student body and local communities, not the government. The first place to look for efficiencies is in the current structure. It is less disruptive and less costly than inventing a new system and will yield the quickest results. Remote northern communities, rural communities, urban centers, First Nations communities, economically depressed communities (present in all of the above) each have different needs related to education. Vulnerable students will be left behind, as is the case now in the Saskatchewan health system. Kids with unique needs that do not align with stringent criteria fall through the cracks in the health system. I know this as fact as one of my children is in this category. The same will happen again in the education system. Only strong locally elected trustees can effectively direct and administer their community's unique education needs. I cannot possibly touch on every issue that this proposal would negatively affect, but I have no doubt you will be made aware of them. I strongly oppose any change that removes the rights and responsibilities of the local stakeholders to govern their unique and diverse education needs.

The existing, or very similar, divisions should be maintained. Larger divisions will not be able to understand and handle well the diverse needs of varying areas. Regina and Saskatoon should not be combined with their wider rural areas as the 2 sets of conditions vary widely. Nor should wide areas of the province be combined for the same reason. Local boards can understand the situations that students, families and teachers/staff experience, and can implement solutions to best meet the students' needs. Combining divisions may result in some administrative cost savings, but likely a small percentage of the education budget, and will result in poorer outcomes for students. Remember, we are building our future society in our schools. We must consider the long-term.

To Whom It May Concern, after reading the highlights of the K-12 Education Governance Review Report, I would like to see the division model implemented versus the provincial or regional model. Being from a small community I don't want to see local voices have less impact on decisions made regarding their schools/divisions. Often, when government tries to streamline and increase efficiency there is a loss of individuality and in the long run it is impacting everyone with the input of just a few. I would like to see the government run more efficiently but retain the input of the individuals.

I am all for whatever lowers the ratio of students to teacher. I don't understand enough about the differences and need a point-by-point cross reference of the current status compared to/against the proposed changes. Therefore I can only say that the current teacher/student ratio is intolerable. It is insanity in thinking that one teacher can successfully teach more than 8-12 students. 20 or more students per teacher sets up both students and teachers so that inadequate education is normal.

I feel that locally appointed boards are more accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. It would be a mistake to eliminate local boards. Who better to serve the needs of our students-which are unique to each division and even each school within divisions-than those elected by our community to represent our community?

Just as MLAs represent the electors School Boards represent their electors – do not change this – gov't. appointed boards have to answer to the gov't. and are not free. PLEASE do NOT change this.

he most fundamental concept of education for children is to allow Parents the right to educate their children as the Parent's conscience dictates. A secular minded parent should have the right to have their children educated in a secular system (which by anyone's judgement would be the Public System). If they are of a certain Religious belief they should then be allowed to have their children attend an institution that supports those beliefs. This would apply to Christian or Muslim or Buddhist or any other religion. If the parents are of First Nations heritage they may wish to have their children attend a school that's speaks to their cultural principals. The Government must allow parents the freedom to have their children educated in a system they believe is most appropriate. Any changes to the present Regulations or Legislation need to reflect this. Currently the Provincial Government allows the freedom and provides funding for parents to have their Children educated in Institutions based on French Language / Culture, Muslim faith, Christian Faith, and Secular faith. It is very important that other groups who represent parents who wish to have their children educated outside of Institutions and tradition facilities have a voice to speak to Government about their concerns. In the case of Home Schooling parents that organization would be SHBE. When Government engages with parents to establish how children are educated, they should do so with the understanding that the parents have the right to dictate which education delivery method is appropriate for their children, Government should then work with them and provide fair, equitable, and meaningful support to that end. The conversation cannot always be about money, it must center on the parent's right to chose which education delivery model is appropriate in their eyes for their children, and Government to then exercise its discretion in enabling that expressed desire to be fulfilled to the extent possible within the bounds of good government and responsible use of Taxpayers' dollars. Thank you for the opportunity to submit my opinion.

It's important to keep our identity separate and our morals! My family and many other families deserve the choice to educate in the separate system or the public. There is a difference!!! Let us continue to be part of it!

I believe this decision would have an extremely negative impact on education and would directly impact my motivation should it go through with the potential cuts mentioned.

We are a home-based educating family living in Saskatchewan. We are asking that changes to governance include representation for home based educators as represented by SHBE (Saskatchewan Home Based Educators) and HSLDA (Home School Legal Defense Association) Canada. We are asking that the above named entities be counted as stakeholders in education-related discussions to represent homeschooling families like ourselves. We ask that the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students. From our personal experience, it doesn't seem right that there is a discrepancy and variance regarding the amount of funding available to us for use in educating our children based on what area of the province we live in. Different school divisions account for their funds differently as it relates to home-based learning. We believe the funding should be even and equal across the province. We ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators. A portion of the report states that "each school division has broad authority to determine how to allocate resources to its priorities." This phrase is somewhat disturbing to us. Though we see the practicality in allowing the school divisions to see their needs and allocate funds accordingly, the thought occurs that home-based educators are not a priority of the school districts as it pertains to allocation of funds. What do we provide them with? What do they get for their money? Why then wouldn't each school division just eliminate the funds given in reimbursing educational resources to home-based educating families? Speaking for ourselves, providing home-based education has put some limits on us as a family, and we have chosen those limits for the education we believe we are providing to our children. One of the limits is that as a mother/teacher, I do not work outside the home; so the reimbursement of educational resources has been a very beneficial program for our children's education, and we hope that funds continue to be provided. Thank you for all your hard work in the area of education for our province.

To the Attention of the Ministry of Education, As parents

we have been alarmed to understand and read the Governance Review Report. We have found it very vague and lacking sufficient evidence to show how liquidizing the school divisions in Saskatchewan would benefit the province as a whole but more importantly how there would be a benefit to the education of the students, teachers and extra-curricular activities. As well, I find it increasingly alarming that not only do we find the report vague, but we have yet to talk to a member of parliament, a school division officer, or a teacher that can support this report and tell us the benefits.

we fully support that LOCAL School Division Office and Board on the decisions that they make regarding our schools in Lloydminster. We appreciate and value that their interests are consistently for the better of our students, our staff, and our schools. The relationship that they have with the principals and the schools prove time and time again how strong this school division is.

Subsidizing the school boards and decreasing the numbers of divisions will not only take away the valuable interaction between school boards and schools but it will also remove various "perks" that many school divisions have. As well, as an Alberta Resident whose children attend a Saskatchewan school district

am very certain that I am wanting my education tax dollars to be spent in my child's School and City. I do not want it to be going to a school that my children will never be attending because it is in a different city.

We made the decision to drive our children into Lloydminster for school because of the School Division and the excellence that the schools in Lloydminster continue to strive for. Our tax payer dollars for education have been forwarded to the Saskatchewan government because of this. Please let it be known, that we do not support the decreasing of school boards. We do not support the dissolving of the Lloydminster School Division. We do not support the grouping of the Lloydminster School Division with other divisions. We are not at all in favour of this report.

I am writing this letter to say I strongly oppose the potential amalgamation of the school boards. The next step would be closures of rural schools. Although my children have all graduated, I am worried about the future of my grandchildren. They will suffer and will be on the bus way too long. It already is a problem to keep farmers living in rural Saskatchewan and if this goes through, more people will leave the farm and move to the city. A school is the glue that holds a community together and if that's lost, a huge part of the community dies. The pupil-teacher ratio will be a lot higher if schools close affecting the student's education. In closing, please reconsider this potential amalgamation for the sake of our children and grandchildren, especially the rural children.

We, the parents are not in favor of the amalgamation of school divisions. We have already been through an amalgamation, we do not want to go through another. Let's keep our schools in our community with elected board members from our school communities. These community minded individuals know what communities face to keep our children educated, safe, and successful!

To Whom it May Concern: We do not feel that the options presented in this report will result in significant cost savings without negatively impacting the quality of education for our students, eroding community voice, and affecting the sustainability of our community. We support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for students and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). We do not support the concept of an appointed Board of Education. We believe local voice is an essential part of a successful school-community relationship. We do not support any of the 3 models presented in the report. We feel forced amalgamation puts our school, and many like it, at risk of closure. We want to know what potential changes there will be to the rural school closure thresholds that are currently legislated. We feel this is a critical consideration in evaluating the options. We would like to see a permanent solution for high school transportation and are concerned what impact forced amalgamation will have on bus ride times for our students. We believe that further progress can be made in existing school divisions to find sector-wide efficiencies and cost-savings and recognize that the government may need to be more directive in requiring these sector-wide efficiencies to be realized.

School boards are backbone of our democratic system. Through school boards, as a first step, our citizens start to get into a life of serving public and being their voice. Our electives practice campaigning, meeting people, going through election and being the voice for the public. Eliminating elective boards will weaken our democratic system. In addition, options presented in the report only apply to the 18 public school boards. There is no change to the nine Separate and one Francophone board due to constitutional legislation. Any systematic change that affect a sub group of the education system only (v.s. the whole education system) raises a risk of creating a discriminatory system (one way or another). We have a diverse community. Serving this community would need to address the specific needs of the community (by offering programs needed). This would consequently need a strong local voice. From the options presented, we can support option 4, provided that the elected board concept is maintained.

As a parent of children attending Prairie Spirit SD, I am most in favour of option 3A restructuring public school divisions. As stated in the report, this funding distribution model is "designed to provide equity in resources across the system." Equity is something that I find to be greatly lacking in this division. This division has already been through amalgamation and I feel that our students and our school in particular have been left behind. The new funding model that moved away from funding on a per students capita basis has been detrimental. The majority of new money that has been allocated to our division has gone to new schools in rapidly developing communities, leaving needs at other schools put on the back burner. Our division has had to dramatically cut costs by eliminating EA's, teacher librarians, and fine arts programming. The result is larger class sizes, burnt out teachers and mediocre education. Equity of resources is definitely something our government needs to strive for for all students across the province.

Dear Min. Don Morgan and to whom ever else this may concern, It has come to my attention that the current government is considering government appointed trustees for the school boards and/ or an amalgamated school board, eliminating the separation of public and separate (Catholic) school boards and the election process in which trustees are granted their positions. As an individual who supports the Saskatchewan Party, I am deeply disappointed and displeased with the course of action that is being considered. It is important to maintain a democratically elected board to ensure the community is appropriately represented. This can only happen if the trustees are nominated and elected by their communities. Furthermore, by combining both the public and the Catholic school boards you are endangering the religious freedoms of the Catholic community's school division and alienating the families that choose to enroll their children there. Electoral freedoms, even if they seem as trivial as a school board trustee election is what keeps a community true to its people and its values. No one in government should be allowed to dictate the beliefs of the people in the communities in Saskatchewan. If government appointed school board trustees become a reality it will affect my future support of the Saskatchewan Party, as there will be little to convince me that the Sask. Party political agendas differ from that of the N.D.P.. Please, Min. Don Morgan, do not do the province's people a disservice by dictating who we must accept as representatives of our children's education and future. I know elections can be expensive but they are our democratic right. I sincerely hope that you and the government of Saskatchewan make the right decision and keep the current system of elected trustees for both the Separate and Public School Boards.

As a parent to five school aged children, I feel the school boards should remain locally elected bodies. The board members are accountable to the electorate that voted them in. My concern with the proposed system government appointed trustees would have the interest of the government in mind when making decisions. The government has shown many times that education is not a top priority in this province. The treatment of teachers in regards to fair wages and appropriate wage increases is one of the areas where education falls short in this province. Also as a homeschooling family, I feel that the home educators need to have representation in the consultations as a stakeholder.

A separate school board is critical to maintain instruction in morality, accountability and the preservation of not only the Catholic catechism but also the values of many ethnice peoples of Saskatoon and include but not limited to First Nation, Frankophone and others. There would be a HUGH risk to take with one central board as it is my view that Religion is separate from the State. How can a state appointed board possibly oversee something when they don't have the laws in place to do so. Additionally, the right to free expression of Faith is a part of our Charter and cannot be governed out of the hands of the peoples. This is a Charter issue over which one state appointed board would be usurping the rights of the People. The State CANNOT force one board to look after the Catholic schools. Additionally, a state appointed board is exactly the same thing. Leave Separate School Boards alone.

I strongly believe in the value of locally elected school boards. As a member of our school community council, we have benefited from, and appreciated, having our school board rep actively engage our council in discussing issues at our school. Our rep is from our community and familiar with the unique strengths and challenges we face. They can address local issues, questions, and concerns at the next level of governance (school board) and keep the communication and feedback timelines effective and accountable. As an elected, versus appointed, official they maintain a level of accountability that would be compromised in an appointed board, and helps to ensure that our community maintains a voice in the education system. Please keep our boards local and elected. It is an essential piece of effective representation in rural Saskatchewan.

What you are considering is very dictatorial. We need elected boards accountable to the electorate. They help to advise you as to the needs of students-which are unique to each division. They also will help to hold you the govt. in check.

Removing local representation and moving to a centralized school division with non-elected members is counter productive to the democratic process. Having smaller school divisions with local elected members ensures that schools have the flexibility to ensure that the students are receiving what they require for success.

I no longer have children in school but have read over Dan Perrins' Report and have a few comments: 1) At this time I am opposed to the number of school boards been reduced. I do feel that boards should be elected and did vote during October 2016, election. I was surprised to read that half the board members were acclaimed but feel this was not so much due to lack of the public's interest but more to do with the public not knowing anything about who is running and if you don't know why vote. Prior to the October 2016 election I tried to find out who was running for the board and was very surprised at lack of information available to the public. I was somewhat surprised by the table on page 15 of the report but without really knowing what time is actually spend by boards do not feel I could comment further. 2) I support each school divisions authority over expenditures but can also see possible conflicts with minister's office. 3) I agree with "Consistency/Standardization and Participation" comments on page 20 of report; and 4) I strongly disagree with Option 1 and 2 as set out by the report but could see a blend of other options.

To Premier Brad Wall, Education Minister Don Morgan, and Mr. David Forbes: I write to you, our elected representatives in the Saskatchewan government, to submit my views and concerns about what is written in the Perrins Report, as well as the Transformational Change initiative being implemented upon us. Our locally elected school boards play a vital role in our communities as they are a direct link between the wishes and desires of our cities, RM, hamlets, villages and towns, and the education of our children. Locally elected school board trustees are not only directly accountable to the citizens living with the boundaries of the Greater Saskatoon Catholic School Division, they have a profound understanding of the particular need and interests of the communities they are elected to represent. There has yet to be a solid case put forth by your administration to prove that removal of this local governance by a Transformational Change to a centralized-council will serve the greater needs of the students and families of Saskatchewan. It is my wishes that the government of Saskatchewan respect our current school divisions in terms of size, borders, and the local governance structures to ensure that our students are not harmed by ideological decisions. It is unclear to me exactly how the Separate/French school divisions will be affected by this change. However, I feel it necessary to express that Catholic education is an important option in this province. It is my concern that this Transformational Change will be working to eliminate the option of separate school divisions as a whole. I feel that this process has moved very quickly with not enough consultations with the general public. I would be interested in the opportunity to attend a "Town Hall"-style meeting to allow more information and to facilitate discussions.

A large percentage of the funding for education comes from local taxpayers and they deserve local representation for education. This is different from health where most funding comes from the general revenue fund of the provincial budget. We need to keep our school boards locally elected. We need to keep decisions close to our communities.

Dear Mr. Doke: We are greatly concerned with the government's plans to once again reorganize school divisions within our province. I understand that the intent is to save money and provide equal opportunities for all students but there are several reasons why we would hope the government would proceed with caution. Our province has recently gone through major amalgamations of school divisions as recently as 10 years ago. The process was time consuming and disruptive for teachers, parents and communities and did not result in financial savings. In some cases school closures and longer bus rides were the result. Such school closures are a major factor in the decline of small communities. The questionable benefits of amalgamation have not outweighed the costs to rural Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan already has the lowest number of school boards and trustees of all 4 western provinces, and the largest average physical area per school division. School divisions are already physically larger enough for efficient management. We personally have seen the disappearance of schools in small communities and the community suffers, stores, banks local business have to close and we start commuting hours to get groceries and to work. In the report by Dan Perrins, there is a repeated motion of various options involving public schools, but Separate Schools are not mentioned. I believe that Catholic schools meet important need in our province, as evidenced by the significant numbers of students enrolled. These parents have made a conscious choice to enroll their students in a Catholic school, and have chosen to pay property taxes to a Catholic school division. I would strongly caution against making changes that would threaten the opportunity for so many students to receive affordable Christian education. This government's short timeline for feedback has me concerned. I hope the government will take public concerns seriously and proceed with caution. If something isn't broken it doesn't need to be fixed. We appreciate all Mr. Wall and the Sask Party are doing for this province but please proceed with caution on this review.

Keep the 18 elected public school boards because that represents democracy on the part of their parents.

Catholic Education Matters! We need locally elected boards in order to serve the needs of the diverse faith and cultural communities in Saskatchewan!

As the parent of a daughter in Grade 11, I am very concerned about the changes the government is contemplating for the education system. The reason for these drastic changes are not apparent in the Perrins report. The report doesn't mention the problem this initiative is trying to solve. The government appears to be panicking and rushing into drastic changes and the repercussions of this panic could affect generations. There is no financial analysis applied to any of the options in the Perrins report, which appears to negate the point of undertaking the government review in the first place, if the reason for this review is to address the \$1B deficit. It is hard to be on board with these changes if there is no actual evidence that these options will improve student achievement or reduce education sector costs. I think electing school boards is important for ensuring that local priorities are considered in planning and setting strategic direction. I am also not in favor of the political appointment of board members. Political ideology and appointments based on political connections should have no place in establishing education system policy. The future of our children is bigger than any political party.

To the Government of Saskatchewan, after review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report, my feedback is as follows: I support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! I do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. I do not support any of the three models presented in the report as I don't see any budgetary evidence to support that change to governance or further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. I am very concerned how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold we are legislated by. We need a permanent high school plan, including transportation, to accommodate the best interests of our students, their families, and our community. Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in. I have seen too many times over the years how the closure of the rural school leads to the death of the community. The give a damn factor amongst the parents in rural schools seems to be higher which is why rural parents are extremely concerned about this issue.

I would be extremely disappointed if the government, namely our current Minister of Education Don Morgan along with our Premier Brad Wall, would continue in their intended direction of further amalgamating school divisions and eliminating elected boards of education to replace them with government appointed boards. Is it not our right to vote? Have we not already elected the party in power in our province? Why would this elected party now feel that it is their right to remove our right to vote on our local boards? Would these government-appointed boards move to our communities? If not, what would they be basing their decisions upon if they do not know us, our needs, our schools, our communities, and our students by name? I do not see how public education could be governed better by officials who neither live here nor know us than it already is by officials who are locally elected. The Saskatchewan government is now implying that it no longer needs nor wants the advice provided by our elected boards even though these elected boards would know best what our community needs are. If the government already determines policies, curriculum, and programs for our public education, what possible advantage would there be to remove our voice, our vote and our right to elect our local boards? Are we moving to a moment in history where the federal government will decide who is placed in each province to govern us instead of letting the citizens vote? I think not. Why, then, does our provincial government feel that this course of action would be best? I am a very concerned citizen, parent, and community member. Please don't disappoint us with your leadership skills. Being a good leader does not mean putting yourself in every position of power there is. Being a good leader is listening to the people who have elected you to govern them and do what is right for them, not necessarily what is easy and more beneficial to you. If you refuse to look at the results that Dan Perrins found and highlighted in his report (namely that he found unanimous support for elected boards being the only effective way to represent the local voice and unanimous support for no more amalgamation), then you may indeed be seen as the bully who is pushing out the very people who voted to put him into power. It is now, and always has been, your responsibility to be fair and democratic for all of Saskatchewan's people - including our teachers, community members, and ALL students. Please don't disappoint us and go backwards - our ancestors fought hard for our right to vote. Please don't take this right away from us now.

As a long time resident of Lloydminster and an employee of LPSD I have concerns about the proposed changes outlined in the Educational Governance Review Report. I feel that these changes will not improve the education that our students receive and could negatively impact them instead. I am concerned about the possibility of there no longer being an elected board of local members who put the specific needs of our students and community first.

I believe that the actions you as a government, are proposing is not only hurtful and destructive to the Education system but to the students themselves. The educators work hard to ensure that students needs are being met but your government continues to destroy all of their hard work. Massive layoffs in the education system has already put these students in peril. Why are our children expected to pay for your mistakes and mismanagement of funds. They had no part in the issues that are playing out in Saskatchewan today. There are other places that you can "trim" funds from. Look at the rural municipalities. Maybe there could be some cost cutting there by amalgamating, yet your government will not even look at that. Why? Because these are your huge supporters. What you are forgetting is that they are not the only ones that supported you in the last election. You are playing politics in the backs of our children. Shame on you.

Please maintain the present 18 public school boards having elected boards. This the best way to address democracy in education. Fewer than 18 school boards would diminish direct representation from parents to exercise their God given rights to decisions to be the primary educators of their children. The latest a amalgamation of ten years ago is just recently gelling out as administrators and school staff are getting to know one another and to become immersed in the new goals set out two years ago to boost achievement of grade 12 level.

Its is my belief that school boards should be voted in not a handful of individuals appointed. This province is to vast with to many changing needs per area. A hand full of individuals would not be able to grasp the needs in the whole province. People that are from the local area understand there areas needs.

I believe that continuing with our current structure of locally- elected school boards is in the best interests of all students in our province. The proposed options outlined in the report will especially not benefit students in our unique bi-provincial city of Lloydminster. The current structure of locally elected boards ensures that our trustees are best able to meet the needs and interests of the students in our community while balancing the requirements of two provincial education systems. It is important that Lloydminster tax dollars are used to benefit Lloydminster students. I believe that any challenges can be met effectively with our existing boards working under new mandates or policies.

We need to keep our school division because rural schools are very important . Every community has different needs. We need to put priority on our students education, as they are our future. We also need to have elected , not appointed board members.

The future of public education in the province could be radically different than what we see at present. Is change bad? Not necessarily! Is change hard? For many stake holders yes! Whatever the changes may be it is vitally important that the product of the education system, the students, the children, are not treated as a product sold at your local big box store. The concerns of parents regarding their child's education occur on many different levels. The willingness to volunteer and work with children at the local level, the concerns of the bussing of their child, the offering of courses that will enhance their child's future, the enhancement of facilities and equipment, and the list goes on. School administrators can address some of these areas but many require interacting with a division board member who is knowledgeable of the local needs. Some of the division board "hands on" involvement was lost in the last round of school division amalgamation. Following the business model of bigger is better will result in a further loss of a parent's ability to effectively communicate with the decision makers of their child's educational future. I would urge caution, bigger is not always better.

To the Panel: We all need to stop and think about what is best for Students. Is taking the decision making farther away from the local voice what is best for students? No. What is the problem we are trying to Fix? Is it budget or what is best for students. Local elected voice is the where we need to stay! SCC have a big voice at the SCC table in strategic planning at the school level, but they don't want to make the Board decisions. They want to continue supporting the schools and the division's good work. How is it going to look if the Catholic schools have elected board member and Public schools have appointed and these schools are across the park from each other or under the same roof. Trustees need to stay locally elected by the people they serve. Local Elected Voice.

I ask that you DO NOT remove local elected boards. I cannot see how you will be able to support or understand what our schools need if you have government appointed boards. I truly feel by removing our local appointed people will leave the rural communities lost with little support. You need to convince me how we will not get lost or get lumped in with urban schools, there is no comparison. My fear is that our school will be closed because an urban person can't understand why having a school with 80 kids is still open. Or why to give funding for such few kids. I want people that understand our situation to come in and support our school. If I know they are thinking of our community then when they have to make changes I will be much more understanding. Thank you for considering what we have to say.

To whom it may concern: After reading the Education Governance Review Report I cannot see exactly what the purpose is. What are you trying to achieve and how are any of these changes going to benefit our children's education? Shouldn't the report have stated the intention and how each option will address this and have numbers in regards to cost, etc. If changes need to be made those changes should be minor and less disruptive. Our schools, school divisions and their members and the Ministry of Education are supposed to be serving and making decisions in the best interest of our children. Any of the options, if pursued could be detrimental to our students and the future of our province. Lloydminster is an anomaly and doesn't fit into the models you have suggested. A large percentage of the population and children attending school are Alberta residents. They deserve a say in their children's education and by removing our existing structure that would make this impossible. Currently there is seamless distribution of funds and each student is treated equally no matter where they go to school or which province they live in within the city. Enlarging the boundaries would make an accounting nightmare and if the hope is to save money this would probably be eaten up in the administration. The community has worked hard to establish the system they have grown and I believe boundary changes would "upset the apple cart" with more time spent on administration of funds when our tax dollars for education are intended to educate and grow our children and grandchildren – the future of our community, province and country. Switching to a provincial model would make the individuals governing the schools so far removed from the situation they would have no way of doing the job that is required. As taxpayers, and parents we would have more red tape to go thru in order to address concerns. Also, each community in the province has different interests, needs and wants. With boundaries set too large how would it be possible to address these things properly. Currently board members have a true concern and passion for the children and development of their community. They attend local functions and are a known face for parents and staff to address concerns to. If a provincial model or for that matter a regional model is taken there is no way a few individual can spread themselves around and be the go to person with concerns. Also, the cost for these representatives to attend meetings and events would be unrealistic. No more noon hour or evening meetings, instead a meeting would entail all day, involving mileage, hotels and meals. If cost saving is the intention, I can't see this being addressed.

It would be nice if some clear information could be provided to parents so we could really see how any of the options in the report would on a local level actually affect our children's education and our local schools. This report provides nothing to most parents but a bunch of questions as to how all the mumble jumble talked about will actually impact of children! At this point with things as spread out provincially as they are with the existing number of school divisions it is hard enough as a parent to know what is going on and what will truly affect our children/schools locally. If they look to change the system it better be done with significant planning and care that it does not have a negative impact on our children's education...they are our leaders of tomorrow and their education today will impact their ability to make our province a better place to live tomorrow .

As a parent of children in the Catholic School System and an employee of GSCS, I am concerned that the changes will compromise the gospel centered education that our children and students receive. I trust our board to provide leadership not only in subjects such as reading and math but especially giving us the freedom to instill gospel centered values which at their core are based in prayer specific to Christianity. The leadership our board provides is much more than what a bureaucrat could provide from behind a government desk. Please protect our schools and our locally elected school boards. I am concerned about the possible amalgamation of school boards for two reasons... 1) We elect our local school boards ... they are accountable to the people and the employees of the division are accountable to the board ... they are also more in-tune with the local needs of the community for the direction of the schools 2) I am concerned about the protection of the separate schools in Saskatchewan. The province has given constitutional rights for Catholics to have their own school system. There is some talk that the amalgamation will prevent Catholics from having solid Catholic school board representation which would erode the ability for Catholic school divisions to exist and thrive.

Speaking from the perspective of a teacher from the region of Lloydminster, I have a number of concerns regarding the recommendations and options from the Educational Governance Review Report. The current system of funding deliverance in Lloydminster ensures that all students within the city receive equitable access to services. Should Lloydminster be forced into an amalgamation, it would risk this existing equitable access for all students within the city. In addition to concern around equitable access to services for all students in the city, I am also concerned that the hard work and benefits that have come as a result of the formation of the Lloydminster Public Advocacy Committee would be lost. This committee, formed in response to the Task Force on Teacher Time Final Report, provides an opportunity for teachers, administrators and division executive administration to work together in order to ensure students in Lloydminster continue to receive an excellent education.

I welcome this review and the rationale for it. There has been a change in the responsibility for how education is funded and the tension between who is responsible for spending, results, human and financial resources needs to be addressed. Regardless of the option that is selected going forward, I strongly believe that home educators need to be represented in any stakeholder groups / advisory boards that are set up. Home educated students are not mentioned in the document, yet they have those educational rights under the constitution and the numbers of home educated students are greater than the numbers of Francophone students. The registering authority for home educators must respect provincial regulations. Likely the best way to do this is by having one registering authority, regardless of the number of school boards. Currently school divisions are credited 1/2 of a "regular" student for each home-schooled student within that division for purposes of "per student" funding formulas. This funding is provided with no accountability that the funds be spent to support home educated students. There is no transparency as to where those funds are spent. There is little to no consultation with home educators about the supports that are available within the school division. If the school division requires the current level of funding in order to provide education to regular "in class" student they should receive it, but they certainly do not spend 1/2 of the per student allotment that they receive for an regular "in class" student on home educated students. As a tax payer, this is not a valid means for funding education - I assume that the province thinks that the school divisions are spending these funds on home based students but in my experience they are not, and they certainly do not demonstrate or have to account for it in any way. I strongly encourage you to review the Saskatchewan Home Based Educators submission as they speak for me and for home educators across Saskatchewan.

I am very concerned about the possible amalgamation and restructuring of our current school divisions. Currently we elect our school boards and they represent our concerns and issues locally. Having a local voice is important and these people are accountable to us. Appointing representatives that are not vested interested in our small rural school will not result in improved student outcomes, support for our parents, teachers or students. Appointment would result in taxation without representation. I am a teacher and an administrator and this potential change has affected staff and student morale. Our small, rural school has achieved and exceeded the provincial levels for graduation, and for reading levels. Our review of our LIP shows that our Division is performing above the goals set out in the Education Sector Strategic Plan as referenced in the Perrins report. We have achieved a high standing and we continued to excel in academics as well as in extra-curricular. We have focused on leadership at the staff and student level and we receive tremendous support from our Division personnel. Our school excels due to the support, governance and the relationship that we have with our Division representatives. Local representation is the best model to understand and address the unique needs of individual schools. There has been very little public discourse and a very restricted time line. A large percentage of funding comes from local property taxes yet we seem to have very little say. I am requesting that we continue with our current Division boundaries with local representation and that we find savings in other places.

Our school division is unique, as is every other division in Saskatchewan. Each division has many voices. These voices must continue to be heard through our elected education boards. Being an employee of a school division, I feel very strongly about the education of our students.

I have seen many changes to our division; mostly good. My husband and I moved to a smaller community to raise our children. We are both familiar with the many benefits of a small community: being active on locally-run boards, volunteering endless hours to enhance our community, knowing all the members of this community (and the children in it), and the pride that goes with belonging to such a community. But our community does not end with our village; it extends to the many communities around us: St. Brieux, St Ben., Cudworth, Humboldt, and many more. Our boards in our "community" are locally elected. The elected members have listened to the concerns of the community and they make a difference in our "community". These elected members are in it for all the right reasons; the main reason is our children. Our school mission statement (which is similar to our division mission statement) is that we are "dedicated to creating a safe and respectful environment that encourages the pursuit of academic excellence, and the development of social skills necessary to become responsible citizens." Our children benefit from such a "community" as ours, and I am very proud that I am a part of it. On the other hand, an appointed board will have the opposite effect on our children; our education will not be student-centred if members are appointed. Will we save money in the long run? Will our children benefit from an appointed board? We, as responsible citizens, must put our children to the forefront and continue to have a voice in our elected education boards.

To the provincial government of Saskatchewan regarding locally elected school boards, with all due respect, I wish to express my desire that locally elected boards remain in effect as these are important advocates for ensuring excellence in the education of our students, and the maintenance of our local community atmosphere.

I believe that in order for the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP) to meet its goals (as outlined in the 34 page Ministry of Education document), we must consider the following three areas before an amalgamation is considered. 1. Eliminating the annual Director's Address at TCU Place. This event costs thousands of dollars each year; money that could be better spent hiring competent EAs for our classrooms. 2. Eliminating the annual principal's conference weekend at Elkridge; money that could be better spent hiring competent EAs for our classrooms. 3. Eliminating the half days' given to each teacher twice a year for CIT collaboration; money that could be better spent hiring competent EAs into our classrooms. There was a year when all teachers watched the director's address via satellite in their home school's library. Think of all of the EA support that could be brought into our classrooms to help the ever increasing class sizes that come with students ranging from everything with ADD, ADHD, violence/aggression, reading and math learning disabilities, to kids with autism and at the functioning life skills level. Right now in my classroom, we have 10 students that need regular daily EA support. We are lucky if we get a 50 minute period of their help once or twice a week due to the fact that they are constantly being shuffled from one IS student to another; because we don't have enough support - whichever student has the higher special needs that day gets an EA.

Our enrollment has increased since then. How will situations like this help us meet our ESSP goals? I believe that money saved from education is not right; that student outcomes do not come from bigger divisions. It does not come from removing the local voice in student education. The annual principal's conference weekend could surely be turned into a one-day event in Saskatoon; saving the school board thousands of dollars. The CIT and PLP professional development documents need to be streamlined and put together into one document. Teachers could either be given 30 minutes at a few staff meetings throughout the year to complete these. Think of how much money would be saved in not hiring subs for those days. Did the last amalgamation save money? I don't believe it did. How about raising the PST? It immediately solves the problem. I truly believe that before we take such drastic measures into our hands, as far as amalgamating school divisions into one, we could try cutting back or eliminating ideas like the ones I present to you today.

I am a grandparent who is concerned about the education system. We live in Rural Saskatchewan. My fear with this amalgamation is that the big schools will get everything and the little schools will get nothing and be forced to go to larger schools. I hope you consider the following: length of bus rides of these children that live in rural Saskatchewan the distance parents have to drive for their children to participate in after school activities be it drama sports or music. the little towns who might loose their schools then their businesses because of no schools Education is very important for all of Saskatchewan children and money should not be the only consideration. Last week when the government received an increase in their wages yet teachers do not. Some of Our teachers work incredible hours and should be compensated for it. In my past experience bigger is not necessarily better. Please consider the teachers and the potential loss of jobs but mostly the students who need these teachers. Thank You

I am a teacher who experienced school division amalgamation about ten years ago. That process was inevitable given the large number of school divisions in the province at that time, and it undoubtedly resulted in greater resources for the hitherto poorer legacy divisions and some increased efficiencies. Nonetheless amalgamation also resulted in some inefficiencies. For instance, a request (for just about anything beyond the school level) became more cumbersome as more layers of paperwork were required in the bigger school division. Previously, because we all knew each other, a short phone call would very often suffice to produce the required results. Local boards were phased-out which meant the removal of another level of governance. While this may have streamlined operations, it also meant the elimination of elected officials who often had significant contact with educational stakeholders at the community level. My fear about transforming our school divisions into even bigger units--particularly if they are constituted without elected representatives at the decision-making level--is that these may be inefficient in some very important areas. And this for very marginal financial savings! If our board of education in Prairie Spirit is representative of boards in the province, then I fear that we change the current system at our students' peril. For example, not only has our school division spearheaded some significant classroom initiatives in assessment, evaluation, and reporting; improved literacy; and better retention rates of at-risk students, our board members have performed very good work in the communities that have elected them in explaining these essential changes to the people whom they serve. Concomitantly they have returned to the division with the questions and concerns that their constituents have raised. Such a process is healthy for education as we educators strive for continual improvement in our students' learning, and this is especially impressive given the already-large size of our existing divisions. Enlarge these divisions even more, and I fear that we will lose some of the tight focus and efficiency that characterize Prairie Spirit and divisions like it--as they are currently constituted.

As a current teacher in the Lloydminster Public School Division, I want to share some of my concerns about the recent recommendations from the Educational Governance Review Report. One concern revolves around the issue of our unique position as a border city. This unique geographic position means that a local school board and school division are the best way to continue to ensure equitable access for all students regardless of their province of residence. Should amalgamations occur, how would the government ensure that monies received from the Albert government stay within Lloydminster? The current seamless delivery levy is the best way to ensure equitable access for all students. I also feel that amalgamations within the province would essentially silence the local concerns of both community and teachers within the city. Alberta residents would have no voice in the education of their children and teachers would be left with significantly less opportunity to discuss areas of concern which impact their students in their classrooms. Standardization and centralization effectively takes the local perspective out of the picture and renders local community members, parents and teachers powerless to effect change.

Local elected school boards reflect the true nature of our democracy. A democracy which values local representation as chosen by its citizens; the right to chose your representative and not have that decision made for you by the highest reaches of government. Locally elected school boards are accountable to the electorate of their school division and a voice for those communities within that divisional district. They are aware of the concerns and needs of the individuals and the communities they represent. They also serve as an important check and balance on the powers exercised by the provincial government and the Ministry of Education. The elimination of these local boards would mean silencing the voice of a community and it's residents. I strongly encourage the Government of Saskatchewan to retain the current governance structure of having locally elected school boards. This structure has served the residents of this province well in the past - if something is functioning well why change it.

I believe that dividing the province into larger divisions is not beneficial to students. Local school boards know better what the students in their area need. Also, appointed boards are not as democratic as elected school board members. Sask. education is moving in a positive direction, why would we toss everything aside for bigger and supposedly better school divisions? Remember our students in this proposed change!

Lloydminster students, regardless of which province they live in or which school they attend, need to receive equitable services, like prekindergarten, transportation, driver education and the many services that our school division, city and both provinces are providing at the present time. Under the proposed Governance Options, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to provide a seamless delivery of service across an expanded division. It is the belief of our Board of Education that the challenges identified in the Educational Governance Review Report can all be met effectively through amendments to legislation, regulations and policy. This would be considerably less disruptive to continue with elected boards working under new mandates, regulations and expectations.

I believe that dividing the province into larger divisions is not beneficial to students. Local school boards know better what the students in their area need. Also, appointed boards are not as democratic as elected school board members. Sask. education is moving in a positive direction, why would we toss everything aside for bigger and supposedly better school divisions? Remember our students in this proposed change!

I am deeply concerned that amalgamation will result in job losses for those in my position as an education support professional (teacher's aide). History shows that when budgets are tight our positions are often the first to be reduced or cut. This results in greater stress on both teachers and students. In RCSD there is no union for support staff. Will we be forced into a union or loose jobs simply because we have no union to speak for us. How will our wages be effected and seniority? Will our school division remain a separate entity? I am concerned that we will loose our voice as Christians. The whole purpose of our school division is to pass on the values of our faith and to celebrate our christian values as we see fit. As population diversity increases will our values become the minority and be marginalized by more aggressive non-christian voices. I was raised in the public school system but I have seen a drastic change in policy and direction. Instead of increasing awareness of all faiths and cultures the system seems to favour teaching none of them so as not to offend anyone. The loss of a Regina Catholic School Board would mean the loss of our Christian voice when decisions are made a the higher levels. As it is, the changes made in the last few years with regard to the length of the school day have done nothing to address the real issues surrounding lower grades and graduation rates. Those issues are caused by problems in the community such as addiction, poverty, truancy and childcare costs. I strongly suggest that the Premier and the Minister for Education spend a lot more time thinking through the consequences of those changes that have been made which have been costly, confusing and ineffective so far. Please do not make that mistake again. To be effective, how much money will be eaten up travel costs for the proposed single school board? How many people will be needed on this board to address the needs of rural and urban schools, Catholic, charter, First Nations and public schools? Add to that the needs of Northern Schools. I have serious doubts about the ability of a single council to address all these needs in a timely and cost effective way. While I see some advantages to amalgamation when it comes to purchasing power, I seriously doubt these savings will outweigh the costs associated with travel, loss of community and parental choice, loss of job security and loss of timely and effective troubleshooting. I would advise the Minister and his advisors spend some serious quality time visiting school divisions and take full stock of what is required to manage our schools, aside from provincial laws, on a more fundamental and personal level. I must also express my disappointment that once again government seems to be using education to cut costs.

I am a grade 12 student who is pursuing a teaching career. The elected school boards are a way to ensure that the community has a voice in the education of our children. Furthermore it ensures that the provincial government is held accountable and the children in the province recieve quality education. I therefore ask you to keep the locally elected school boards.

Although based in Regina, I was in the SW for many years and watched the process of amalgamation a number of years ago. Who suffers? Certainly the children who require support in the classroom and then ultimately the teachers do! Administration in the consultant division seems to remain the same? I wonder why that is? I understand the budget constraints that the govt is under but it does nothing for the students and staff at schools who are the front line people. The population is very diverse now in SK. What is decided on the provincial level will miss the mark for those who do their best for the rural communities and having a school with students and staff will support the community to survive. One broad stroke will not do a thing to help.

Locally elected boards are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. They are important advocates for ensuring excellence in education, and should continue to do so. Thank you for your time.

I have many concerns regarding the options put forward by Mr. Perrins regarding the future of Saskatchewan's education system. Is some refinement of costs necessary? Absolutely. But is a complete overhaul of a system the best option- an unequivocal NO. When the province is sliding into hard times, and education is the first to be pressed for budget cuts, the government's priorities are WRONG! The school boards have done what was asked this previous year and have slashed many millions of dollars in costs, all the while not affecting key aspects of education such as teacher-student ratios and classroom resources. As you consider which option to choose regarding educational governance, as a teacher and a parent, please choose 3B (if you must choose any). The readjustment of school division borders will find the government the cost cutting measures it is demanding while doing the best job of maintaining the educational integrity that our students desperately need to be competitive in the world. As a teacher, I am concerned with the government's lack of concern for students and teachers. My colleagues and I spend hours, many volunteer, helping students reach their potential. Any cut backs that would jeopardize the hours spent with students helping them prepare for life after high school are untenable. This includes the teacher-student ratio as well as teacher prep time. Without preps, I would be unable to plan and prepare for the individual needs of my students, as well as being able to meet with those students for individualized conferencing and help. As a parent of a child with special needs, I am concerned that the distancing of student supports from local division offices and schools will hamper both my son's growth and development, as well as the growth and development of other students who have disabilities.

Having only one central office or 4 regionals school division office would make it almost impossible for timely supports to be provided when he needs help, especially if specialists were hours away. As the government looks forward to the future, please do not be short sighted as to think that drastic cuts to education is the answer. If we want to be a province that has an eye to the future, with a vision of young Saskatchewan men and women who are fully prepared to take on the world, we have to remember that that process begins in the classroom and with teachers who are prepared and supported in their mission to educate the future leaders of Saskatchewan and the world.

Dear Panel, I understand changes are being considered in our education system. I have some huge concerns about the situation coming. I personally believe that we need to keep our school boards. Locally elected boards are responsible for placing student needs first when making decisions and are accountable to their electorate. They are responsible for ensuring all students within their jurisdiction have equal opportunities to reach their maximum potential. This may be lost with larger elected boards or appointed boards who may be more influenced by politics because they are responsible to the government who appointed them. We need to be able to have any issues, concerns, and help from our local representatives as they know the community, the people and the schools. Each school, where the schools are located and the situations are so different and the representation needs the local rep to deal with any issues, and to bring forth our issues to the Government and the school board as a whole. Electing our local school boards, and keeping any decisions close to our communities is huge to each area of the province. Based on past experience, amalgamation will put the focus on governance, administration and change management. Students will become a secondary focus setting back the advancements that have been made in literacy and improved graduation rates. The previous NDP amalgamation caused disruptions for at least 5 years and education spending continues to rise. Economics of scale have been realized. Teachers over the past couple years finally feel confident in their teaching the curriculum, and amalgamation would set back the advancements in the current system. Significant improvement in learning is just beginning to be achieved in the last couple years. It took at least 5 years for the Boards, formed only 10 years ago, to become accepted as our community's school system. This would be the second forced amalgamation excluding Separate (minority faith) School Boards, firstly in the NDP action and now in the Sask Party proposal. A large percentage of the funding for education still comes from local property taxes. While the Province sets the taxation rate, the local taxpayers still pay the toll. Taxpayers deserve local representation for education. This is different from Health where all funding except portions of capital comes from the general revenue fund of the Provincial budget. I feel, if amalgamation happens, students are not considered first, they will be on the back burner for cost savings, and some communities are not going to get the help needed. If you need to do a much tighter budget, then you ask each school board to cut more, find more cost savings, but not at the expense of the students. Teachers and EA's are not to be touched as they are what make the education what it is! Thank you for taking our concerns and passing them on to the government.

Please don't dilute our voices with regard to the type of education our children/grand-children/great-grand children. Allow each community to look after the education of their children. Thank you.

Dear Panel, I understand changes are being considered in our education system. I have some huge concerns about the situation coming. I personally believe that we need to keep our school boards. Locally elected boards are responsible for placing student needs first when making decisions and are accountable to their electorate. They are responsible for ensuring all students within their jurisdiction have equal opportunities to reach their maximum potential. This may be lost with larger elected boards or appointed boards who may be more influenced by politics because they are responsible to the government who appointed them. We need to be able to have any issues, concerns, and help from our local representatives as they know the community, the people and the schools. Each school, where the schools are located and the situations are so different and the representation needs the local rep to deal with any issues, and to bring forth our issues to the Government and the school board as a whole. Electing our local school boards, and keeping any decisions close to our communities is huge to each area of the province. Based on past experience, amalgamation will put the focus on governance, administration and change management. Students will become a secondary focus setting back the advancements that have been made in literacy and improved graduation rates. The previous NDP amalgamation caused disruptions for at least 5 years and education spending continues to rise. Economics of scale have been realized. Teachers over the past couple years finally feel confident in their teaching the curriculum, and amalgamation would set back the advancements in the current system. Significant improvement in learning is just beginning to be achieved in the last couple years. It took at least 5 years for the Boards, formed only 10 years ago, to become accepted as our community's school system. This would be the second forced amalgamation excluding Separate (minority faith) School Boards, firstly in the NDP action and now in the Sask Party proposal. A large percentage of the funding for education still comes from local property taxes. While the Province sets the taxation rate, the local taxpayers still pay the toll. Taxpayers deserve local representation for education. This is different from Health where all funding except portions of capital comes from the general revenue fund of the Provincial budget. I feel, if amalgamation happens, students are not considered first, they will be on the back burner for cost savings, and some communities are not going to get the help needed. If you need to do a much tighter budget, then you ask each school board to cut more, find more cost savings, but not at the expense of the students. Teachers and EA's are not to be touched as they are what make the education what it is! Thank you for taking our concerns and passing them on to the government.

Elected school boards have helped create the successful system now in place. You don't fix what isn't broke.

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report I would like to express my concerns with the options provided in the Educational Governance Review Report: Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in. I do not support any of the three models presented in the report and wish to remain a part of Prairie Valley School Division. The document options clearly acknowledge that changes to the current system may compromise student outcomes, reduce accountability, reduce community communication and access to decision makers, put more work on SCC's and disrupt our schools. The negatives far out way the positives. I also support finding cost saving systems, strengthening our educational outcomes and standardizing expectation for of our Boards, but cannot support wide sweeping changes as proposed in the document. Could the current local structure not be maintained while centralizing the purchase of large items such as paper, IT equipment, copier machines and consolidating transportation? Although I understand budgetary restrictions, a lower teacher/student ratio is crucial for success of all students with regards to academic achievement and socio-emotional well-being. None of the three proposed plans support this fact. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support that change to governance or further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! I do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. I value the connection our community has with our elected Board member and do not feel a move to appointed boards would benefit our remote community. I fear loss of our local voice will negatively impact our students experience and performance may suffer as a result. Our current Prairie Valley School Division board member is very visible in our schools and community. I have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold. Rural communities thrive, grow, and revolve around their schools. Closing schools will "close" small town Saskatchewan. I believe that all children should have equal opportunities and having public and separate education with separate funding does not support equality in education. Having any of these proposed models will not only affect how teachers are able to best deliver their course loads, but I question if the already limited access to current School Division Support Teams will further diminish (Support Team meaning: Occupational Therapists, Speech and Language Pathologists, Child and Family Support Workers, Social Workers, etc.) Nearby schools are at maximum capacity and there are great concerns for distance, safety, and time spent on buses for rural children. Finally, I wish to repeat that I do

not support any of the three models presented in the report and wish to remain a part of Prairie Valley School Division.

Remember the purpose of your role is to improve the educational process for each individual student in the classroom. By amalgamating school divisions and reducing the number of local school boards you are impeding the delivery of services to that individual child. It would be as if you had a classroom of students and the teacher had to teach those students from the roof of the school. How likely would quality education be delivered and reach those individual students under those conditions. Consider all the government initiatives over the years that were supposed to improve the quality of education. The results of these prior initiatives have failed according to the current government, and now they propose further cuts?...to improve student outcomes? I think not. Education will only be improved by increasing resources to classrooms so that each child receives the instruction that meets their individual needs. The student to teacher ratio must be reduced. Listen to the recommendations from teachers who are personally in touch with their students and government get out of the way!

I am not comfortable with discussions and decisions being made in regards to the education of our children without the representation of those who chose to educate at home. There are many of us within Saskatchewan who have chosen to remain the primary educators of our children. I am highly disappointed that the report fails to acknowledge these students or their needs at all, despite making claims of Other Partners in Education, 'parent participation' or the ESSP to meet the needs of ALL students (not just those in traditional schools). To ensure our voices are heard and our rights be taken into account when crucial decisions are being made, I believe it is necessary for those who educate at home to have representation on the board(s), which impact the rights and freedoms for the parents and families who choose home education. Statistics support the positive role home-based education has in making successful students, it would be negligent for this to be ignored (See the Fraser Institute's report on homeschooling in Canada [2015], starting on page 10; this form would not let me link to the report) Therefore as a member of Saskatchewan Home-Based Educators (SHBE) I request the following: 1. I ask that SHBE be counted as stakeholder in these discussions 2. I ask that the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students and these persons be educated in the rights of home based educators. 3. I ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators.

I would prefer to see the structure and organization of the Public and Separate School systems continue as they presently exist. I am also not in favor of amalgamating all of the school districts in Saskatchewan. I am adamantly opposed to the amalgamation of our public and separate schools. My parents were pioneers who worked hard for the stability of Catholic education in our separate schools. I would consider it a disgrace to take this privilege away from these children who choose to attend our separate schools in order to save money. Our children should not be punished for government financial shortfalls. I am equally opposed to the amalgamation of Catholic School Boards and Public School Boards, for the same reason. Must we abolish all the freedoms that make our province a great place for young families to raise their children, all for the sake of saving money that should be spent on education? Tax payers should have a voice in this decision, or will they all be put in the melting pot to save a few more dollars to balance a deficit financial budget. Why is it that teachers, students and our health care workers are the scape goats. Begin saving money on overpaid government officials instead.

I do not want to amalgamate school division and I want to keep the locally elected school boards. As a parent of students going to School, I feel confident that my kids' academic needs are best met by their school. I am confident that the school is doing what is best for each of the students. I feel confident because I know that the people behind the administration of the school are locals. They know the community very well, they have kids in this school, and most importantly, they feel and understand what the school and each student needs. Amalgamating school divisions and removing locally elected school boards would mean setting up standard procedures for schools throughout the province which, for me, will not answer the needs of each student nor the needs of each school. Each school is unique. Each student is unique. Who better understands the needs of the school/students than those elected by the community to which the school belongs? I understand that part of the reason for the possible changes may be for financial savings/budget constraints for the province. However, I believe that the province should INVEST more on the education and the unique needs of the youth. They are the future of this province. They are the future of this country. We should understand their needs/talents/contribution to society by investing in their formative years. The school is the best avenue for them to show what they can do for society, for the province, and for the country. If we restrict what the school can do for them by setting up standard procedures and not letting the very own community where they come from answer their needs so that we can save financially NOW, then we are also restricting the future of this land.

As both a long-term resident and an educator in Lloydminster, Saskatchewan, I have concerns regarding the proposed changes to education in Saskatchewan outlined in the recent Governance Review Report. Mr. Perrins stated in his report that changes to how Saskatchewan education is governed must "maintain and improve the quality of instruction for all students, wherever they live;" however I strongly believe that the three options that have been presented will diminish the quality of education across Saskatchewan, with the most profound impact being felt within the community of Lloydminster. Lloydminster Public School Division #99 employs and serves citizens from both provinces, and the locally elected board and city-based school division effectively maintains an effective governance of education through an intimate understanding of our unique situation as a border city. The majority of education funding for Lloydminster students is provided by Albertans, but long-standing agreements have ensured that both Saskatchewan and Alberta students in Lloydminster benefit equally from our shared resources. If changes occurred to the local board or division boundaries, I believe that funding would not remain equitable. As a result of any of the three proposed options, Alberta tax payers would lose their voice in how education is delivered to their children; obviously this is unacceptable. Furthermore, it can be suggested that removing locally elected boards and increasing division boundaries will result in a loss of control for all education stakeholders in regards to how Saskatchewan education meets the diverse needs of students and communities. As a Lloydminster resident _____, I have witnessed the unique challenges of this community, and as an educator I firmly believe that effective education delivery and governance must absolutely respond to the local needs of those it serves.

I feel changing the school divisions is a huge issue for the fact that the school divisions in my opinion are already at the maximum size to provide adequate support for education needs. I am strongly against the school board trustees being an appointed member from our current elected positions. I feel this change will have an extremely negative effect on our schools and the decisions that need to be made. The school board trustee is supposed to be our voice to the school division, if that is an appointed position then who's interest is in their best interest, the school boards or our school? Probably not our school!!!! I am completely opposed to the changes that the Saskatchewan Government are thinking of making to our School Boards!!!!

As the government is asking for feedback on the report that Dan Perrins has submitted these are my thoughts and opinions. As a supporter of Catholic Education and former trustee I would like to first thank the Minister and the government for their support of our Catholic schools and divisions. We all recognize that funding has and always will be a challenge. Our responsibility is to our students who no matter what is happening are our main and sole focus. We must ensure that our resources be put into the classrooms while making sure our staff and administration have the tools needed to make this happen. I do recognize that changes may be needed however the government must never discount the relationship that the schools and the divisions have with parents regarding the education of their children. Parents want the best education they can have for their children so we must be careful of not causing a direct impact in the classroom. So when considering the potential options please ensure that local concerns are taken seriously to ensure they are addressed. Supports for students in one area of the province may differ from another. We want all students wherever they are to achieve their full potential! How can a super board include the possibility of having local residents included. It is imperative that local representatives be included in any model going forward.

I feel strongly that we need our locally elected boards. So important that we have local people. Many concerns that we will lose our Catholic schools.

I am very sad to hear this news. It has taken years to implement the last change like this, and FINALLY the focus is back on our children. You know that so much time and money are wasted on the reshaping of divisions, and that takes time away from the children. Wait out the recession, it will turn around. The money you'll spend on making the proposed changes will be such a waste. Plus there is word that there is going to be a freeze put on teachers' wages, and that they are not going to receive the raise promised them in the last contract. That is incredibly shameful. I encourage you to follow a teacher for a week, and you'll see the hard work they put in, time spent away from their families, etc. They are responsible for the minds that will lead this country in the future. They will be in charge when you are in a care home....show them how to do what's right, that the decisions made now affect the future and beyond. I agree that administrative positions need to be decreased. Now that steps are being taken towards this, I find everyone is up in arms about it, yet when teachers get cut, nobody cares. The proposed change is going to annihilate Rural Saskatchewan.

Any decisions made in restructuring must be made based on its merits in regards to educational quality for our students. Although I understand the economic pressures, school division restructuring that puts our high quality education system risk are not acceptable. I did not read a great deal in the Perrin Report, or since, that suggests that there is any consideration for the STUDENTS. This must be the first and main priority... the education of our children!

The most dangerous phrase in the language is ‘We’ve always done it this way’” is a quote that resonates with me. We need to consider more than traditions to justify why we do the things that we do. But, conversely, I think it is just as dangerous to change for the sake of change. The essence of the quote is that we need to be constantly questioning what we are doing, studying why we are doing it, and evaluating if there is a better way. This is why reviews such as those done by Dan Perrins are a necessity. What worries me after reading the aforementioned report is that the Status Quo is not presented as an option despite the fact that Mr. Perrins states in his Letter of Transmittal that there was a unanimous feeling among stakeholders that changes to school board structures and further amalgamations are not needed. The lack of review of the benefits and costs of our current system leads me to question whether or not it was a foregone conclusion that there will be change. Further, on page 3 of the Perrins Report under Purpose, it mentions goals such as “Reducing the difference in graduation rates between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal students by 50 per cent by 2020” and “Leading the country in Grade 12 graduation rates by 2020.” Yet I saw no references to the impact of graduation rates of any of the 4 suggested options. The report talked of transparency and efficiency, but there was not one word on how it will benefit graduation rates. Under Purpose it did state the desire to be financially efficient and I do see the need to be sure that we are being as efficient as possible. However, the Efficiency Benefits are said to be “likely”, and the “extent... and effectiveness is difficult to pre-judge”(p. 22). It also states that “Current boards of education understand the need for change to create enhanced efficiencies and have expressed willingness to make modifications to current business practices.” I posit that this suggests we do not need to necessarily change board compositions or district sizes to be more efficient. Boards are already working hard to maximize their efficiency and are willing to continue to do so. Additionally, the time line is of particular concern. The Letter of Transmittal is dated December 10, 2016 and this public consultation extends until January 23rd, 2017. Education affects every person in this province and it seems that 44 days is not enough time for the public to properly inform themselves nor for them to be sure to properly express themselves. When we take into account that those 44 days encompass the traditional “holidays” during which our attention is put on our families and festivities rather than government reports, the time allowed for public consultation seems even more insufficient. I think much more information and study is required - not only to be sure to properly evaluate the Status Quo, but to answer so many questions that have yet to be addressed. As a teacher, it worries me that there are no answers to questions that will greatly affect student learning: Will there still be specialist teachers? What will come of the technology that I use in my classroom? If technology services are centralized, will there be a delay in support? What will come of the consultants? What will come of French Immersion programming? What will it mean for staffing? What will it mean for local agreements between divisions and their staff? What will be the policies regarding extra-curricular activities? Many divisions have a different number of contact hours; how will they be unified? There are more implications to the day-to-day teaching that happens in schools than the report addresses. I think that it is not only worthwhile, but necessary, to delay a decision until we have more information. We cannot fully answer the question of IF things need to change without first knowing exactly HOW they will change.

I'm concerned that amalgamating school divisions will lead to less services being provided to the front end staff and students of the school divisions. By centralizing IT departments, and HR departments we will be setting up a scenario where we can not adjust instruction as fluidly to try and get the right software/people in front of the students. These savings might only be temporary as time goes on and the problems with centralization start to present themselves. This coupled with this only being an 7-10 million dollar savings seems to be insignificant when compared to the billion dollar deficit we have.

Thank you for the opportunity to share my concerns and comments on the proposed changes to education governance. I have read the report and and I am processing the information and trying to figure out how the background information supports the options that are offered. Our education system has gone through a number of reviews in the past 20 years, and each time changes have been made. Never have any of those reviews pointed to one school division or moving school boards to a system of appointing board members instead of locally electing them. I think that this review of our system was hasty and done in a short amount of time and that it hasn't been thorough. Trying to save money and find efficiencies within the system is very important, but I don't feel like it should be done at the cost of our children's education. At this time, I feel that the only thing that needs to be audited and changed within our school system is the ministry of education. I see our school divisions working and partnering with other divisions and trying to work with budgets that are being cut. The ministry is making the job of educating our children harder and harder. I am NOT in support of any further amalgamations within the education system and I am NOT in favour of moving to appointed boards. I fully support our locally elected school boards and want to have local accountability and a local voice when it comes to my children's education.

We are writing to you regarding the proposed changes suggested in the Educational Governance Review Report done by Mr. Dan Perrins. On behalf of the _____ school Community Council and the members of the community _____ and surrounding area, we strongly oppose the idea of both amalgamation in any of the forms that have been suggested as well as the idea of provincially appointed board members! The changes and amalgamations that were made in 2006 resulted in what we believe are very large school divisions already. However, the current model of partnership with parents/community members and government seems to be effective. We feel we have a strong relationship with our elected board member which has served us well. An elected board member is in our best interest as these are people that are chosen by us to represent us. These people are local and best understand the issues and concerns that are important to us. An elected official is accountable to the community they serve, it's the most effective way to represent our local voice. As a local they also have what we think is a greater commitment to our needs. If a change is made to appoint board members, we believe this will have a negative impact on us as a school and as a community. Appointed trustees are accountable to government and not the people they serve. Our local voice will be lost or diminished. We believe the communication between the school board and communities and the public's access to decision makers will also be greatly reduced. We also believe that if either amalgamation or appointed trustees is to happen, it would have a greater negative impact on us in the rural communities. Rural communities have challenges and issues that differ from those of urban centers. It is reasonable to assume that local elected board members understand these challenges and issues better than a government appointed board which serves our needs as a school and a community more effectively. There's no doubt there are areas that greater efficiencies are required however, none of the suggestions in this report would be supporting the best interests of our students and this community. Thank you, _____ School Community Council

It is my belief that none of the options presented in the report are acceptable. You need to understand that Education is not a business nor is it the same as the Health sector so comparisons do not work nor is it likely that a strategy for one is the solution for the other. If your worry is money, then remember that the school divisions are committed to working together with the government and have already shown savings of over 5 million dollars above what we were instructed to initially find. Education is a community responsibility therefore it needs local voice from the community it serves. The needs for a school in La Ronge are different from the schools in Regina for example. Our democracy provided our communities the opportunity to elect Trustees from our own stakeholder group to bring passion and community voice to the board table, which supports Enduring Strategy related to partnerships. I believe the best way to continue showing commitment to education is through the Education sector Strategic Plan (ESSP) and not eliminating the local democratic decision making component we presently have. I have to question the possibility of forced school divisions amalgamating given that the cost would far outstrip any savings. There is no clear evidence that shows that this will save money or provide better education for our students. The government needs to learn how to make education a true priority and work with our school boards, administrators and teachers to make sound and long lasting improvements for our students. Taking away the public voice does not provide better education – It will only serve to weaken it!

I believe that amalgamation is not a good thing and that elected school boards should not be replaced with appointed boards. Amalgamation is not a good thing because I believe not all school divisions will have an equal voice, especially if there is appointed boards. Only having locally elected boards can we be assured that the voices of the smaller communities will be heard. I believe amalgamation of school divisions would eliminate the voice of the local community in our education needs and standards. I think an appointed board will not address the needs of individual smaller community as compared to the needs of a bigger centre. I believe local leadership is necessary in all school communities.

Dear Minister Morgan, I am a concerned Mom to a vulnerable child. He is not a number or a way to save money. _____ I strongly feel that the proposed change of one or larger school boards will not be in the best interest of _____ or the students of Saskatchewan. I am concerned how this will impact his education. As a rural school the support for _____ and other students in his school is already stretched thin. I ask you what will happen to this support which is now determined by local need if this change is made? How will this change save money? Have any of the proposed models been researched and found effective? How will this change effect student-teacher ratios, and class size ratios? Will schools in smaller communities have closures because of these options? How will the needs of individual students/schools and divisions be met? I put to you that these are the citizens of the future not dollars and cents. Our children should be viewed as an investment in the future of Saskatchewan, not a way to save money. Amalgamating school divisions does not benefit them or their educational needs. As the Minister responsible for education, I stand with other concerned parents and we strongly urge you to oppose the amalgamation of our school divisions and oppose government appointed school boards.

As a newly retired teacher, I have some thoughts on the education system. In the final ten years or so of my career, I have seen more "monies" spent on administration, both school-based and central office-based, while class numbers increased and teacher responsibilities increased. Our province needs to be a "student-first" province. Yes, I know that I borrowed that from health care. Students need to be supported first and foremost in the classroom; secondly they need supports with such things as mental health, addictions, and family structures; thirdly, students need curricula that addresses the present time and future. Students need grassroots instruction with GOOD teachers. Our government needs to support teachers first and that support will translate into a student-first ideology. Things as simple as starting school after labour day, tightening up teacher-student contact time, made a difference in instruction. Students, parents and teaches were reminded of the importance of student teacher contact and more learning was the result. It is important for government and schools and the public to share ideas about this valuable resource-education

To Whom It May Concern, I am writing today in response to the K-12 Educational Governance Review.

I have a deep concern regarding the future of my children's education if changes happen within our province as they have been proposed by the Educational Governance Review. I am concerned that all four options given for consideration are all completely opposite of what the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, Service Employees International Union, Saskatchewan School Boards Association, SSBA Public and Catholic sections and Saskatchewan Association of School Business officials, as well as a parent group, the opposition education critic and members of the general public unanimously stated. They have given unanimous support for elected boards and for no more amalgamation. These associations are made up of the people that work hands on with our children and I am concerned that their voice has not been heard. I am concerned that this change will actually cause inefficiency as this potential change would only affect 18 out of 28 of our school divisions. Running two separate school systems is inefficient. Ten school divisions would still have elected boards and only eighteen would have a provincially appointed authority. All the time and resources spent to create efficiency would only be spent to be recuperated from a little over half of the divisions within our province. I am concerned about when these changes would be occurring and how quickly. Planning has already started for the coming school year. When does the government plan on making these changes? What will happen to the plans and resources already in place? Discarding these plans would be a waste of time and money, which could both be put toward our children. If the goal is to create efficiency, how long will it take to make all these changes to a point where tangible efficiency has been created? Does the province of Saskatchewan have the money to make these changes? Change causes disruption which will inevitably slow down progress towards educational goals that teachers are working towards within the classroom. This slow down within learning will be happening during formative years of our children's education. I am also very concerned about accountability. There are essentially two levels of accountability with having a locally elected school board; the elected trustee is accountable to the community which placed their support behind them, and then together as a school board, the school board is accountable to the provincial government. If the province changes to a single education system where leadership is appointed by the provincial government, one level of accountability is removed. I am concerned that I no longer am able to choose who represents my voice in public education. By the removal of publicly elected school boards, you are removing the democratic process from education and my right to vote for who I place my trust in to run my children's school division. Education is public, not a provincial entity. Elected school boards can be specific to our needs and can focus on the area in which they serve. So if the province changes to a single board, or amalgamates to a smaller number of boards, whom will I contact when there is a problem or concern within my school? Thank you for your time and consideration in reading my concerns.

I am against Option #1 of a provincial model. I opt for an option that ensures the existing of local school boards, especially those that are Francophone and Catholic.

This government seems to be intent on dismantling the local autonomy of citizens into a a number of our provincial institutions. Education seems to be a regular and popular target. The latest travesty is the move to further amalgamate school divisions and dismantle local boards of education. The assertion that this will save money is ridiculous to anyone who has any familiarity with the education system. What it will do is further reduce school divisions ability to be flexible and responsive to local needs. Make no mistake - students will be the big losers. Additionally questionable in the governance review suggestions is the absence of any plan to include Catholic school boards in their restructuring plans. How is that fair to Sk taxpayers? How is that equitable? Most people that I speak to believe that this move by the government is aimed at eliminating local voice and citizens' ability to question the government. Even taking the time to write this feels like a waste of time, as I, like many other Saskatchewan residents truly believe that the government already has a plan ready to roll out to advance their agenda.

I understand changes are being considered in our education system. As a teacher with the Chinook School Division, I believe that education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support the Chinook School Division and ask you to consider these questions with your colleagues in the provincial legislature: 1. Will amalgamated school boards be the best thing for students? How will an amalgamation affect a students' access to timely services like Speech and Language, Educational Psychologists, Occupational Therapy? 2. Will teachers have the same access to Professional Development, in order to best meet the diverse needs of our diverse students, in a vastly increased geographic division? Will we still have access to what we currently possess in terms of human resources, such as Math and Literacy coaches, in a timely fashion? 3. Who will decide the details that affect my job, because as you are well aware, we as a collective are still awaiting a reasonable conclusion to the Teacher Workload Intensification Recommendations: • reporting student progress • assessment • Student Services model • class size and composition • staffing formulas • supports for students with exceptional and diverse learning needs • EAL supports The amalgamation that took place 10 years ago held back education for at least 5 years because instead of focusing on student needs, administration had to focus on the details of amalgamating the school divisions. I fear that another amalgamation will set back the advances that Chinook has made in math and literacy especially. Ultimately, I believe that local democratically elected school boards are the best choice for my community and that local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities. From my work in the classroom, I do not believe that students will benefit from moving decisions further away from the community. I appreciate your consideration of this critical decision.

Dear Educational Governance Review Board, As a resident of Lloydminster I feel it is imperative that I share my concerns about the proposed changes to the school division zones that have been suggested by the Saskatchewan government before the decision is made. I did attend the public meeting in Lloydminster on January 18th and have heard the possible changes that are being suggested. As I am sure you are well aware Lloydminster straddles two borders which has issues that we could fill pages with. The legalities are something that cannot be ignored. I think the point I will stick to is that there are numerous challenges identified through the review report that could all be handled with strategic amendments to legislation and policies. A clear set of guidelines and budget parameters would apply to each school division equally. I do not see where these drastic changes will save money in either the long or short term. The amount of man power that this is taking away from the students and constituents you are serving and the stress that this is causing to school divisions, administration and staff is unwarranted. Write the policies that you want to see in place and allow the school board Directors to carry them out. Thank you for time. This letter is also being sent to MLA - Collen Young and MLA - Richard Starke.

To Whom It May Concern: we do not agree with any of the options presented. There are issues that are hard enough to get through with the big division we have now. As a family who farms, we appreciate living in a rural community and we like the fact that our rural school is close and tight knit. Our fears of reduced funding (which is already dwindling), and school closures with what is being proposed are heightened. We do not understand how this is going to help our education system. Our Children are the Future of this Country and we need to provide them with The Best Education Possible! The Government needs to reassess everything. It's appalling at what and who are behind making these decisions. Please listen to the many people who are concerned about the future of our children and schools.

Without the school boards us as the parents of the children in the school system do not have a voice nor will we be heard. Also, having worked within a school division that is so spread out I have seen how it is difficult, if not even impossible to get much done or see a marked improvement within the system for any real change to be effective to the students that need it. Please do not remove the school boards as they are needed to make the schools effective to all students.

These people have been elected by people who have faith in there ability to do the best job for their children.... Appointments of people who have know knowledge of the problems in the schools and understanding of their situations in each school is a large step backwards. With all the problems in schools and problems that students have today , they need all the personal help and understand they can get. The system is not broken , lets not ruin what is working.

Local boards advocate for the excellence in education for each division, and each division is unique. The province is diverse and the needs are very different from division to division. Please allow the persons who know the needs best to speak to the government. The idea that one size fits all never is true. Let each division speak to what is necessary for the best education of the children and promote the profession of teaching for that area. Local boards have a vested interest in education because it is the ground work for next generation and the growth of the area in which they live, who better to have that knowledge than people that reside and pay taxes to the schools they represent.

Hello, I am a mother of 2 kids. We live in _____ and the kids attend /attended the _____ . When we moved _____ to _____ the _____ schools still had the 4 day school week, Monday to Thursday. I loved the opportunity to have this extra day with my kids. That however was changed with PVSD. _____ became part of PVSD in 2006. I mention this because I personally think the society puts too much emphasis on academic education. The goals that the Educational Governance Review Report came up with are not much different than most other goals for the different school divisions. Everyone strives to do better. Not everyone is academically wired. We rather should give young people after grade 9 the option to start with a trade school and whoever wants to go the University way can go on to grade 10,11 and 12. There is too much emphasis on a University degree and not enough on trade school and technical school. There are also too many University Graduates with degrees working minimum wage jobs. It just does not add up. As for having a Provincial wide school board, I think that would "institutionalize" the system too much. Bigger is not better. How would the local voices and needs be heard? And from my own experience, small town schools will never have the same opportunities available as city schools. Magnet programs work only so far. I have seen it with my kids: they learn things to graduate grade 12 and not because they are interested in the subject. My son would have much rather started an apprenticeship after grade 9 as a carpenter. He would be done in 2018 with a trades certificate in hand and earning a living. Others go into debt for a University degree that they might or might not use. I also think it is not a good idea that students can 't fail grades anymore. This solution might look good on paper for statistical purposes but there are too many grade 10's and up that cannot read properly and do not understand basic math. Students that struggle academically might flourish in a trade school/apprenticeship setting. What I am saying is: Instead of becoming one provincial board why not start changing the system to include more young people with different academic levels and working on having more trades/ technical school options instead?

Having local elected school boards that are accountable to the public are very important. A provincial or regional body in no way can replace the local knowledge and insight that they provide. They are an important link in the appeals process providing a unique avenue for parents to advocate for their children. It was through this exact process that I was able to advocate for my son when his needs were not being met. My son has a language disorder and developmental delays, which requires him to have an educational assistant for part of each day. He is at present thriving in the classroom in large part because of the educational assistant, which was only made available to him as a result of our advocating for our son. Any changes which interrupts or fails to take the appeals processes and the Boards key place in that process into account would be a huge mistake.

I am greatly concerned for the future of our Saskatchewan schools and school divisions. I look at our schools through the eyes of a parent, a teacher and a citizen. I understand that financially, our province is struggling after what seemed like a financial boom. I deeply wish that the governance review board wisely considers the ramifications of their decisions toward education and the people it affects. I support CATHOLIC education and I stand for LOCALLY ELECTED boards of education. Please consider this as a concern for many people, especially for the students who are the future of this province.

Dear Minister Morgan, I understand changes are being considered in our education system. I do not believe that amalgamated school divisions will be the best thing for students because a few administrators in a central location cannot possibly have the same sensitivity to the issues faced in local/rural schools as local administrators can. I would prefer that, if necessary, taxes were raised in order to preserve some local autonomy for our school division. Our local school division, Chinook, believes that the last forced amalgamation (by the NDP) 10 years ago set the division back at least five years. I fear that the advances the division has made as a leader in literacy and numeracy will be lost if they must once again focus all their attention on amalgamating. I also fear that students' access to timely special services like speech, language and occupational therapy will be negatively affected by an amalgamation. As a parent of a teacher, I am also concerned about how an amalgamation affects teachers with regard to class composition, professional development, workload, and hiring of support staff. Students are the backbone of the province and the future, and all our decisions must be in their best interest. I appreciate your consideration of this urgent matter, Sincerely,

Hello, thanks for sharing the information in the report. 1) We ask that SHBE be counted as a stakeholder in these discussions, 2) We ask that the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students, and 3) We ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators. Thank you.

To whom it may concern: I am wondering how it could possibly make any sense at all to "centralize" the school system in a province that covers such a vast area. With that comes differences in weather patterns (for bussing for instance) as well as people differences like areas with more reserves and others with less of them. Those areas are so diverse in needs and demands on the system that it makes me question the idea altogether. Is it because of cost savings? If so, how can a school area this large propose to cover the division with adequate services throughout the entire area? And if so, why has this school division not been established as such in the first place? Or could it have to do with politics? Does someone in some party believe that the numbers would look that much better at the end of a transition that it will be worthwhile the effort to "loose" a number of jobs of local people in rural areas? Just some thoughts. If people loose their jobs in a rural community they will eventually show up as a statistic in some unemployment record which does not really make anything better financially for society, only for whom ever is involved with those schools decisions. And since it is much harder to find employment in a rural setting than it is in a urban area I do not believe it to be a wise decision at all. All in all I do not think that an amalgamation is a good idea. Have a great day

Attention Mr. Don Morgan: As a graduate myself, and parents of children who have completed their K-12 schooling in Lloydminster and now have grandchildren embarking on the same, we are concerned that the Saskatchewan government is considering the amalgamation of the province's school boards. Lloydminster is a unique city with its bi-provincial status. Our local school board system has been very successful and effective for many, many years. Funding from Alberta could be compromised if Lloydminster is not allowed to retain its own locally managed school board. Our school division delivers many services equally to all students, no matter which province they reside. The Lloydminster Public School Division remains a viable, operative entity. As our system here works well within our bi-provincial position, to disrupt and change the delivery of services to our students does not seem like a solution. We are concerned that our tax dollars for education will not be used solely for the children of Lloydminster. Mr. Morgan, we would suggest that Lloydminster be left out of the Saskatchewan provincial school board amalgamation. Respectfully submitted

I have lived through 3 amalgamations of school districts, during the final amalgamation, with distance from our school to the school board division office increased time and time again we were finally closed. I live in a rural area which has started to thrive again. I live in an area where young families are moving back home and having families and it is so sad to see there is no local school for all of these elementary children to attend, without an extended bus ride. I am not in favor of increasing the boundaries of school divisions creating even more distance between my school and our representative board. I believe that although in theory administration should become lower with decreased boards, time and time again it appears that the only sector that does increase is administration. The children are suppose to be the reason we are trying to do better but I feel the biggest disservice we give these children is the wasted time on a bus. Longer bus rides create tired and less attentive children during the school day and with increased boundaries seems to come increased bus times for rural children. Please take into consideration not only the children that attend school in Regina and Saskatoon but for all the rural children that are already paying for the price of changes to K-12 governance reviews of the past.

Although I think local input is important, I don't think that the current size of school divisions effectively facilitates this. I don't think that changing the structure will change this. -board members must be accountable for the budget and student performance. This is difficult to do under the current structure -funds must be used more efficiently than they are currently -the current system has huge potential for conflicts of interests -it isn't surprising that current board members don't want change, people resisting change is a common response -in the current election system, the majority of voters have little knowledge of the people running for director positions and from what I have seen, directors often don't have any special skills that make them more qualified for the position, just have an interest and the time to commit. -the current structure isn't well suited for negotiating salaries and performance for employees

Our family has been home-educating in the Prairie Spirit School Div. for 10 years. Our experience home-educating within this school division has been very positive; there is a sense of trust, relationship and positive support from our board members, local schools, and the Home-Based Education Program Facilitators we have worked with during the past 10 years. Therefore, we see the benefit and strength of a board of education that is elected by its local community. During our decade of home-education, we have been members of SHBE (Saskatchewan Home-Based Educators). To further support their voice on our behalf, we ask the following: 1) We ask that SHBE be counted as stakeholder in these discussions, 2) We ask that the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students, and 3) We ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators.

Honourable Don Morgan, Q. C. Mr. Doug Steele Minister Morgan and MLA Steele Full disclosure—as a teacher for most of the past 23 years in the province of Saskatchewan, I have experienced the financial ups and downs, the promise of the SchoolPlus model, the 2005/2006 school division amalgamation process, and the various curricular/assessment tweaks and changes that have occurred along the way. Throughout it all, I have held steadfast to two beliefs: 1. educating the students that parents send to school each day is the most important part of my role as a teacher within our society, and 2. that everyone involved in education, no matter their political beliefs, social or ethnic background, financial standing, or physical location (urban/rural), believes in providing all of the students within our province with the highest quality of education possible. When the concept of "Transformational Change" first came into the provincial lexicon last year, I—like many other teachers—was unsure as to what the term actually meant and how it would be actualized within education. That being said, I am aware of the financial stress that running an enormous and sparsely populated province like Saskatchewan entails. I get it, it costs a lot per student, per year, to educate our children and youth. I understand why Dan Perrins was hired to create his report. In reviewing the report, I can even wrap my head around the its purpose. As an Executive member of our local Teachers' Association, I have been given multiple opportunities to read, analyze, and discuss the Educational Governance Review over the past month. I have also received and reviewed the SSBA response to the report, the School Division response to the report, my local SCCs response to the report, and the STF response to the report. I was also involved in the CTA response to the report which will be forwarded by our association president to the provincial government. Through it all I have continued to work in my classroom with the students that I teach. I have continued to plan for my classes. I have continued to work with our EAs to enhance the programing for the students in our building who need our help the most. I have contacted parents to let them know how their children are doing in my classes. I have continued to help students before and after school with their studies. I have discussed programming with our curriculum coordinator. I have had a conversation with a local SCC rep over coffee. I have kept running my extra curr. programs. I have enlisted the help of our librarian and office manager. I have continued to put on lunch sales to raise money for our track/football field renovations. I have been doing my scheduled supervision. I have mentored younger staff members and have had my educational pedagogy invigorated by them. I have talked to our school councilors regarding the "non-academic" needs of our students. I have continued to create and mark assignments. I have went to staff meetings and sought advice from my in school administration. I have continued to lend our custodial staff a hand here and there. I have needed tech. support. I have went to a two-day CTA retreat where local CTA reps and a Sr. Admin. representative from the STF talked about all things transformational—from provincial bargaining and local bargaining to teacher time issues and the role of public education in society. This list isn't to elicit sympathy, to complain about my profession, or to seek a raise for all of the things I do. It is to showcase how one teacher alone cannot run our education system, but that it is the combined effort of everyone involved in education that gets the job done. I would ask that you consider the impact on students that any decision you make could have and that you keep teaching and learning at the heart of any decision you make regarding transformational change in education. Strong schools help our youth and make strong community bonds for the people of Saskatchewan. With that, I would encourage you, our elected leaders, to carefully consider how your decisions will impact the day-to-day lives of the students in our schools. Like I have already said, I get it that education costs money. I know that the economic environment in Saskatchewan is not what it once was—but—I also firmly believe that the government of Saskatchewan has the responsibility to ensure that the #1 priority of education within the province is that public funds will be made available to provide all of our students with the learning opportunities and supports that they need to be successful in life.

Dear Minister Morgan, I understand changes are being considered in our education system. I do not believe that amalgamated school divisions will be the best thing for students because a few administrators in a central location cannot possibly have the same sensitivity to the issues faced in local/rural schools as local administrators can. I would prefer that, if necessary, taxes were raised in order to preserve some local autonomy for our school division. Our local school division, Chinook, believes that the last forced amalgamation (by the NDP) 10 years ago set the division back at least five years. I fear that the advances the division has made as a leader in literacy and numeracy will be lost if they must once again focus all their attention on amalgamating. I also fear that students' access to timely special services like speech, language and occupational therapy will be negatively affected by an amalgamation. As a parent of a teacher, I am also concerned about how an amalgamation affects teachers with regard to class composition, professional development, workload, and hiring of support staff. Students are the backbone of the province and the future, and all our decisions must be in their best interest. I appreciate your consideration of this urgent matter,

I am opposed to the amalgamation of the school divisions

I believe the system is fine the way it is.

Dear Honrary Mr. Brad Wall, I understand changes are being considered in our education system. You, as Premier of our province understand the importance of a local voice and listening to our communities. I support the North East School Division in thier fight to keep Education in the hands of the Communities. I ask that that you stress this to your Colleagues in the legislature and keep our school boards locally elected and decisions close to our communities for the benefit of our Students. Sincerely,

I strongly feel that this would be another step to take away our opportunity to keep in touch with is happening in our schools. We have already gone through almagamations with our schools being closed and our students being bused further distances. I truly believe that it is of utmost importance to have a local say in our school boards in order to have a say in the goverence of our schools. I would ask that you reconsider any idea of almagamation in order to best serve our schools and our students!

K-12 Education Governance Review: Any changes to the governance structure of the education system in Saskatchewan have to serve the outcomes of the children in the system. My comments regarding the changes to the school board structure are informed by a belief that all the cost structures in the school system effect how much we are willing to spend directly on the education of students. I have seen larger class sizes, more split classes, and lack of basic resources impact the day to day operation of schools in Prairie Valley school division and the Regina school division. As an example, one specific issue we have seen is kids sharing text books. Many issues arose from this. There has been a gap in the education of parents and some teachers on why this happens, but in the end it is hard to see it other than as a cost saving measure. While the purpose is supposed to be collaboration in class, it still doesn't help when the whole class has homework. The students either don't have the text or they photocopy the sections. The kids are getting more technology resources, but the implementation and training for the teachers is usually behind and "on the job". This cuts into teaching and learning time. My belief is that cost cutting and efficiencies at the governance level seldom, if ever, filter back to the operation of the schools. Recent centralization of purchasing and some infrastructure services have started to help with efficiencies. These savings will depend on adoption and will take time to help the cost structure. I think the main debate around governance should be about control over the priorities in each school. The governance must serve the needs of the individual communities. Even though I expect that any one person can empathize with someone on the opposite side of the province, unless you live there for a significant amount of time, you can't understand the exact need. Fewer divisions and less board members may seem to be more efficient, but it's hard to imagine them handling the whole province. While I believe that if we had a more centralized organization, you might get more professional expert educators in the governance system, you also might get political appointees, with alternate agendas. I feel most communities would be more comfortable with boards elected with local people, even if they don't have education backgrounds. The "Educational Governance Review" pointed many of the pros and cons of four potential options. The single central option (Option 1), a "regional" option (Option 2), and two boundary realignment options (Options 3a and 3b). The boundary realignment options are really the "do nothing" option. Realignment should be a normal procedure, undertaken as necessary. If there is no policy or procedure to allow for necessary realignment today, that is a change that should be made no matter what changes are proposed. The information in the "Review" did point out the opposition from many groups and had a lot of challenges stated with regards to the Single Centralized governance option (Option 1). I think that Option 1 is removing too much local governance and frankly letting the local administrators and school community councils off the hook for strategic thinking. It would be too easy for the local organization to say the strategy comes from "The Province". I won't go as far as to say I don't accept any amalgamation. It might be the right thing to do in some areas. Done right, the Regional option (Option 2) may be the right thing to do. But, from looking across the country, we seem to have a good size of governance structure, given our size and population. These changes would be small from a budget perspective, and I would expect any saving to go back in to the education system to help the teachers and student. In summary, I would expect any governance changes to be guided by the strategies laid out in the Governance Review and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). I think the operational portion of the budgets cannot be sacrificed to cost savings, even in hard financial times in the province. Education is an area that we should spend more, not less. I even think we could spend a higher year over year percentage. But, we need to make sure it's spent efficiently and with the students outcomes in mind. Thank you,

arent - Prairie Valley School Division

My name is _____, we have lived here 8 years and we are happy that we have a school in _____ as well as a fully operational daycare. I personally am NOT IN FAVOUR of any new changes. let's keep the model that Saskatchewan has been utilizing. Electing local boards is a huge benefit to the school, community and the local councils. Thank you for listening to my opinion.

We have moved to the prairie spirit school division specifically for the small town moral and values that we found in this school system. I am upset to hear the possibility of combining school boards with those of the city thus putting our small town school under the same umbrella as the large city schools. I have a lot of question regarding this possible change. I would appreciate being informed of this matter through the school as it plays out. I feel that as a parent of one student in the school system with 2 more to be entering the school system; we should have found out about this through the school. Will we be receiving future updates? Are there meetings we can attend to voice our concern? Will we get a say in the outcome? This has the potential to impact our kids very negatively and would appreciate the chance to be involved in this process.

As an employee of a school division working as a substitute EA, I firmly believe that amalgamating into one provincial school division and having appointed officials will be detrimental to the youth that attend our schools. There is no possible way that an appointed board that functions out of a city will be able to assist a school within a rural setting. Elected officials within the rural communities see and understand what is required. Electing officials allows for the best representative for each school division. Classrooms are already to large for our students to benefit properly from the education they receive. The support in classrooms is so minimal and harmful to the students. So many more students require assistance than what is actually receiving assistance. Today's youth in our education system is severely in trouble and are not receiving the care and education they deserve.

I am happy with the operation of our school division (Prairie Valley) – it is large enough that all kids have access to a wide range of educational and extra-curricular opportunities, but small enough that teachers and administrators know individual children. The size of the division is also large enough to assess individual student needs outside of the core curriculum, and provide specialized services as needed (ie. speech therapy, student companions, etc) - while these specialists are not available in every school every day, they are accessible and I have not heard of any unreasonable delays in receiving services. Given our experience in this division, I submit that a public school division with approximately 40 schools in it (which is the case for most divisions) appears to be in the “sweet spot” of service delivery – large enough to afford specialists, curriculum options, larger capital investments, but small enough for the senior leadership team to remain connected to the specific needs of each area/school. I believe that should the divisions get any larger than the 40 school range, decisions may be made with a heavier weight on metrics, statistics or policy, rather than on a core understanding of each school, its community and unique needs (the farther away leadership is from the students, there is an increased risk of disconnection). With respect to the “sweet spot”, there are 8 public school divisions who are well below the ~ 40 school complement. I suggest that these divisions be reviewed first, to see if amalgamations in some combination would be appropriate. There may be some significant increases to services (experienced by other divisions in previous amalgamations) that would benefit students in these areas. I do not support any changes to those school divisions who have approximately 40 schools (including Prairie Valley). I am opposed to any action plan that would see any divisions amalgamated with either the Regina or Saskatoon divisions. While the issues facing kids may be the same in all communities (ie. poverty, drugs/alcohol, etc), I think the way these issues show up, the causes and possible solutions may be significantly different in urban and rural settings. There is a perception that city schools would receive preferential amounts of resources over the rural schools, should they be joined together. With respect to Board governance, I am not concerned about where the board members live – as our division is quite large in size, not every community has a local person on the board. I trust that everyone in a board position acts in the best interest of all students in the division. I was surprised that remuneration, on average, is double or triple of that paid in health regions, especially given that the roles are similar in time commitment and public accountability. I think that board members invest significant hours into their role, and as such, I am in favour of remuneration. However, it seems that a rationalization of the amounts paid is necessary, especially in a time where funding for core operations is strained. Finally, I believe that effective boards have diversity of thought and a range of skills and abilities in order to make the best decisions. It is difficult to create diversity through an election process, unless there were more specific criteria that must be met to qualify as a candidate.

As a home based educating family in Saskatchewan, represented by SHBE (Saskatchewan Home Based Educators) and HSLDA (Home School Legal Defence Association) Canada, we hereby request the government to remember that parents have the foremost right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children. We choose to personally educate our children because we simply decline to delegate that right, responsibility and joy to anyone else. Therefore...
1) We ask that SHBE be counted as stakeholder in these discussions, 2) We ask that the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students, and 3) We ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators. Thank you

Power is a funny thing, and with politics, power is everything. The driving force that defines power is always money; who has it, and who gets to spend it. And the best thing about power, is control. With education being a publicly funded enterprise in the province of Saskatchewan, and across the country, it is clear that it is a huge expense. With the economy faltering, it is an obvious decision to try to make the largest expense to the province more efficient. So when you look at the issue of “transformational change” from a government perspective, it seems like a no brainer - make the changes needed to balance the books. So with that, the idea of making one enormous public school division to attempt to eliminate the bureaucracy education seems to have would be a reasonable option. Also, eliminating elected school boards and being able to appoint like-minded government officials as the new board would be another cost-cutting efficiency that could be made. From a government perspective, this would be ideal; save money, and most importantly of all, have all of the power to spend money as they see fit (especially since they are the experts when it comes to finances). Unfortunately, as the government should know, life isn't fair. You don't always get what you want. As one gets older, more mature, and more worldly, they tend to realize the world does not revolve around them. They start to realize that sometimes what they personally want isn't always the best thing for everyone else. People learn to be selfless and learn to compromise. And that's what I expect from my government - for a group of professionals (in their own areas of expertise which is not education) to come to realize that transformational change is not the best thing for education in Saskatchewan. There are many concerns that I have as a person who experienced the first major amalgamation in 2006 as a student in a rural town, and now as a teacher in a rural town. First, the number of years it takes a system to get “settled in” and really become more efficient takes many years. Throughout those transforming years, there are many expenses that do not positively affect the students because the money is spent to restructure the entire system. With this change, it is apparent that the government does care about the students and wants to ensure the quality of education stays the same, or even gets better, however, the expense of any changes made in the next 5 years might benefit students 10 years down the road and only harm students of today. So why not take advantage of the school divisions created over 10 years ago after the major amalgamation and continue with the system that is in place? Secondly, as we know, Saskatchewan is a large province that is diverse in its economy, resources, and culture. We are not one small homogenized province. Implementing one division would not give regional representation and focus on needs of that region as multiple divisions and elected boards do. The people of that area are the best voices and have the best knowledge of the needs of the region. As a ratepayer, I have much more trust in an elected board member who lives close to my town rather than an appointed government official who is trying to understand the needs of my region. My elected board members of the North East School division are smart, caring, compassionate, and educated experts of my school division. As a board, they know what the needs are of the north east and know exactly how the money should be allocated. For the government to even suggest that an appointed board is an option shows the distrust they have for the people in their province. Distrust that the board can't make sound fiscal decisions, and distrust that ratepayers cannot make a sound decision with the board electees they chose to represent them to make the best decisions for the youth and their education - which is the root of democracy. Showing distrust to the people of Saskatchewan may result in distrust from the people towards their government. Just remember, the Sask Party is highly supported by people of rural Saskatchewan and the government needs to recognize that. Do not take away the rural voice, especially when it comes to the education of their youth. Once again, power is a funny thing. Try too hard to attain it (with centrally appointed boards) and one may not be in power for much longer. This “transformational change” thing might not just be for education, but for the people in charge of our government as well. Sincerely,

I am a _____ who has worked in the Lloydminster Public School Division since 1990. I have always been very proud of the specialized services students in our school division receive, regardless which side of the border they reside. In fact, due to the Lloydminster Charter, all children in the Lloydminster Public School Division are eligible to receive equal services such as transportation, pre-kindergarten, speech-language pathology, occupational therapy, counseling, etc. If LPSD was to be amalgamated with other school divisions I cannot see how students on each side of the border would be able to receive equal services as Alberta funding needs to stay within the city of Lloydminster. I feel very strongly that amalgamation would be very disruptive to the students in LPSD. Challenges identified in the Educational Governance Review should be able to be met effectively through amendments to regulations, policy and legislation. If this was done, elected boards could continue to work under the new regulations and expectations rather than going to appointed boards. I feel strongly that Lloydminster is a unique situation that needs to be taken into consideration- we are very different than any other school division in Saskatchewan and the ramifications of amalgamation will affect our students to a far greater degree. Sincerely,

The governance of education must remain the way that it is for the Lloydminster Public School Division. The uniqueness and complexity of governing education in the LPSD has operated seamlessly for the delivery of a high quality education for all students regardless of their province of residence for the past 84 years. It works extremely well. Having a public education system governed any other way or as per any option as outlined in Dan Perrins' report, with a separate school division operating in its own way as it always has, would make for a very unfair and divided system of delivery of education. Education in Lloydminster would very much become a system of "the haves" and "the have nots" despite the very best of efforts of those on the front line in educating children. Public education would follow the mandate of a very distant and, potentially appointed, board of education, likely unapproachable due to geographical distance, and the separate school division, within the same city, would have its elected members actually live, work and be neighbours of the students it educates. Furthermore, the funding that the LPSD receives from the Government of Alberta and from the Government of Saskatchewan is used to equally benefit all students no matter which side of the border they live in. I can't imagine that the government of Alberta will want that to continue under a differing governing model with its neighbour to the east solely making the decisions. Less funding equals less opportunities. There again, it is the students and families of Lloydminster that would lose. There must be another way to meet the challenges as identified in the Educational Governance Review Report without disrupting the education of Lloydminster students and our unique and complex situation.

K-12 Education Governance Review Advisory Panel, After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report I would like to express my concerns with the options provided in the Educational Governance Review Report: Public education has the opportunity to create equal opportunities for all children regardless of religious beliefs, socio-economic status and varied home environments that are affected by abuse, addiction, poverty and illness but proposing changes to the structure of the public system yet not the separate system will create great inequities in our schools. I believe that all children should have equal opportunities and having public and separate education with separate funding does not support equality in education. Having any of these proposed models will not only affect how teachers are able to best deliver their course loads, but I question if the already limited access to current School Division Support Teams will further diminish (Support Team meaning: Occupational Therapists, Speech and Language Pathologists, Social Workers) I do not support any of the three models presented in the report. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support that change to governance or further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. The document options clearly acknowledge that changes to the current system may compromise student outcomes, reduce accountability, reduce community communication and access to decision makers, put more work on SCC's and disrupt our schools. The negatives far out way the positives. I do support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). I also support finding cost saving systems, strengthening our educational outcomes and standardizing expectation for of our Boards, but cannot support wide sweeping changes as proposed in the document. Could the current local structure not be maintained while centralizing the purchase of large items such as paper, IT equipment, copier machines and consolidating transportation? Although I understand budgetary restrictions, a lower teacher/student ratio is crucial for success of all students with regards to academic achievement and socio-emotional well-being. None of the three proposed plans support this fact. It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! I do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. I fear loss of our local voice will negatively impact our students experience and performance may suffer as a result. When elected officials (i.e. Sask Party) suggest that a current elected position (School Board) be appointed then it appears there is a reason for less transparency and public involvement. This leads to me to believe that the interests of all students are not at the forefront but that of the political party currently in power. How can someone hold a position that was gained through a democratic vote by the public and suggest that appointed positions would be an acceptable change in a democratic society? Nearby schools are at maximum capacity and there are great concerns for distance, safety, and time spent on buses for rural children.

Keep local representatives on or school boards. Rural divisions such as mine have needs that are unique and need to be represented as such. It's important to have our students educational needs, particularly in our smaller schools, viewed through the lens of our community and not lumped in with the needs of urban areas. Local representative who are elected based on merit and not appointed, based on political affiliation, help maintain accountability and connection with the community. Thank you.

We feel representation of our rural schools at the local level is very Important for the administration of programming, finance, staffing Numbers. What accountability is there when setting up budgets for Ten to fifteen thousand students verses 500 with an elected local board.

I believe locally elected trustees and school boards are the best choice for my community and current school division. * Local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities. * The previous consolidation held back education for at least five years and cost money rather than saving money. * This would be the second time that forced amalgamation excluded separate school boards. * I see no benefit in moving the boards farther away from the communities. * We must all work together to maintain our local school boards who support the complex and diverse needs of our schools, and most importantly, the needs of our students.

Power is a funny thing, and with politics, power is everything. The driving force that defines power is always money; who has it, and who gets to spend it. And the best thing about power, is control. With education being a publicly funded enterprise in the province of Saskatchewan, and across the country, it is clear that it is a huge expense. With the economy faltering, it is an obvious decision to try to make the largest expense to the province more efficient. So when you look at the issue of “transformational change” from a government perspective, it seems like a no brainer - make the changes needed to balance the books. So with that, the idea of making one enormous public school division to attempt to eliminate the bureaucracy education seems to have would be a reasonable option. Also, eliminating elected school boards and being able to appoint like-minded government officials as the new board would be another cost-cutting efficiency that could be made. From a government perspective, this would be ideal; save money, and most importantly of all, have all of the power to spend money as they see fit (especially since they are the experts when it comes to finances). Unfortunately, as the government should know, life isn't fair. You don't always get what you want. As one gets older, more mature, and more worldly, they tend to realize the world does not revolve around them. They start to realize that sometimes what they personally want isn't always the best thing for everyone else. People learn to be selfless and learn to compromise. And that's what I expect from my government - for a group of professionals (in their own areas of expertise which is not education) to come to realize that transformational change is not the best thing for education in Saskatchewan. There are many concerns that I have as a person who experienced the first major amalgamation in 2006 as a student in a rural town, and now as a teacher in a rural town. First, the number of years it takes a system to get “settled in” and really become more efficient takes many years. Throughout those transforming years, there are many expenses that do not positively affect the students because the money is spent to restructure the entire system. With this change, it is apparent that the government does care about the students and wants to ensure the quality of education stays the same, or even gets better, however, the expense of any changes made in the next 5 years might benefit students 10 years down the road and only harm students of today. So why not take advantage of the school divisions created over 10 years ago after the major amalgamation and continue with the system that is in place? Secondly, as we know, Saskatchewan is a large province that is diverse in its economy, resources, and culture. We are not one small homogenized province. Implementing one division would not give regional representation and focus on needs of that region as multiple divisions and elected boards do. The people of that area are the best voices and have the best knowledge of the needs of the region. As a ratepayer, I have much more trust in an elected board member who lives close to my town rather than an appointed government official who is trying to understand the needs of my region. My elected board members of the North East School division are smart, caring, compassionate, and educated experts of my school division. As a board, they know what the needs are of the north east and know exactly how the money should be allocated. For the government to even suggest that an appointed board is an option shows the distrust they have for the people in their province. Distrust that the board can't make sound fiscal decisions, and distrust that ratepayers cannot make a sound decision with the board electees they chose to represent them to make the best decisions for the youth and their education - which is the root of democracy. Showing distrust to the people of Saskatchewan may result in distrust from the people towards their government. Just remember, the Sask Party is highly supported by people of rural Saskatchewan and the government needs to recognize that. Do not take away the rural voice, especially when it comes to the education of their youth. Once again, power is a funny thing. Try too hard to attain it (with centrally appointed boards) and one may not be in power for much longer. This “transformational change” thing might not just be for education, but for the people in charge of our government as well.

I do not support any of the three models presented in the report. I do support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan plan for growth, and the education sector strategic plan (ESSP) It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school community. I do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support that change to governance or further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings in the province We have a deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold.

PLEASE KEEP OUR LOCAL ELECTED BOARDS BECAUSE THEY ARE ACCOUNTABLE TO THE ELECTORATE AND THEY HOLD THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT TO ACCOUNT. TO BETTER SERVE THE NEEDS OF THE STUDENTS.

In looking over the report on potential changes to the education governance in Saskatchewan, I noted that home-based educators are not mentioned or included in any of the discussion. Home education is a right set out in the Education Act of 1995. There are more than 2000 students in Saskatchewan registered as a home education student. This is more students than are registered in some of the public school boards in the province and more students than are registered in most of the separate school boards. As such, I feel that home educators should have a voice in the decisions being made about education policies, particularly as it affects Home Based Education students. Whatever education governance model the province decides on going forward, Home School groups like SHBE (Saskatchewan Home Based Educators) and HSLDA (Home School Legal Defence Association) should be consulted and involved in how funding and registration is provided for Home Based Education Students. My family will be moving to Moose Jaw soon and when I inquired about registering for home education there I was told that I could receive \$200 for one of my home education students. In Regina, where I live now, I receive more than \$800 for each of my students. I have been told that school divisions receive the same amount of money for each registered home school student. However, even if that is not completely accurate, I would like to know why it is so different. I would like to see transparency and accountability for that money as well as the governance in general.

Please see our attached signed letter as parents of four (4) children who have been through the Prince Albert Catholic School Division system

We couldn't have asked or planned for a better primary, middle years and secondary education for our children to have achieved academic, emotional and spiritual success through their school years in the Prince Albert Catholic School Division. Their positive graduation success was directly impacted from a smaller and local school division, who had the ability of a hands-on approach to each student's success through their years of school.

We seriously contemplated moving to Saskatoon for more employment opportunities but in the end, the quality of education our children had and were receiving along with their positive relationships in the schools made our decision to stay in the community of Prince Albert with the Prince Albert Catholic School Division. We strongly encourage this government to NOT make one giant school board or merge too many of them together for Saskatchewan...what a mistake that will be to the children and teachers on the front lines!:(With this model we would have so many small schools, cities or towns that are not in a bigger city like Saskatoon or Regina who would be lost in the big picture. We cannot allow this to happen to children with the possibility of many of them to be lost in too big of a school division to address their needs for them to achieve their individual success and receive the quality education they so deserve! Too big of a school division can and will also impact the value of educational support that is needed for our teachers to administer quality education to our children. Teachers are responsible for making all of us who we are. Teachers make all other professions possible: Doctor, Artist, Nurse, Prime Minister / President, Firefighter, Engineer, Police Officer, etc. Sincerely,

I would not want to have appointed Board members/trustees. Please keep elected Board members/trustees. A reduction in the number of Board members/trustees would be fine, but greater voice be given to the School Community Councils and ensure regular meetings between trustees and the School Community Councils in their School Division. I would only recommend option 3 A or B, but no less than 14 school divisions in the restructuring. Maybe the large urban school divisions such as Saskatoon and Regina could be split - half or quarters and connected with outlying rural divisions with the Board Office located in a rural town rather than the large centers therefore ensuring rural/remote community needs and voice is not ignored and equity in educational services for all students in the province. Former Teacher and presently SCC Vice Chair

Dear Minister Morgan: As a parent, property tax payer and supporter of your government. I would like to express my deep concern over the time frame and potential elimination of our elected school boards. I feel the division structure works very well as it is and a change would result in poor communication with the parents, SCC and schools in general. If a change is desire it can be done within the existing structure. I look forward to continuing supporting your government but a rethought here is needed. I strongly disagree with changing our School Divisions! With our large amount of Rural students, I do not see how only 1 Division would be to their benefit. This plan has to be re-visited and maybe dealt with in a more timely manner, instead of being rushed through. Thank you,

Honorable Don Morgan, Q.C. Honorable Brad Wall Dear members of Governance Review: I write to you today as both a teacher, and a parent. I am a third generation educator, the daughter and grand-daughter of school administrators who have worked their entire lives to help children and youth reach their full academic, social, and emotional potential. Their passion and commitment to the students in their care moved me to obtain my own Bachelor of Education degree, so that I could continue their legacy of supporting, inspiring, and educating. Now, as a parent, I hope with all my heart that each of the schools, administrators, and teachers whom my children come in contact with will work to support, inspire, and teach them in the same way. As you consider the Educational Governance Review Report, I fear that the move towards amalgamated school boards will silence the voices of local families and communities. Locally elected boards are directly responsible to the families in their divisions, and best understand the unique and diverse needs of the unique and diverse communities in which they live. As a teacher, I have seen firsthand the devastating effect on student growth and learning that results from increased teacher workloads, increased class sizes, and decreased access to support services; As a parent, I must advocate for my children's right to receive the best possible education, which includes a teacher who is able to focus on supporting, educating, and inspiring students, rather than on administrative and generalized assessment tasks; a reasonable class size to allow for individualized support, learning plans, and assessments; and timely access to support services (speech pathology, educational psychologists, etc.). The lack of a locally elected school board will effectively silence my voice and others like it - the voices of the very people the school board is meant to represent. Thank you for inviting the public to be part of this conversation, as the changes you make have the potential to drastically affect the future of our children's lives and education, and thus the future of this province. Sincerely,

I am deeply concerned about the apparent lack of value the government seems to be demonstrating towards the future of education in Saskatchewan. The services that we are able to provide for our students will not happen in a timely manner if we amalgamate school divisions. Lloydminster, in particular, has its own set of needs that will not be met, and ALL of our students, regardless of where they live, will be impacted by any amalgamation. Lloydminster needs to remain in its current state in order to maintain equitable funding and services for each student and navigate the challenges of a border city. If these changes are about the government regaining power, then perhaps they need to get creative in their solutions, rather than threaten the students, parents and educators in this province. Also, it would be a massive disservice to democracy if boards were deemed to be appointed rather than elected. Elected boards have a vested interest in their community, and understand their school divisions unique needs. Appointed boards become nothing but the governments "yes men", serving to simply rubber stamp what the government decides. That is a frightening road to embark on. I pray we are better than that.

I very strongly disagree with the "thought" of amalgamating school divisions across the province. I think it's very unfair for us, the public, to only have 3 weeks' notice to make a life changing decision for our children's future. We need more information as to what this means for the future. What are the pros and cons for my children's school? As a parent of a small town school student, I fear what these changes will do to the future of not only the school but the town. Is our little school safe? Will it get shut down? Can these questions be answer? Again, I do not agree with this. Sincerely,

The school divisions have undergone massive cuts in recent years. Most have completely drained their reserve funds in order to cover budgetary operating expenses. Reserve funds should not be used to cover budget expenses. In addition, almost all EA's have been cut. This has had another effect in that not only are students with educational challenges having to share resources, and may find it harder to keep up, but some of the extra special programmes that students look forward to are being cut. For example, the annual drama which primarily features grade 8 students, is cut and the annual camping trip for the grades 7-8 classes has been cut from our school. My daughter is intensely disappointed in losing the opportunity to be involved in these things. There are not enough resources to cover classes so that the teachers that would normally participate in these activities can do so. The last straw was the teachers salary announcement last year. It was absolutely unconscionable, and unacceptable for the government to negotiate a contract with the teachers then tell the school divisions that they wouldn't provide the full amount of the required budget to the school boards. Education needs to be a priority. We need new schools for all the population growth the government has encouraged, but if we aren't going to staff them properly then this becomes second rate education. If we keep asking our teachers to do more with less they will burn out and leave for better environments. We need to keep our top notch staff here.

Please do not algamate school boards. We have been very happy with Father Robinson school. We moved to Saskatoon 4 years ago and we first chose Father Robinson because of the positive comments. We then bought our home in the neighbourhood. Kind regards,

As both a parent of a rural Saskatchewan student and as a member of a Saskatchewan community, I am deeply concerned about the 3 options put forth in Mr. Dan Perrin's Educational Governance Review Report and do not support any of them. First and foremost, the lack of forethought to impacts on all Saskatchewan students is a grossly ignorant and glaringly absent from the report. The idea of removing elected board members and replacing them with appointed board members, removes our right as Saskatchewan residents to have a direct voice about education. Those board members are elected in the same way our government is elected. Why should we, the people not be allowed to be represented in education through these elected members? The publicly elected board member for my children's schools, attend our School Community Council meetings, are available and open to discussions with anyone within our area. Appointed board members are not accountable to the people of Saskatchewan. They are instead, most likely already internal government employees being moved into positions by government and not the people of Saskatchewan. Provincially appointed board members will not be as accessible, nor will they know their communities' needs. They will not be at the schools; they will be in their offices. It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! Currently under the direction of the Prairie Valley School Division, we celebrate some of the highest performance scores in Reading and Math as well as extraordinary High School graduation rates. What guarantee is there that these standards of excellence will be maintained through provincial amalgamations? There isn't any guarantee. All forced amalgamations will be extremely costly to students, teachers, administrators, families and communities. The last forced amalgamations is 2006 saw students, teacher and administrators at a loss for several years while they tried to make things work. The cost and burden is directly put on students! The youth of Saskatchewan should not bear the brunt of the financial situation the province is in! There is no budgetary evidence in the report, to support the governance change or how further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. Changes as large as described in the report, will have large administration costs. How is that not thought of? Was there any investigation into the costs of the last amalgamation? If anything is gained, it will be a very small drop in the bucket to the overall debt situation. I am deeply concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold. Rural communities thrive, grow, and revolve around their schools. Closing schools will "close" small town Saskatchewan. A government for the rural people of Saskatchewan have given little to no thought of the impact to rural Saskatchewan. My community and I have great concerns for distance, safety, and time spent on buses for rural children caused by closures. We need a permanent high school plan to accommodate the best interests of our students, their families, and our community, as well as a permanent high school transportation plan. We would rather our students be part of a smaller school, than being in overcrowded classrooms in larger centers. This is one of the reasons people choose to reside in rural areas. Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in. In Mr. Perrin's report the opening letter to Minister Morgan states that ALL stakeholders who approached Mr. Perrin for conversation UNANIMOUSLY support elected boards and NO more amalgamations! WHY would we continue with pursuing drastic changes? Regards

I think that there should only be one large school division. These boards are sometimes biased towards whomever the elected town officials are, and are sometimes a waste of money. Many times if you attend the meetings it goes on and on with nothing of real value being said. It would seem more efficient if one school board could handle the essentials. Many kids don't care if they do well in math and reading because there is very little incentive to do well, unless the parents individually spend extra time and money on tutoring programs, such as Kumon. We attended the Luther High School open house and the representatives said that most foreign students are as much as 5-7 years ahead of our school system, and that grade nine students needed extra tutoring just to catch up with the basics. Many small schools, especially in the inner city, are getting left behind because they have very little support. Those kids in many cases don't even get to have outdoor recess due to gang activity. Whereas, the richer areas are debating where to put the huge electric sign that runs 24-7 telling you which direction to drive through the parking lot, and what type of special programming they are organizing. If there was one school board maybe they could assess the overall health of the education system from region to region and spread out the resources so that every student had a fair chance at getting a good education. There is a lot of people wasting money within the administration areas, just like in healthcare in this province. Unfortunately, the first area to cut always seems to be the first line people, where maybe the administration should be the first area to be reduced. Many large international companies don't need the massive staff that govt. uses to run both healthcare and education. You don't need an excess of bureaucracy to get things accomplished - it only gets in the way of real decision making and the saving of money. Administration may be a great area to reduce if the govt. is seriously looking for some easy money to save. People that write in saying that they need to have their own school divisions, are more than likely, usually getting something extra that they know their neighbors are not getting.

It has taken the better part of a decade for schools and communities to overcome the challenges of the 2006 amalgamation. In the time since that, we have seen over 175 school closures and numerous funding decreases to education province wide. Further amalgamation could potentially cause more hardships and stresses on our communities, schools and children. We need to keep the decision making as close to the communities as possible, as the needs from each school and division vary so greatly from one another. It would be extremely difficult to provide equity to all of the different schools and communities within our province if the government were to move to a one or even four division model. What concerns me most about the potential changes to education governance however, is the proposed appointed school board representatives as opposed to elected trustees. We need our local representatives. They can not be replaced by officials who do not fully know and understand the makeup and diverse needs of each school and community. Taking away elected representatives will make communication between school communities and representatives extremely difficult. I sincerely hope the government is not considering this "taxation without representation " proposal, as I believe local representation is imperative to the successes of all school communities.

I am greatly concerned what will happen to our education system, if we go to 1 school division and government appointed individual's to run the education system. there are many reasons for my concern 1) will these appointed government officials have a background in Education? Will they understand what needs to happen in a classroom? Will they understand that what is good for city schools is not good for rural school, and all rural schools are not the same. 2) Schools in are an important part of the community, and that comes with an elected official from that community, Someone who is in the area, sees and knows what is going on in the community. Someone that is in a large centre has no idea what goes in our school. Will said person come to each community to see and participate in school events? that would be come costly on tax payers dollars, for a lot of unnecessary travel 3) Our class rooms are already over crowded and those that need help do not get it. The government has already cut much needed funds to education, and I don't believe they understand what is going in schools all over the province. Please reconsider your idea of one school division province wide. It not a good idea for students today or of the future thank you The _____

To whom it may concern; I want to thank you for this opportunity to share what it means to me to have local leadership setting the direction for Good Spirit School Division (GSSD). As a _____ with the GSSD, I have come to appreciate the direction of our local school board along with the guidance of our leadership team. In my role as _____ work with students and families who encounter various struggles that may impact student learning, and their overall well-being. The board and leadership team see the benefit of having the support of individuals like myself in coming along side families and children to ensure they reach their full potential. If it were not for the insight to the needs of our local community, I am concerned that in many cases, students would not receive the immediate support, or intervention that can make a difference in their lives. By moving forward in eliminating the local voice, I fear we will lose sight of the individual needs of families and children. For this reason, I ask that consideration be given to support local leadership, who will in turn carry out a plan that supports the emotional and overall well-being of our students with in GSSD. Sincerely, _____

I am disturbed by the direction the government of our province appears to be heading with regard to education. Although my own children are grown and no longer in need of schooling, I feel the quality of education my grandchildren will continue to receive will be greatly affected should the proposed changes take effect. Between my children and my grandchildren I have had experience with the public, Catholic, and French Immersion schools in my area and I have also homeschooled two of my children. I have greatly appreciated the level of education given to each of my children and grandchildren and the personalized care they received from school boards and teachers who understood both the children, their environment, and the city we live in. Amalgamations would seriously disrupt the continuity of the education system as teachers and school divisions would again have to struggle to find their role. Centralization of services in a small province or area may work but Saskatchewan is a large land mass with diverse student needs. The educational needs of our children would therefore be determined by the largest cities if amalgamation were to occur. We need both our school divisions and our locally elected school boards in order to ensure the quality education we have come to expect. In my mind, amalgamation would be fiscally irresponsible and a step backward. Please do not play political games with our children and grandchildren.

At this time I am not finding the options outlined in the report to be favourable for our province. Why? How is the well-being and quality of education going to be affected? I like knowing that my children's school board have an invested interest in all the children growing up in our community. We are in a smaller community and our school board members are visible members of our community that I feel comfortable approaching with concerns. I feel this report does not have students best interests at heart but rather is an attempt to try and save money. My children's education is important, find another way to save money!

Thank you for giving us this opportunity to share our concerns with the governance review. In your remarks you state that the Advisory Panel will engage with stakeholder organizations in face-to-face meetings. As there are more than 2,000 home educated students in Saskatchewan it is crucial that they be included in the discussions on any changes to governance. Many of these students and their parent educators are members of Saskatchewan Home Based Educators (SHBE). Because of this SHBE needs to be counted as a stakeholder and meet with the panel. The Department of Education provides funding to school divisions for home educated students that greatly exceeds the \$300 provided to parents. (Although we have calculated this amount based on the provincial funding formula but do not have access to the calculation at this time and are unable to recall the exact amount but believe it to be in the range of \$4,000). We recognize that the division does have costs related to their supervisory role and providing access to educational programs such as driver education. However, these costs do not come close to the amount being retained by the school divisions. It is unfair that the school divisions are using funds provided by the Province for home educated students to educate other students. It is unfair that home based educators have no input into this decision. As the governance model is changed it is necessary that home based educators are included in the model. They need to have direct input into the supervisory roles and other education programs provided by the divisions. We look forward to your recommendation.

I am a _____ with Regina Public Schools, an employee for several years here in Regina. I am very thankful for my union and our collective agreement. I am very concerned about the recommendations/options that have been put together and such a rushed fashion. I don't see how these options and I quote..." Will focus on student success while ensuring accountability and efficient operational structures within the education system". The government gave Dan Perrins three weeks to study the amalgamations/restructuring and write his report. Why did Mr. Perrins recommend reduced school divisions and appointed trustees? There has been no meaningful public consultation, and a change of this scale has the potential for many errors. Why is the government rushing this? There's no evidence or report that states amalgamated/re-structured school boards and government appointed trustee's and CEO, will save money. It will only guarantee that the parents, workers and communities have no voice. Please stop this! The public feedback supports our existing school division boundaries and keeping our democratic process of elected school boards. Why would the government want to change this? Why was this not brought up during the elections? I love my job working with students and they are my priority every day when I go to work. Why did the report not reference how this change will impact the students and their learning? Students are not a priority in this report! This is a business model, with government appointed school boards, Communication and feedback to and from parents/communities will be negatively impacted. I love my democratic right to elect a school board trustee who will be accountable and represent my community. Elected school board trustees have a vested interest in my community, not the governments mandate. How fast can major decisions, such as school safety issues, be made if there's no local contact or voice? I am asking that you hear the deep concern in our public voices... Local democratically elected school boards are the best choice for my community. Local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities. Sincerely,

I am strongly against are new proposed ideas and am prepared to do what it takes to stop this.

I am writing regarding the proposed changes suggested in the Education Governance Review Report. I am concerned about the possible amalgamation of rural and urban education governance. Rural and urban settings have very different needs and because urban settings have more people their needs risk over-powering the needs of rural communities. Small schools are important to rural life and should be supported and valued. Some things matter more than numbers. I value having elected school board members. These people are local and best understand the issues and concerns that are important to us and are accountable to the community they serve. I believe a transition to appointed board members will have a negative impact on our school and community. I do not believe that amalgamations are the answer to the financial challenges facing the government. Any change in governance will be disruptive and time-consuming for staff and communities. That time is better focused on the needs of students and families and our communities. I encourage you to thoughtfully and slowly examine all sides of this issue before moving ahead with a decision.

As a former teacher when I read your call for input from teachers, administrators and parents I was concerned with the fact that you would not offer people the opportunity to provide input anonymously. Having been in the position of being offered the opportunity for input from an employer I know that it is very difficult to offer meaningful or honest opinions when you are asked to put your name on it. I question if you really will receive valuable opinions this way. It is also my opinion that if you create larger governance jurisdictions for school boards that you may be encouraging more parents to home school to have the input they desire for their child's education. Respectfully submitted, A ratepayer

I am writing to you in regards to the proposed changes in the education sector... I am not in favour of any of the proposed changes and wish to see that the education system remain as it is with the current number of school boards and their locally elected officials. I feel that our voice is being heard with our current school board model, and we are able to access the necessary services in a timely fashion. If changes occur, I fear that we will not only lose services but also our school, as we are from a small community just outside Regina. Losing our school will have a detrimental cost to our town, decreasing property values, as well as the businesses in the area will be in jeopardy of survival. This will have a significant ripple effect. I do not see how increasing the size of a school board region is going to make changes in the cost effective.. The cost to access services will only increase, let alone the amount of time it will take to do so... therefore putting student needs at risk of not being met. In closing I would like to restate, that I am NOT in favour of any of the proposed changes for the education sector. Sincerely, Longstanding member of the community and a teacher in the education system.

I wish to submit my feedback on the Educational Governance Review Report. As a parent, my utmost priority is ensuring student success is not compromised at the expense of any perceived efficiencies gained within operational structures. After reviewing Perrins' report, it is my belief that significant changes to the school board structure would not positively impact the funds that are spent on the education of students. The current school division model utilizes elected officials to serve on boards of directors. As these directors are locally elected, they are accountable to their neighbours, and likely to receive suggestions, criticism, and valuable feedback from their community members. When school division boards are made up of so-called education experts from hundreds or thousands of kilometers away, the perception exists that they are no longer accountable to the average parent. Personally, I am less likely to engage with a government appointee, as I believe their allegiance does not lie with my family's best interests, but it lies with the politician responsible for their appointment. This scenario does not lend itself to parent engagement, and without engaged parents and caregivers, a critical factor in student success is missing. My belief is that cost cutting and efficiencies at the governance level seldom, if ever, filter back to the operational level. The Educational Governance and Review Report made repeated reference to alignment of boundaries and policies with the delivery of health services within Saskatchewan. I do not believe that a dollar saved by purchasing in bulk for health regions has ever resulted in a dollar more being spent to improve front-line health care services. Rather, that dollar goes to increased salaries or bonuses for upper managers, as a reward for finding those savings. I am not convinced we would see any different results if this philosophy were applied to education delivery and governance. As an example, one specific issue we have seen is students sharing text books. Many issues arose from this. While the purpose is supposed to be collaborative education and cooperative learning, the execution at the school level has been poor. When there is homework, students are having to complete it without access to a textbook, or are utilizing photocopies. Copying the textbook defeats any cost savings that might have been designed in the curriculum. Electronic resources are available, but front-line staff (teachers and administrators) has not been trained properly on how to use or access those resources. Instead, they are forced to learn "on the job", which cuts into their teaching time, as this is simply an inefficient method. In summary, I would expect any governance changes to be guided by the strategies laid out in the Governance Review and the Education Sector Strategic Plan. I think the operational portion of the budgets cannot be sacrificed to cost savings, even in hard financial times in the province. Education is an area that we should spend more, not less. I believe we should spend a higher year over year percentage. However, we need to ensure that funds are spent efficiently and with student outcomes in mind. Thank you, Parent, Prairie Valley School Division

Please consider the needs of the students and families and how these changes directly will negatively effect them. Each school, family, child needs the support of committed, supportive school board personnel elected by our community. It is very important to our communities to have locally elected boards of education. Thank you.

I understand that changes are being considered in the Saskatchewan education system. As the MLAs responsible for our area, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community. In Lloydminster the only Canadian border city this is even more important. None of the models proposed will work for Lloydminster with our unique situation. We want locally elected school boards who know the local situation. We want our tax dollars to be used for education locally. We want the children in Lloydminster from both provinces to receive equitable services which is now in place due to a municipal levy. Any of the problems noted in the Perrin report can be addressed in a different way - through amendments to legislation, regulations and policy. As a parent with a special needs child these issues are even more important for me and the ability to have locally elected boards addressing the local issues is the only solution for this unique city that straddles the border of two provinces. We need to keep decisions close to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from our unique community. Sincerely, Lloydminster, AB.

With regards to the proposed introduction of an amalgamated / Provincial Model for the school divisions in Saskatchewan, I have to voice my concern. Each government has had an opportunity to centralize to a provincial body, investigate a regional model or continue with a divisional model. Over the years, we have moved back and forth between the models depending on the thought of the day. In the end, before any decision is made, the priority needs to be set. This is the student and youth of this province. If the government is going to continue to put its hopes in the youth of this province, they need to give them the tools they require. This means the ability to govern themselves and provide the services and fill the needs of their particular areas. The needs of the Northern Communities are extremely different than those of an urban centre. They are also different from that of a rural setting. While I believe there needs to be more accountability of the particular boards to a governing body, I don't believe that needs to be government alone. There needs to be a partnership between the people, the province and the school divisions, a P3 model of sorts. Right now, the boards are not REALLY listening to the parents and students but neither is the province. The Board is not getting buy in from the parents and students because of a lack of communication. The province is not seeing enough control over the whole group of divisions. This doesn't mean we need to overstep each other like a parent who cannot trust a child. Can you all not find a way to work together in an cohesive and meaningful way? Do we really need to change the school boards at the cost, impact to families and impact to the bottom line? Can we not spend in a way that wisely incorporates what we have into a protocol that strives to have win-win-win scenarios for everyone? Please don't go ahead and make a centralized division! It is just too precious of a resource to leave in a small group of people's hands. Kind regards,

, Prairie Valley School Division

I am writing regarding the proposed changes suggested in the Education Governance Review Report. I am concerned about the possible amalgamation of rural and urban education governance. Rural and urban settings have very different needs and because urban settings have more people their needs risk over-powering the needs of rural communities. Small schools are important to rural life and should be supported and valued. Some things matter more than numbers. I value having elected school board members. These people are local and best understand the issues and concerns that are important to us and are accountable to the community they serve. I believe a transition to appointed board members will have a negative impact on our school and community. I do not believe that amalgamations are the answer to the financial challenges facing the government. Any change in governance will be disruptive and time-consuming for staff and communities. That time is better focused on the needs of students and families and our communities. I encourage you to thoughtfully and slowly examine all sides of this issue before moving ahead with a decision.

Education must become an investment priority for the government. Stop the cuts and start putting money back into the system as though you think education is important. That includes honouring the teachers contracts! If you do not value teachers, you will never value education properly. And by the way, teachers would be some of the best people to give advice on how things can be improved. There should be enough money so parents are not out of pocket for school expenses. Start putting healthy lunches into schools. And by healthy, I mean real food, not something shipped in from who knows where and re-heated! This could be an education opportunity as well. Study the Finnish education system. They get amazing results. We should be taking their ideas. We don't have to re-invent the wheel. If the government truly valued education they would have been looking for some of these ideas years ago. Do not keep making funding cuts and then pretend that you care about education! Cutting the funding to education is cutting off our noses to spite our faces. A strong and high quality education system is the foundation to a strong and vibrant economy. When we short change education, we hurt our economy.

I am against amalgamating the school divisions of Saskatchewan. It has been tried in Alberta and proved that it does not work and does not save money. I am afraid that if we become one big school board that the small towns of Saskatchewan will get lost in the process. As it is, living in a small town and having my kids play sports with teams in Regina, I already see that happening. We are expected to go to the city to play sports yet the drive is too far for the city teams to come to our small town so we end up doing all the driving. I fear that this will happen even more with sports and educational events if we become one big district. Smaller towns will be left out or they will close the schools and bus our kids into bigger centers and my kids already spend over an hour on the bus each way. I am definitely against having board members appointed, not elected. Do we not live in a democratic society? I know the Sask Party is trying to make it seem like they are trying to save the people of Saskatchewan money, but the reality is they are trying to make up for a decade of blowing the wealth of Saskatchewan's boom, while setting up their buddies in "appointed" positions so once again their friends can profit while the rest of people in Saskatchewan pay the price.

Bad idea. I think parents should have the choice of raising their children with god in their school.

I can only speak to our school division but I believe that the vast coverage currently in place may in fact all ready be too large and getting larger is concerning. While I believe that smaller elementary schools with short bus routes are preferable for smaller children the same does not necessarily hold true for high school where the programming costs can become much more significant. I attended a country high school where we received not much more than the basic academic education which has been just fine for me in having a successful professional career (now retired). I didn't get the same options as I would have in a city high school which made sense since our Gr 12 class was 22 vs the much higher city class sizes; but today there seems to be a sense that smaller decentralized high schools should have close to the same programming options as the more populated high schools even though the tax base does not support this. I question - 'why?' Also when I look at a map of our division I see towns that are standing alone that may be better suited to being in a different division where the high schools from a number of towns could be centralized into one. I see Kelliher and Milestone sitting pretty alone - are there any towns in other school divisions close by where the high schools could be amalgamated ? Then looking at high schools again (based on initial comment) why could Southey, Cupar and Lipton not be combined to one central high school - probably saving a fair bit of money on programming? Possibly before looking at making divisions bigger the current structure(s) should be reviewed to determine where there could be improvements/cost reductions. Without doing this the 'real' problem does not get resolved and it potentially stands to get worse. Elementary schools - why are we continuing to keep schools like Edenwold, with 34 students, open as well as others like it? Before I retired I was a Account Process Manager in the IT industry and my job was to ensure our services ran smoothly and efficiently which only can be accomplished with mature processes in place. Your service may not be IT related but it is service related - the service of education. The signs of a poor process (or none) are easily seen with resources being added continuously with little to no improvement to the quality of service which in my humble opinion is what we are seeing today. So my suggestion is fix the 'process' first. And my opinion is that 'Lean' which is the new 'buzz' word is not the answer - if you have an effective process management system in place the objectives of LEAN should be realized....implementing the lean process prior to fixing your process mgmt will probably only make the situation worse. Of course this is only my own personal opinion that is based on my experience. As far as people on the Division Board I believe a lot could be gained by having members independent of the local schools so that their are non-biased decisions being made. Each school should have a local school board made up of volunteers from that area who would represent local concerns and work closely with the Division Board. In summary: clean up the current situation before making any major changes (I see division boundary changes, high school amalgamations, elementary school closures, division board member revisions and most of all the key item is implementing/fixing your process mgmt system)

SCC Member. Thoughts: The Perrins report revealed quite a few issues & concerns for me as a Parent, SCC member & a strong supporter of Saskatchewan's youth & their future's. 1) Saskatchewan's performance on the PISA and the PCAP continues to lag behind other Canadian provinces. In 2015, Saskatchewan ranked last among provinces in Science, Reading and Math. In 2013, Saskatchewan ranked 7,8, and 6 on those same subject areas. In addition, Saskatchewan's three-year graduation rates have plateaued, remaining between 73 and 75 per cent for the past 10 years. These stats are highly concerning for the future of our province! We want Saskatchewan kids to be successful in life. These stats are a huge concern for those of us that were born & raised in this province & plan to stay. Who will be the people left in the province to provide service, healthcare, education to us & our future youth? We are in LAST PLACE this is not acceptable & should be in the fore front of every person's mind in going forward! Every Member of Government, Educator, SCC member, Parent, Grandparent, Citizen of Saskatchewan needs to be concerned & thinking how can we change so we can get Saskatchewan out of last place in Reading, Math & Science? Everyone in this province uses reading to some degree or math in their everyday lives. To be successful in life you need to be proficient in these two so you can avoid costly mistakes & have the ability to make good decisions. Reading & Math are essential to success in life! I have heard a lot about this report being just about money, that nobody is focusing on the students needs or learning. Is it? 2) ESSP: It is intended to provide a united approach to education in order to meet the needs of all students. To provide leadership to the Plan, school division directors of education, leaders from First Nations and Métis education organizations and members of the Ministry of Education (PLT)." Working towards common outcomes "thinking as one" these are positives in my opinion. However, we do need to keep in mind that not all communities, divisions are the same. Each has their own idiosyncrasies that make them successful in reaching their education goals. Regular reporting and review is intended to promote mutual accountability and to develop corrective actions when strategies are not achieving the expected results. Accountability in anything we do is important. We need to keep the people in charge of educating our children accountable. The entire education system needs to be accountable. Who is taking responsibility for Saskatchewan being last in 2015? Who is going to be accountable for Saskatchewan getting out of last place? 3) Efficiencies and shared services are expected to: lower the cost curve; create

enhanced value in the system; and, improve services to students. I do hope this will hold true, that the improved efficiencies will go directly back to the needs of all students. That the money saved does not simply go back to the government, board members, division's pockets. That action would keep us in LAST PLACE. While the ESSP has been in operation for only two school years, good results have been achieved on one of the key priorities – improving reading at Grade 3. Since the initiation of the ESSP, all 28 school divisions are participating in Saskatchewan Reads and the percentage of students reading at grade level in Grade 3 has increased from 65 per cent in 2013 to 74 per cent in June 2016. We have seen the improvement with this directive in our own school in regards to reading. The stats from 2013 to 2016 show positive results however, it is still not enough based on the 2015 stats. A second priority – Following Their Voices – an initiative that has been designed to improve First Nations, Métis and Inuit student outcomes, has been in full operation in 17 schools for only one full school year and is beginning to demonstrate small gains in student attendance, credit completion, on-time graduation and final marks in English language arts and math. This is good news. Are there other things we could be doing to ensure this priority continues to improve? 4) Board Members: I have an issue with the number of board members required by some divisions. (I was told the changes will only be affecting the Public School Div however, when I read the report it has mentioned looking at options & analyzing the Public, Separate, & Francophone Division's. This should definitely be happening not just changes to the public). Why does Creighton have 5 board members with only 1 school & 430 students? In the Separate School Division there are more board members than schools for the most part why is that? Christ of the Teacher 10 BM for 9 schools with 1,666 students, Geographic Size 4,401 Holy Family 10 BM for 5 school's with 1,218 students, Geographic Size 6,612. These compared to: Chinook 10 BM for 61 schools with 5,938 students & a Geographic size of 42,739 Saskatoon 10 BM for 58 schools with 22,819 students, Geo Size of 217km's. Explain to me why a division has 10 Board Members with 61 schools & another division has 10 Board Members with 9 or 5 schools? I see that & think why? These members could be making \$30,000 to \$40,000 per year of tax payers money. Why do they need so many board members for so few schools? People are concerned that if we eliminate or reduce Board Members it makes our school, community vulnerable to not having our concerns or voices heard at a local level. There are members on our SCC that have yet to meet a board member. I have been an SCC member for 6 years & only met a board member once because I attended a workshop. Yes we need to have a local voice for our student's & specific community's needs. What that looks like I do not know. Do I feel board members are invaluable to our children's education & getting us out of LAST PLACE. No I do not. I believe Educators, Teacher's & EA's should be the focus. They are the ones in the trench's with our children. The difference between a teacher that knows your child & one that doesn't can make or break your child's & family's year. It makes a difference! We need to make sure that Educators & students have the support when they need it. We should NOT be increasing class size per teacher; this does not improve a child's success. Having a proper balance teacher student ratio is imperative to a child's success & Saskatchewan's future. Ensuring the proper programs are in place to Maximize student's learning & success all over the province should be top priority. Busing & transfers are a huge deal in getting kids to school & on time. However, the length of their bus ride changes their behaviour throughout the day. The longer the bus ride the more melt downs teachers & parents experience at night or throughout the day. These lengthy bus rides impact student learning. In changing the boundaries are you expecting bus rides to become even longer? A concern if option 1 is chosen, having only 1 Division, is emergency response times. When emergencies happen & there is only one division will we experience huge lag times to make decisions based on the schools, community's specific needs? Also, why on average is more \$ allocated per student to the Separate & Francophone Divisions vs the Public Schools? If our goal is to have equal learning opportunity's & services for all our children in Saskatchewan, these numbers (in Perrin's report) are showing something entirely different. The total money allocated ranges from \$307.83/student being the lowest in Regina to \$1783.27/student for the Francophone. So is this report all about money? I don't believe so. If we keep the decision makers accountable for what they say, I do believe there is room for improving efficiencies, communication, & there are some cost savings to be had. The answer however, is NOT to have mass classes & one frazzled teacher with no help/support, that has no idea who her/his students are. That plan will be serving no one, that decision will guarantee Saskatchewan stays in last place. Common Goal: Educate our kids effectively, help them become successful in life! Don't just go through the motions. These are my thoughts...

I am a parent, teacher and SCC member from a rural, K-12 school and I am very concerned about Saskatchewan's students' rankings a school last in Science, Math and Reading. I would like there to be more accountability among school boards and schools for how the curriculum is being implemented yet I do feel that the local voice will be lost if there are no elected school board representatives. I feel that option 3a would be a good option. There are needs specific to rural communities that I feel might get lost if more significant boundary changes happen yet I want to see improvement in rural education for all students.

To: K-12 Governance Review and Lyle Stuart, MLA. I have read through the Perrins report. I have also heard the issues voiced by the Prairie Valley School Division in a local public meeting. I concur with most of their concerns regarding the negative potential impact on the quality of education that would be delivered in rural Saskatchewan. Please consider the PVSD and I to be of the same mind in these matters. I also have some personal concerns with the process currently underway. First, the structure and approach of the report strongly suggests that at least one, if not all, of the options being offered to the public represent a "Pareto improvement" to the status quo. (By Pareto improvement I mean an outcome that harms no one and helps at least one person.) Since the status quo is not given as an option in this public choice matter, the report strongly implies that the options offered are somehow superior. However, I see no definitive evidence in this report to unabashedly support such a presumption. As an important matter of public policy, the "Pareto improvement" criterion is a basic expectation of the public. Therefore in its absence, by constraining the public's choice to "anything but the status quo", this consultation process comes off like a heavy-handed, passive-aggressive exercise to obtain political permission to increase the mill rate on property, which of course is a jagged pill for the electorate and perpendicular to the governing party's central philosophy. It would be disingenuous to assume that if the public rejects all options presented, then they are effectively giving the government permission to raise taxes to cover the operating shortfall. That would be taking too much liberty with the interpretation of a public's rejection of all options presented. Furthermore, the design of this process erodes accountability for management of the provincial budget by forcing the public into a corner, asking them to choose between options that, regardless of the choice made, ultimately serves the government more than the public. I believe that there is more than enough wrong with this process to strongly consider suspension for significant retooling or a lengthening of the review period. Having said all this, I agree that there are likely operational efficiencies (savings) to be captured by consolidating/centralizing some common functions, that do not require disruptive restructuring of rural education delivery. Things like IT, procurement, transport, etc. are common areas where there can be some efficiency through consolidation/centralization. I have professional experience in the private sector leading such initiatives. I have learned some very important lessons from these experiences. First, most consolidation/centralization efforts did not result in a significant savings from leveraging a lower unit price. If there was a short run improvement in costs, it was only because the administrative cost of leveraging suppliers did not dwarf the initial price savings. Second, significant savings were realized only if the behaviour of the organization could be altered to promote more efficient consumption behaviour. Simply put, it was not a lower price being paid for something that created significant, sustainable savings, but it was the changes to the organization's consumption behaviour that generated the largest financial improvement. This kind of consolidation/centralization benefit is tough to achieve in the short run because it often entails significant cultural change for the organization. Nevertheless, just because something is "tough" does not mean that we don't attempt to do it, it just means that expectations must be tempered and perseverance will be necessary. In my humble opinion, this back office reengineering should be the first priority before trying to create efficiency through big changes to the structural delivery of the core product (K-12 education). (I did some cowboy math on the potential governance cost savings and it would be small even under ideal execution conditions. My business experience leads me to discount any promise of flawless execution or quick cultural change.) Finally I would like to point out that any plan that potentially lowers the quality or convenience of the rural education system, will be detrimental to your current economic development initiatives. Your efforts to attract new business opportunities to rural Saskatchewan will be a fruitless endeavour if the public infrastructure (K-12 education, healthcare, etc.) suffers in the quest to save money. Businesses simply won't entertain moving to (rural) Saskatchewan if they can't convince their key people to move there or if they think future recruitment will be throttled by the condition of public services. There is no corporate tax incentives, or other giveaways, that will offset this business risk and it is a complete show stopper for any serious suitors. There is simply no senior executive anywhere in the world that wants to stand before their shareholders and explain a white elephant, so they will avoid new projects where conditions are not favourable for securing the top people they require to deliver shareholder value. Like it or not, these rural issues (primary education and economic development) cannot be considered in isolation.

To Whom it May Concern: As a Saskatchewan resident, parent and School Board Member I am worried and gravely concerned about education in our province and community. I have read and reread the Educational Governance Review Report many times and am not sure that any of the options presented will produce the efficiencies that the government wants and needs to see. I have sat in on many meetings, presentations and panels and the same underlying message has been repeatedly stated. 'Students and their success is the most important'. This message has been shared by the Minister of Education and his staff, by members of the SSBA, members of the STF, and members of LEADS. I have also heard this message shared within individual school divisions, by boards, administrators, teachers and educational assistants. Kids should be first in education. I fail to see how removing local voice or making larger school divisions will

keep our students the focus and provide them with the best education possible. The ESSP has been in place for a few short years and has been seeing results. I know our school division, Lloydminster Public School Division, has worked very hard whether it is in the classroom or through our staff at division office to help students achieve their personal goals as well as meet or exceed the provincial goals. We need to work together to continue to see these results and help with student success. I ran for school board in Lloydminster because I care about children and their education in our community. I grew up in Lloydminster, attended and completed my Kindergarten to grade twelve Educations here. I now have two children of my own and am looking forward to them attending and completing their education here as well. I have seen the hard work and dedication that has historically and what currently exists in our division and our city. Lloydminster has a unique and complex situation because of its bi-provincial location. The City of Lloydminster created a Charter, 84 years ago, to provide seamless delivery of services in our community. Embedded in the Charter are restrictions pertaining to education and its funding. Because of these restrictions it would be very difficult, maybe even impossible, to provide seamless levels of service in an expanded division. We are able to provide equitable service in Lloydminster as it does not matter what province you live in, your child will be provided with the same level of education and service at any school in the city. A municipal levy was established to ensure students in both provinces have access to services such as Pre-Kindergarten, driver education and transportation. I, as well as our whole Board of Education, believe that the challenges expressed in the review can be addressed through legislative amendments, and regulation and policy changes. If this happened you would see less disruption to our students and staff. Also our locally elected boards could continue to work hard under new expectations, mandates and regulations. I personally feel locally elected school boards are the best choice for education. When someone volunteers to run for school board it is because they have a keen interest in the importance of quality education being provided to the students in our province. These board trustees are able to make informed decisions for the schools in their areas because they have or know the kids in the schools. They know the parents and grandparents of the students. They have relationships with the staff and are able to help in the schools when needed. I cannot tell you how many people have reached out to me in the two years that I have been on the School Board. Parents contact me with questions about their kid's schools, the programs at school, division boundaries and policies. Locally elected school boards help to build partnerships with community organizations and companies to help provide our students with extra opportunities. I fear that without a local voice these types of relationships will be missed. Every community in our province has different needs due to demographics and population. A provincial or regional division model will not be able to provide the best services for these communities. When a school division is too large and a board has to oversee too much area there is going to be disconnect between the board and schools. Parents and community members like having a connection to the board and the decision makers in their school division. I can say for myself that I would not want to have to call an office hours away from where I live when I have a concern about my child and their education. I have spent many hours and days thinking, reading and talking about this review. If the government wants to find efficiencies in Education and budgets there should have been dollar amounts and plans on how any changes might happen attached to the review. There were little to no specifics to be found anywhere within the review. If either of the first two options are chosen I worry about the jobs that would be cut. The loss of jobs would mean residents would be leaving our province and no longer be contributing to taxation in Saskatchewan. Therefore less money would be coming to the government. It is my belief that the two most important things that our province needs to invest in are Education and Health. We need and should be investing more money not taking it away. If we cannot keep our people educated and healthy, people will not stay in our province and if they do stay they will be a cost to the system. I hope that the government is looking at and reviewing all areas of spending in our province. I feel that there are many other areas that should be addressed before making unneeded cuts to Education and Health. In closing I would like to caution the people who are making decisions about education and challenge them to look at the long term outcomes and implications that any drastic changes could have on our students, our future. If we make poor choices for our little people we will be setting up our province for trouble ahead. Please consider these children, their education and their future in your decision making process. Choose what is best for Saskatchewan today and tomorrow. Sincerely,

To whom it may concern, My wife and I homeschool our children and we belong to the Saskatchewan Home Based Educators organization (www.shbe.info). As there is no official body to represent our interests as a stakeholder, I want SHBE (and their affiliates, such as the HSLDA) to be the voice on my behalf to the Minister of education. I would also like to see SHBE directly involved with the registration of our children since we are already communicating with that organization. I am also concerned about how funding will change since it is not currently uniform across the province. I think that SHBE should be involved in the process of metering that change. Thank you.

I am disgusted with these new ideas. Our system in place seems to work really well and I would hate to see it change. Our school is ran better then schools in Regina for my sisters kids go to Regina and do not get lots of the help kids get in lumsden. In Fact my neighbour took his kids out of Regina school and are now in lumsden and there grades went up dramatically. Leave well enough alone are kids don't need to ride on buses anymore then they already are!!!

Very simply put, this is a bad idea. It will have the opposite effect on education that you want it to. The system is broken, but this won't fix it. Policy changes at a government level will. As part of our last round of bargaining, divisions were to create some sort of method to have every level of education meet to create a more streamlined delivery of education. LPSD, Lloydminster Public School Division has done that and we are only of the only ones. We are able to meet on a monthly basis with our school board and division office with administration's and teacher at the table, all to work toward the common goal of what's best for our students. However, not surprising that the government has made no effects to be a part of these conversation. These valuable conversations, with or without a government presence, would be impossible if LPSD is not except from any transformational changes. You are already losing good educators to the changes and demands you've placed upon the education system. You are well on your way to losing more. This will only cause Saskatchewan to drop lower in the ranks for education. That will be on you. If you want to know what needs to be done, ask the teachers. Don't be ignorant and assume you know what is best for us.

Lloydminster Public School Division

To Whom It May Concern: I have recently discovered that the Government of Saskatchewan will be undertaking a Governance Review for grades K-12 in the near future. As a mature parent who has recently placed two of my children (previously private school or home educated) in the Southeast Cornerstone Division school in Saskatchewan and who holds a B.ed. from _____ I am pleased that you have decided to take on this monumental task. I am happy that you are undertaking this review and hope that some of my own personal concerns with the Saskatchewan curriculum (especially reading and special needs education) that my children are taking in your school system will be addressed. Because of my unique situation, I am respectfully asking that HSLDA be allowed to participate as a stakeholder in the discussions revolving around this Governance Review. As well, I believe that it could be beneficial to your cause to including SHBE as a stakeholder in your discussions. By including these groups in your discussion, perhaps a better communication and understanding will bring about benefits for both children who are home educated as well as those who attend your provincial schools. I am hopeful that by communicating with these groups, who also take an interest in the education of Saskatchewan's children, could eventually work together to build new strategies that will benefit all children in Saskatchewan who are being educated, whether in the public, private or home environment, or with children who are going from one environment to another. Thank you for taking the time to consider my letter,

First and foremost through this process, the needs of students need to be at the forefront. The stakeholders in the Educational Sector Strategic Plan have committed to working towards goals to improve achievement of our First Nations, Inuit and Metis students. Early Childhood Educators are implementing instructional strategies to ensure students exiting Kindergarten are ready for the primary grades. Schools are creating goals for improving achievement in reading, writing and math. Aside from the groups mentioned in the Educational Sector Strategic Plan, there are still other students, such as EAL (English as an Additional Language) students, and other students who require interventions to assist with their learning. We need to maintain boards of education that are able to meet the diverse needs of students in a timely manner. Currently, boards of education and school community councils work together to support the learning priorities of schools. Parents and community members are informed of areas of focus and the vision of the learning community. To ensure continued success, teachers and support staff require ongoing professional development and resources to promote growth within the learning priorities. With large school divisions, travelling time will impact the time that consultants and other professionals from agencies working with the division, spend with students and families requiring assistance. With larger urban boards of education, community members may feel a preference for the smaller separate school boards to meet the educational needs of their children. Reference has been made to the scores on the PISA and PCAP. Standardized tests enable comparisons to other schools and provide some helpful data. Currently, school divisions in the province are working on instructional strategies and assessments that are improving achievement in the areas of reading, writing and math. Educators are able to collaborate on the implementation of best practices to work towards their goals. These practices would be more difficult and happen less frequently within larger school divisions. I would like to see the government move forward in good faith to benefit the education of our province's children.

The report was interesting and thorough. I have a lot of thoughts, but will try to contain them in succinct points of opinion. 1. Boards should be elected. It provides a voice to the people of the areas. Smaller school boards know the area and the needs/concerns/issues of the area and students. Acclamation doesn't always show disinterest; it can show that a person is doing a fine job and nobody feels the need to challenge their role. 2. That said, some board decisions and the number of board members could be regulated. My school board has too many members and the governance costs are larger than other comparable divisions. The province/ministry could regulate the number of meetings, role, number of visits, remuneration, SCC funds, etc.. 3. School Community Councils provide a small voice, but they are no more than a parent committee with no authority or power. Elected school boards give real voice with decision-making power to local people and concerns. 4. The ESSP is showing promise in directing province wide goals, initiatives and improved student achievement. It should be given the chance to continue. 5. I have been through the last amalgamation. It was necessary, but difficult and disruptive. We have only felt settled and able to trust and make progress for the past few years. Students, parents and staff were not served well through some of this time. Another forced amalgamation would be too soon, too big and too disruptive. 6. The idea of aligning school divisions with health regions would be helpful. It would help coordinate services such as social work, public health and more. 7. Most importantly, one school division would be a disservice to the students of this province. We already have the least number of school division of the prairie provinces with a large geography to service. I realize that our PISA results are unacceptable and poor, however, amalgamation will not improve student achievement. It MAY improve efficiency, but not effectiveness. I would support the option of keeping divisions as they are because being too big removes personal knowledge of students and staff. A needs based approach is effective. If forced to choose, 14 school divisions could function well, but nothing smaller. Student learning is expensive, but it is NOT a business. It can't be run like one.

Making the right decision is not always popular. We hope that the government has the courage to amalgamate school divisions as our local elected Board is not serving our students well at all.

I am not in favour of one school division for the province of Saskatchewan. I have never been in favour of our division getting bigger from the get go. I feel that every time there is an amalgamation in any organization, that organization loses its power to be able to do what is best for itself. This has not only be true with our education system but also our health system, our libraries, our co-ops etc. What is good for one area is not necessarily good for another area. Local people living in our communities usually know what is best for the organizations that are located in the area!

Whatever the changes are made to governance, it needs to equate to more teachers and Teachers aids on the ground. I have 2 young children in school and have had anywhere from 18 to 31 kids in their classrooms. Their experience with the large class: it was hard to learn, hard to receive any opportunities for additional learning with the teacher if they needed it, and the teachers were burnt out. The amount of \$ I see teachers paying out of their own pockets for classroom supplies is absurd, as a parent I give gift cards to them for supplies just so they don't have to pay themselves but this is ridiculous! So of you need to change your structure to have better decision making so be it but the benefits need to be seen in the classrooms.

My name is _____ and I have three children under the age of six, so your proposals will directly affect my family. I have been thinking about what to say this past week regarding your "proposals" and honestly I am at a loss. First, how can you ask for feedback when you provide such little information? I want to know how each proposal will supposedly help with the budget and how each proposal directly effects my school division, children's education and my school and future school that my children will attend. Second, you have done very little to ask for public opinion of this matter. I was sent an email from my school little over a week ago and nothing directly from the Ministry, not a phone call, not a letter, I heard nothing about this on the radio or any other media. You have access to every family registered in school systems and yet you sent nothing directly out to those attending and have no regard for those who will be attending in the future. I feel like you are just trying to pass something you know is wrong and then say "well we asked for public opinion and we didn't get any feedback". If you actually want a real discussion, hold forums, week days, nights and weekends over several MONTHS. Be forthcoming in information, give exact numbers. As someone who worked for the Provincial government for several years I know first hand that I do not want the government running my schools. I left the government stayed home for five years to raise my children and when I was ready to work again I knew I could not go back to how the government was ran and your act, or lack there of proves that I made the right choice to go to private. The government has no business running schools.

I would like to start by saying I have been a supporter of the Sask Party from the day it was formed and have always been steadfast and unwavering in that support. As both a parent of a rural Saskatchewan student and as a member of a Saskatchewan community, I am deeply concerned about the 3 options put forth in Mr. Dan Perrin's Educational Governance Review Report and do not support any of them when it come to the PVSD in particular. This is not to say a review isn't worthwhile, but a blanket change to each and every school division is not what is required. First and foremost, the lack of forethought to impacts on all Saskatchewan students is a grossly ignorant and glaringly absent from the report. As a government who was built on the support of rural Saskatchewan it is absolutely unfathomable to me that you could support such a short-sighted report. The idea of removing elected board members and replacing them with appointed board members, removes our right as Saskatchewan residents to have a direct voice about education. Those board members are elected in the same way our government is elected. Why should we, the people not be allowed to be represented in education through these elected members? The publicly elected board member for my children's schools, attend our School Community Council meetings, are available and open to discussions with anyone within our area. Appointed board members are not accountable to the people of Saskatchewan. They are instead, most likely already internal government employees being moved into positions by government and not the people of Saskatchewan. Provincially appointed board members will not be as accessible, nor will they know their communities' needs. They will not be at the schools; they will be in their offices. It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! Currently under the direction of the Prairie Valley School Division, we celebrate some of the highest performance scores in Reading and Math as well as extraordinary High School graduation rates. What guarantee is there that these standards of excellence will be maintained through provincial amalgamations? There isn't any guarantee. All forced amalgamations will be extremely costly to students, teachers, administrators, families and communities. The last forced amalgamations is 2006 saw students, teacher and administrators at a loss for several years while they tried to make things work. The cost and burden is directly put on students! The youth of Saskatchewan should not bear the brunt of the financial situation the province is in! There is no budgetary evidence in the report, to support the governance change or how further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. Changes as large as described in the report, will have large administration costs. How is that not thought of? Was there any investigation into the costs of the last amalgamation? If anything is gained, it will be a very small drop in the bucket to the overall debt situation. I am deeply concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold. Rural communities thrive, grow, and revolve around their schools. Closing schools will "close" small town Saskatchewan. A government for the rural people of Saskatchewan have given little to no thought of the impact to rural Saskatchewan. My community and I have great concerns for distance, safety, and time spent on buses for rural children caused by closures. We need a permanent high school plan to accommodate the best interests of our students, their families, and our community, as well as a permanent high school transportation plan. We would rather our students be part of a smaller school, than being in overcrowded classrooms in larger centers. This is one of the reasons people choose to reside in rural areas. Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in. In Mr. Perrin's report the opening letter to Minister Morgan states that ALL stakeholders who approached Mr. Perrin for conversation UNANIMOUSLY support elected boards and NO more amalgamations! WHY would we continue with pursuing drastic changes? This is absolutley nonsensical and I cannot comprehend the lack of thought that is going on regarding this review. Regards

Lumsden Sask

Schools in rural Saskatchewan face unique challenges to urban schools. Residents in rural Saskatchewan live different lives then residents in the cities. One size does not fit all in Education. There is a significant risk that the needs and interests of the small number of rural students and schools will be lost if combined with the large number of urban students and schools. Education is a right and the quality of that education should not depend on where you live in Saskatchewan. Elected School Board members are familiar with the geographic area; the needs of the community and the unique challenges of its residents and students. Decisions are then made to meet the best interests of the given student body, keeping in mind the community specific factors. Decisions of an elected Board are aligned with the best interests of providing education in the given community As the Review report indicates, an Appointed Board would be making decisions aligned with the view of the Government, regardless of the best interests of the student body and community. An investment in quality education is a good investment!

Locally elected boards are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. The community elected representatives are the best positioned to serve the needs of the students within each school/division.

Dear Ms. Young, I am writing to you as a concerned citizen of your riding. First, there were changes in health care and now the government is pushing through an agenda for change in Saskatchewan's Education sector. I have had the opportunity to speak to parents and to educators about the proposed changes outlined in the Perrins report. My understanding is that the report itself says none of the options are ideal for our students. Making changes that are detrimental to kids is not a decision I support and I would be deeply disappointed to learn that my MLA supported such change. I have also heard that it is the government's intent to look at appointing members of Educational boards. This, in particular, is quite concerning to me. As a Saskatchewan citizen I have taken for granted that my government would always engage in democratic, grass roots feedback from its citizens. To hear that this may not be the case is, quite frankly, alarming. Citizen input is of outmost importance, as this is the foundation of democracy. Our society needs to prioritize democratic processes that support our students. It is deeply disappointing that your government would use a time of financial hardship to wrestle control of our boards of Education and nullify parent voices. I urge you to reconsider this matter of "transformational change." It is my understanding that you, yourself have sat on a board of Education and I would ask you to consider why? Was it because you wanted input in the education of your children? Did you have valid concerns and suggestions you wanted to see impact your kids? Ms. Young, please challenge our premier on behalf of your constituents. Erosion of democratic practices and of our Education system should not and cannot be condoned. Sincerely,

As a licensed teacher and parent of school aged children, I have been analyzing the most recently released information and potential changes to the provinces school divisions and wish to submit the following feedback: Our school division, Prairie Valley, underwent major restructuring ten years ago. That major change resulted in our communities have less of an elected local voice. It is very concerning to consider that any further change in our school division boundaries would further lessen that local voice. How can that be in the best interests of our children or communities? Education belongs to the community. ¥ We need to keep our school boards locally elected. ¥ We need to keep decision making closer to our communities. ¥ We do not need further amalgamations and I do not support them. ¥ I do not support changes to our subdivision boundaries. Our children do not benefit from moving decisions up the bureaucratic chain and further away from the community. We understand the Province faces a serious financial challenge and are on board to help fully address the challenges but not at the cost to our current and future students. We do not believe that changing governance or amalgamating school divisions is the right thing to do, or an answer to the current financial challenges. Education belongs in the community. Sincerely,

I think we, as a province, need to be very careful when we are looking at total amalgamation. Having worked in two of our school systems for 15 years, and collaborated with colleagues from several others, I am very well aware that there are three distinct types of schools in Saskatchewan: urban, rural and Northern; each with their own priorities and challenges arising from the readily available and accessible resources and struggles in the communities they serve. There is no way that one governing body could successfully and equitably answer the needs of all schools province-wide and it would be extremely unfair to expect it. I understand that we must examine our current system and make cost-saving decisions where we must. However, we as a community, and you, as our community leaders have a duty to ensure that the decisions that you make will not negatively impact student learning and our classrooms.

Dear Educational Governance Review Board: As a resident of Lloydminster I believe it is imperative to share my concerns about the proposed changes to the school division zones recently suggested by the Saskatchewan government before the decision is made. I attended the public meeting in Lloydminster on January 18th and heard the possible changes put forth. Lloydminster's unique border-straddling location presents numerous challenges in several sectors. Now that the education sector is the focus of the proposed changes, it hits rather close to home. Our youngest son is currently in grade 10 and we certainly hope that any changes will not have a negative impact on the remainder of his high school experience. I strongly believe that the numerous challenges identified through the review report could all be handled with strategic amendments to legislation and policies. A clear set of guidelines and budget parameters would apply to each school division equally. I do not see where these drastic changes will save money in either the long or short term (as the changes some 11 years ago apparently proved). The amount of manpower drained away from the students and constituents you are serving and the stress this is causing to school divisions, administration and staff is unwarranted. Write the policies that you want to see enacted and then allow the school board Directors to carry them out. Thank you for your time. This letter is also being sent to MLA Colleen Young and MLA Richard Starke. Regards,
Lloydminster, SK

I do not feel that amalgamating is the answer. Locally elected school boards is what is best for our community to serve our needs. I like that I know who our local representatives are, and that our voices are being heard.

To whom it may concern, I am a parent of two young children and I am concerned about the direction this province is looking to go when it comes to education. Having a local board of representatives is a tried and tested method of overseeing education and I am baffled to why this government would stray from that? I only assume that the government is looking to make these changes to save money? I do not believe that the savings will be astronomical and benefit the schools more than having a local board does. Having a local board that can deal with the schools in my own city is the only thing that makes sense to me. I do not feel that it is solely the job of any government oversee education, this doesn't feel like a very Canadian thing to be doing. As far as I'm concerned it should be the right of a community to be involved in their kids education. Not all schools and communities have the same needs when it comes to education. I fail to see how single government oversight, will have the ability to make public education better. There is no way a government panel can give the same care and attention to a division that currently receives from a local board. **SO THE FACT THAT THESE CHANGES WILL NOT MAKE EDUCATION BETTER FOR MY CHILD, THEN THAT ALONE IS REASON FOR NOT DOING ANYTHING!!** If some in the government feel that this will benefit my child's education, all I would say to that is, I hope their right. This is a major issue with huge political implications. Thanks

I urge you to reconsider your decision to move ahead with this plan. As a full time special education teacher for almost 20 years and as a substitute special education teacher for 12 years, I fear that our students will suffer, if you proceed. As has been reported by southern school divisions who went through a similar plan, it took years to re-organize. During this process it will be students, particularly our most vulnerable students, who will be negatively affected the most.

Dear Governance Panel Members: Recently your government announced a need for 'transformational change' in Saskatchewan. As a mother of two children in your constituency, and as a teacher myself, I am deeply concerned with the short-sighted vision the Saskatchewan Party has for the education of our children. About seven years ago, I met with my then MLA, in the Meadow Lake constituency to ask him exactly what the future goals and visions of our government were for the education sector. I left deeply disappointed. It became quite clear to me then that education was not a priority to our government, and that really, beyond dismantling organized labour, there was no vision for our kids. Now, once again, I believe our children are going to pay the price for a government with questionable priorities. While I understand that our province has fallen into debt, and needs to dig itself out, I do not believe this should happen at the expense of our children. I was a part of 3 school divisions forced to amalgamate approximately 11 years ago. What we experienced in the aftermath was a restructuring that deeply affected the kids in my classroom - whether they or their parents realized it. Services were hindered and strategic goals could not be addressed as teachers, support staff and administration scrambled to restructure. Now, just as we are recovering and able, once again, to put the focus on our kids, the government sees a "need" to change again. Under this government, the pressure to perform and get our kids up to an expected standard has been immense. Many of the initiatives the ministry has pushed down to us have been touted as a measure of accountability. Now, we hear talk of appointed boards of education. The irony is not lost on me. Appointed boards can surely also be "unappointed." In this way we move from a democratic form of education to an authoritarian government void of public feedback. What exactly has history taught us about authoritarian governments? My concern about the decision making process in this regard is further heightened by the fact that the Wall government is choosing to act even before the house sits. I am aware that the government commissioned Dan Perrins to write a report about education in Saskatchewan and that it now appears as though, the future of our children's education rests on one man's opinion regarding what is "best" for education and a report that was completed in a mere three week period. I ask you, does that sound like good decision making? Does that sound democratic? It is my hope that other parents, who are not a part of the education sector, have the opportunity to understand the implications your government's proposals have - though I doubt many will, as it was clearly not the intent of the Saskatchewan Party to receive parental feedback. I'm not aware of any parent groups being invited to your six person panel discussions. As a Saskatchewan voter I urge you - please do right by the voters and our children, rather than by our Premier. Sincerely,

As parents of 4, 2 of which are attending the _____ we sincerely hope that funds are not cut back. We already fundraise a lot for our school and feel that further cuts would jeopardize our kids education. Our children are the future of Saskatchewan and this is supposed to be about their success. Well if you take something away from their education now, how will they be expected to succeed later?

Education belongs to communities and we need to keep our school boards locally elected and should keep decisions based in our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions away from the community.

Our family votes for amalgamating divisions into one division. We want and need more consistency and decisions made for all students.

To whom it may concern: In today's political climate of change the Latin phrase "status quo" is often associated with a lack of adaptability and progress. The Educational Governance Review Report aims to bring change and "progress" to the systems in which education is administered. The options outlined in this report will have a direct impact on how local control of education is handled. I work for the Lloydminster Public School Division in the area of _____ When I was first hired I wrongly assumed that the only interaction I would have with my school board would be mostly those concerning human resources. In the three years I have been with LPSD I fostered professional relationships with our superintendents. They know the names of the students I work with, the needs of our classrooms, and ensure that our instruction and implementations of our IIP's is first class. They have their boots on the ground and they see and meet with us in an authentic ways. I don't believe that any option that removes our school board from our city would be able to replace the benefits we currently have from these close working relationships. I fear that under option 1, 2, and 3a my students would lose their story and identity to those in administration and become just a number whose services can be so easily cut. It is easier to make broad changes that have a negative impact when you are miles away. Keeping our school boards local ensures that the people who make policy are directly accountable to the people they serve. The status quo that we have develop here in Lloydminster is bearing fruit every year, our reading rates are increasing and our graduation rates are on the rise. We have awesome leadership that have directed resources needed to reach our hoshin goals. I ask that you preserve this status quo, and keep the education of the children of Lloydminster in local hands.

Sincerely,

We request that home educating parents be part of any stakeholder groups such as the proposed provincial advisory board to the Minister of Education. We feel there is a great benefit in hearing our voices along with public, Catholic, First Nations and Metis, and Francophone students. We request that Saskatchewan Home Based Educator (SHBE) and Home School Legal Defense Association (HSLDA) represent home educating parents as part of any stakeholder groups such as the proposed provincial advisory board to the Minister of Education. We request that home educators register with one province-wide registering authority (as opposed to the current local school divisions), and that SHBE have input into the selection of that registering authority. Additionally, SHBE suggests the province allow SHBE to approve the ministry's choice, or to have the ministry choose from a list of nominees provided by SHBE. We request that there be a re-evaluation of home education funding in Saskatchewan with the purpose of ensuring that funding be directed toward home educating families. We request that SHBE and HSLDA be involved in the re-evaluation. Currently, thousands of dollars in funding is given to the local school division for each home educated student. We receive in PSSD a paltry \$200 per year towards supplies. The rest of that money goes into the public pot and is used for other children who attend public schools. This does not seem right. There needs to be accountability for that money and if it isn't being used for the designated home educated children, then PSSD shouldn't be receiving it.

I am writing you today about my thoughts about the Educational Governance Review Report. I am an Educational Assistant who has worked for LPSD for the past 5 years. I believe that our school board should be left alone. Our staff at LPSD can have conversations about any students with our administration, they know who they serve. Our students in our schools are looked at as amazing individual people and not just a number. In the city of Lloydminster, our house taxes help pay for some of the awesome programs we have here in Lloydminster. It helps us to make sure we can have a Pre-K program which supports families who can't afford pre-school and gives their child a safe place to be. It allows us to have breakfast and lunch programs for the families who can't put food on the table. If we went to one board that was based outside our city as an AB residents how do we know that what we pay in taxes are going to stay in Lloydminster? Our school board is funded 60% from government of Alberta. How do we know that that money will stay in our city? Take Care,

Education Assistant,

My concerns are: How this is going to help our rural school systems? I feel that if we have just one division board ruling all of Saskatchewan Education system the rural communities will not be able to survive. What is going to happen to the rural teachers? I can see lots of cuts in the future and many rural communities there is already combined grades, which is not helping the future of children's Education. Right now our School Divisions are struggling to help the growing needs of our children but they seem to work around the budgets and help provide the needs for our children. If the divisions amalgamate we will lose resources and special services that every community needs to fit the diversity of our children. If the amalgamations are for financial reasons, it hasn't been established very well in the report on why and how this is going to help our Education system. I'm very worried if this almagation follows through, our Education System is going to be centralized on city Schools and how to benefit the Government instead of looking at the Education of our children. This isn't going to be a postive change please give me more information on how this would make our province give the Best Education System to help the diversity of our children.

Please consider carefully the cutbacks and reorganization of school divisions. Our children are far too important to use schools as a political pawn.

Hello to Whom it May Concern: I have a unique view as I am a parent, SCC Member, and EA sub, as my position was cut in June due to cuts in the system. It saddens me to think of yet another set of changes for our teachers, staff and most importantly students, to go through. I understand that we are going through a hard financial time, but am thinking of all the repercussions that more changes and drains will make on the system. I think of all the students I used to spend time with daily, I wonder if some of them are getting any attention, as EA's are stretched very thin these days. Only students with severe issues get to have time with an EA. The kids who need help with ELA or Math are falling through the cracks. Without help now, these confused elementary students become even more confused middle years students, the ones who start turning to street drugs and go down the inevitable road to become troubled teens and adults who have issues in all aspects of life. It is sad, as it is predictable, and I feel, completely avoidable. I wish we could spend our hard earned tax dollars in the direction of these students and not on more expensive changes. These kids are our future, if we are not going to invest in their education, where will our future be? I attended a telephone conference this fall about a hopeful province wide system that all would use to keep track of grades and all education info. I remember seeing, for a brief few seconds, a picture of our province split into 5 school divisions. I felt change coming at that moment, and when this all come up, I knew the decision was more than likely made already. I hope you reconsider deleting all of our school boards. Changes may need to be made, but please take some real time and consider all the options you have, our future depends on it! Thanks for your time,

To whom it may concern: I as a parent have reviewed information available to the public and find that the 3 options presented are over simplified and may in fact be misleading. I believe reducing the school division would severely affect the education of rural students. Our population is Saskatchewan is less than BC and Alberta but the education still needs to cover the same distance. By increase division sizes individual schools will lose their voice on boards. The amalgamation that has already occurred (2006) created a lot stress, and loss community needs and interest. CONCERNS: 1) Provincial model and 2) Regional Model 3) Division Model. Rural schools would loss there voice based on population. Who would be a contact when concerns arise; and how quickly will feedback occur? What are the financial costs; what are the educational costs on Saskatchewan students? Loss of community voice. Elected board members are required for rural schools. If appointed boards occur how will individual communities be dealt with in compared to large centers? This needs further development and exploration. The opening letter in the education governance review report indicates there was unanimous support for elected boards and no more amalgamation. So why then do all the options indicate removal of boards and amalgamation? In closing, the question foremost for me, how any of the 3 proposed options will enhance the learning standard that our children currently enjoy? It appears there needs to be an additional option that has no change to elected boards and no change to public school division. Sincerely,

Dear Panel Members: I have had the opportunity to speak to parents and colleagues about the proposed changes in the education sector. I am not satisfied that any of the options our government outlined are being considered for the right reasons. It is my belief that "transformational change" is really "detrimental financial measures." It seems the impetus behind this is purely financial, and absolute control; that these proposed changes are not actually in the best interest of Saskatchewan students. If I'm not mistaken, it was only a few years ago that the Saskatchewan Party touted our youth and our students as Saskatchewan's greatest resource. Now, what is best for their education and futures is to be taken from parents and voters through appointed boards of education. Mr. Wall has continually based his platforms on "keeping Saskatchewan strong" but now when times are tough, his solutions lack the foresight to preserve what's in the best interest of students. Education should be a collaborative process in which the community envelopes and supports the success of our children. Removing local and parental input in favour of government controlled decision making is wrong. As a concerned Saskatchewan citizen and voter I urge you to have the wherewithal to stop the disruption in education and leave it to the professionals and elected trustees to do their jobs. Our kids are our greatest resource - they deserve for our decision making to be grounded in their best interest, not to be dismissed and used as a pawn in a political strategy to gain even more control of the Saskatchewan tax payers. Sincerely,

To Whom it May concern, I understand the government is considering the amalgamation of school divisions throughout the province to one large division. I support North East School Division. School boards should be elected locally. I believe with one larger division children will get lost in the system. It will become about more about politics and less about quality of education.

As the organization SHBE is the "voice" of the many, many homeschool families in Saskatchewan, I see it as vitally important that they be given an active participation in these decisions being made in our province. Thank you.

Honourable Don Morgan, Saskatchewan Education Ministry and Saskatchewan Party: After reading the Educational Governance Review Report and attending a local meeting regarding the potential impacts of this report I must say that I am greatly disappointed in the direction education in this province appears to be heading. The first area of concern comes from the time frame that this study was compiled in. From the announcement on Nov. 15 2016 to receiving the report on Dec. 10 2016 does not appear to give appropriate time for a comprehensive review to be completed. In comparison, the study on the amalgamation of health regions took 8 months to complete. Mr. Perrins noted 4 shifts in governance (Strategic Direction Accountability, Effectiveness, Efficiency and Equity) that should occur in the system as a whole regardless of any structuring change. These are excellent points that I agree with. However, the 4 changes regarding school divisions are ridiculous at best. The savings that would result from these changes would be minimal in the overall scheme of the budget. The cost of governance currently is \$11.3 million (0.6%) of a \$2.2 billion education budget. This equates to 0.08% of the overall \$14 billion provincial budget. We all know that there would not be immediate savings from any changes in divisions. Following the last amalgamations in 2006, administrative changes took up to 3 years to complete. For any real savings, there would need to be school closures which we foresee with the proposals. Living in a rural setting this is highly disturbing. We do not need our students riding buses in excess of 1 hour each way in order to get to school. Lots of rural schools are already full and adding to the student population (by closing surrounding schools) will require school expansions (much more costly than the \$11 million savings for cutting divisions). There is not a 1 size fits all solution. Each division is diverse and has their own unique cultures, needs and requirements that is different from others. Mr. Perrins also makes reference to appointed board members. School boards need to be removed from government, not part of it. Having appointed boards will also remove any voice that the community currently has. Our board members care for our schools, a government appointed member will have the governments goals in mind, not the communities. If we (Lumsden) would become part of a division that would include Regina city, how much voice would our school have (500 students) in comparison to Regina who have 21,000 students. Why was there never any public town hall meetings with the people directly affected by potential changes, not just an email address to write? It appears that the decision has already been made and you are making yourselves feel better by 'giving us a say' without having to face us directly. What is going to happen to places like Ile-a-la-Cross (who were excluded from the prior amalgamation), Hutterite schools, Lloydminster (Alberta side follows our curriculum), Creighton (follows Manitoba) and religious schools like Regina Christian (who follow Regina's curriculum but are a faith-based school)? Why are no separate or faith-based school divisions being attacked in this? Why wouldn't you implement the 4 governance changes that Mr. Perrins referred to and leave the division sizes alone. Surely we can find substantial savings in this alone. There are school divisions that are excelling in this (Prairie Valley being one), why don't you use these as a model for other divisions? Why in this age are the information systems different between districts. Surely a student should be able to transfer their marks smoothly between Saskatoon and Regina. Amalgamation of IT, finance and bulk purchases could generate cost savings. Just please don't copy the federal implementation of Shared Services Canada and the Phoenix pay system. The single most disturbing element about this report is that there is no mention of the students. They are the ones that are going to suffer should any of this come to life. There is only concern of saving money. We already suffered a \$9.7 million funding reduction in 2012 for our school division. Despite being financially attacked Prairie Valley continues to be one of the top divisions in the province and we are proud of that! Not to mention, their board has maintained a balanced (sometimes even a surplus) budget for the passed 9 consecutive years while focusing on the students needs and interests. Politics is banging on the door of the classroom and is going to affect student learning!! How much is it worth to see our kids' education go down the drain? A lack of education will only increase the future costs of health care, welfare, social programs and law enforcement.

Dear Minister Morgan: I am writing as a concerned parent and a member of our SCC _____ I strongly support our elected boards and believe they are the best way to represent our students. Our board provides a local voice and representation for our local taxes. We do believe that having government appointed trustees would be in the best interest of our children and schools. Forced amalgamation will disrupt our students and their learning. Our school divisions are large enough to run efficiently and we believe the additional amalgamation will not create cost savings. We are concerned about the impact of amalgamation on rural schools, vulnerable students, quality education, etc. We trust that our school division will continue to find efficiencies that will not detract from the quality of education our children receive and that they will have our children's best interests as a priority. Our children should be viewed as an investment in the future of Saskatchewan, not a way to save money. Amalgamating school divisions does not benefit them or their educational needs. As the Minister responsible for education, we strongly urge you to oppose the amalgamation to our school divisions and oppose government school boards. Sincerely, _____

Our SCC unanimously supports our elected boards and believe they are the best way to represent our students. Our school board provides local voice and representation for our local taxes. We do not believe that having government appointed trustees would be in the best interests of our children or our school. Forced amalgamation will disrupt our students and their learning. Our school divisions are large enough to run efficiently and we believe that additional amalgamation will not create cost savings. We are concerned about the impact of amalgamation on (rural schools, vulnerable students, quality education, etc.). We trust that our school division will continue to find efficiencies that will not detract from the quality of education our children receive. To our students, and that they will have our children's interests as a priority. Our children should be viewed as an investment in the future of Saskatchewan, not a way to save money. Amalgamating school divisions does not benefit them or their educational needs. As the Minister responsible for education, we strongly urge you to oppose the amalgamation of our school divisions and oppose government appointed school boards. Sincerely,

We are not catholic but value immensely our children's education. As the rest of our family is religious the exposure that the kids get at their school is rather informative and broadens their life's possible choices. We have had experience with Alberta rural public schools which had a limited budget, Homeschooling, Alberta Catholic system in a larger city with a larger budget and now the Saskatchewan Public and Saskatchewan Catholic systems. In the Alberta rural school, which my son felt and saw as a family since he grew up in it - he was crushed by a teacher who had moved into the community.

They refused to use any helpful teaching forms or methods - I am forever grateful to the teachers and aides who cared for him who did fight for his education there. We pulled him and took him to a different public school where he thrived - however I had had to immensely homeschool him to bring him up to speed to make up for what he had lacked in teaching beforehand. We moved to Alberta and became involved with the Catholic school system there. It was WONDERFUL and the experience was immensely positive.

My son, had the choice of a public school or a catholic school and he flat out refused to go back to the public school system. He felt it had failed him. He is loving the SK catholic school he is with. I firmly believe that the skills they have and the training that they have with his learning issues have helped him succeed.

He sees it as a family and feels that there is minimal bullying and that his teachers have his back if they need it. He has not had a lot of exposure to other ethnic races and aboriginal people, however our family does not encourage racism and he is relatively colorblind and accepting of other cultures and practices. He likes the diverseness that the school offers and we plan on transferring our girls next year to his school. He believes in being involved with the school and tries to be as much as possible. As well as being involved in the community as much as possible. I strongly believe that if it wasn't for this support he wouldn't have dealt with the changes this past year as well as he has if it wasn't for them. I can tell you that due to lack of funding the SK was BEHIND the AB schools in curriculum. This I feel is largely due to the fact that schools have huge amounts of populations who do not pay taxes and they are already struggling with being largely underfunded. I beg of you - do not destroy the children's chances at succeeding in life by taking yet more away from our schools. Be it Catholic or Public. I do know that he would have never received the help at the public school as he has at his catholic one.

I am thrilled to hear that the Minister has made a commitment to continued publicly funded Catholic education in the province as it would be beyond foolish to cripple Saskatchewan's future as a leader by depriving our children of what they need in order to compete with those from other provinces when they go onto secondary schooling or looking for jobs in the workforce. I do know that the skills that the Catholic school offers allow many of the first nation and metis students to succeed and give them the stepping stones to overcome hurdles and issues in life that they are already facing. I realize that this differs from past history as I have worked on residential school issues in the past and understand this history better than most - however the schools in these times are different and I believe that they now offer a far better, nurturing system that many of the children badly need. Thank you for accepting my feedback.

In response to your request for comments it has been noted that proposals put forward do not once take home based education into account. As a parent and the primary responsibility holder for my children's education. I ask that home based education in Saskatchewan be included in any future discussions chiefly that: 1) That SHBE and HSLDA be counted as stakeholders in these discussions; 2) That the Province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students; and 3) That any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators.

Saskatchewan

We request that home educating parents be part of any stakeholder groups such as the proposed provincial advisory board to the Minister of Education. We feel there is a great benefit in hearing our voices along with public, Catholic, First Nations and Metis, and Francophone students. We request that SHBE and HSLDA represent home educating parents as part of any stakeholder groups such as the proposed provincial advisory board to the Minister of Education. We request that home educators register with one province-wide registering authority, and that SHBE have input into the selection of that registering authority. Additionally, SHBE suggests the province allow SHBE to approve the ministry's choice, or to have the ministry choose from a list of nominees provided by SHBE. We request that there be a re-evaluation of home education funding in Saskatchewan with the purpose of ensuring that funding be directed toward home educating families. We request that SHBE and HSLDA be involved in the re-evaluation. In summary: 1) We ask that SHBE be counted as stakeholder in these discussions, 2) We ask that the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students, and 3) We ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators. Thank you for your consideration.

We request that home educating parents be part of any stakeholder groups such as the proposed provincial advisory board to the Minister of Education. We feel there is a great benefit in hearing our voices along with public, Catholic, First Nations and Metis, and Francophone students. We request that Saskatchewan Home Based Educator (SHBE) and Home School Legal Defense Association (HSLDA) represent home educating parents as part of any stakeholder groups such as the proposed provincial advisory board to the Minister of Education. We request that home educators register with one province-wide registering authority (as opposed to the current local school divisions), and that SHBE have input into the selection of that registering authority. Additionally, SHBE suggests the province allow SHBE to approve the ministry's choice, or to have the ministry choose from a list of nominees provided by SHBE. We request that there be a re-evaluation of home education funding in Saskatchewan with the purpose of ensuring that funding be directed toward home educating families. We request that SHBE and HSLDA be involved in the re-evaluation. Currently, thousands of dollars in funding is given to the local school division for each home educated student. We receive in PSSD a paltry \$200 per year towards supplies. The rest of that money goes into the public pot and is used for other children who attend public schools. This does not seem right. There needs to be accountability for that money and if it isn't being used for the designated home educated children, then PSSD shouldn't be receiving it.

I would strongly prefer that we keep rural school divisions/boards as they are, separate. An amalgamation of school divisions would be disruptive to staff and communities, which in the end its the children who suffer. Possibly loss of teachers and programs. Which means larger class numbers, and decreased opportunities. Having our board members voted for is much better for our small communities. They live rurally and understand the challenges of small towns and education. Plus it gives us a voice to be heard. I believe don't change what is working. Our children have been very fortunate with the boards decisions, the teachers, programs and opportunities as it is. My vote is no amalgamation. No appointed board members. If rural communities are doing good financially, then fix where they aren't. Don't add us to the problem.

I have worked as an Educational Assistant for the past _____ years . Our 3 sons graduated from a small town school. I value the idea of knowing the students and staff and the members of the board that come to visit our school. I have seen the many cutbacks throughout some schools and have always said we need these people coming into our schools to see what is needed to see some of these students succeed. This is what we all want for each and every student...success. I don't believe this will happen if we join these school divisions into one. Bigger is not better. We need these members involved in every school and I can't see this happening. I appreciate that I had a chance to voice my concern and I hope many others also have taken the time to show concern for our children.

Dear Government of Saskatchewan, In response to the "Educational Governance Review Report". As a concerned parent I do not agree with the thought of having appointed Board members as we currently live in a democracy and feel the our will be lost. The government members are elected not appointed as the voice of the people from their constituencies. Appointed members may not be acting in the best interest of families. May be more pro to government thoughts. Rather than proceeding with any of the options listed in the report I feel that some of the of the school divisions are large enough or too large to provide support to the children already. There are some further amalgamations the province should consider. Existing School Division should look for efficiencies in ways to save money province wide. This would involve sharing of best practices, province wide buying power for school supplies, technology, etc. Changing governance or major amalgamations as outlined in the report are disruptive to staff/students, very time consuming and come at a cost. Thanks you your time. Sincerely, A concerned parent

We are writing to express our concerns with the potential amalgamation of school divisions within our province. Our four children attend a school in _____ with a student population of 140 students in kindergarten through to grade 12. We have already been subject to one restructuring where fewer school divisions were created. At that time, we witnessed funding from our region be redirected to larger centres. We are a small school and small schools always get the least attention. Since the last amalgamation, two schools in our area were closed and another was changed so that students are bused to another school once they reach grade 9. Our RM is a wealthier RM in our school division and our school tax levy, in addition to that collected by other communities that have students attending our school, far exceeds what our school needs to operate yet we do not even have enough text books for each student to have their own. Obviously the money is ending up in other schools in our division. When the two of us voted for the Sask Party in the last election, we would never have believed that this party would try to rectify their deficit by first targeting health care and then targeting education as a solution for dealing with a budget shortfall. Nor did we vote for a Party that would choose to appoint school board trustees and remove the local voice and representation from elected members. The best way to keep your appointment as a trustee by the government is to do whatever is asked of you. That means, they have no reason to persevere with an issue presented by a community if it is not a priority of the Ministry of Education. One thing that the two of us have realized is that we have no reason to trust the values, nor priorities of the Saskatchewan Party when they are so quickly willing to make changes of such great importance. We stress the importance of leaving the school divisions as they are, as well as continuing to have trustees elected by the people of Saskatchewan, but we also encourage you to evaluate the use of tax dollars by each school division to identify waste and inefficiency. We hope that you respect the voting public and hear what we have to say.

Agree there is a need for development of operational efficiencies similar to 3S Health. Option 1 - not the best option. Concerned that option 1 would mean a different system between public and separate school divisions. Also uncomfortable with reduced communication between board and community. Option 2 - consider this to be the best option of the four. Equity between public and separate may still be different but may still lead to greater collaboration and alignment. Also, communities and board communication is enhanced from option 1. Option 3A and 3B - seem to be no better than the existing and the risk the system will divert back to less collaboration and not thinking and acting as one is too great. It is however the least disruptive to student outcomes. Whatever option is chosen: 1. Operational efficiencies are required similar to 3S Health 2. Suggest considering a board(s) that are a combination of elected and appointed officials. 3. First Nations and Métis representation is key as is work on reconciliation. 4. Continued work of ESSP is critical 5. Student centered is and should be considered the most important in implementation of any plan. As follow up to previous comments, I would like to see a revision or review of student to teacher ratio by grade. My children are in elementary, K-8, both have had tutors for several years. From my discussions with other parents in other schools this is quite common and becoming an expectation to put your child through tutoring. Why is that? I don't think it is The teachers are not good. My daughter is in a class of 29 this year and she is in grade 4. She has a brilliant teacher who is amazing. with 29 students there is hardly even space for the kids to sit and yet my daughter has grown and learned so much. Imagine how far she would be if the class size was more manageable for the teacher? Would I even need to be spending \$500 a month on tutoring? I also don't agree that teacher aides are the answer. Teacher aides do not have the training and support needed to provide support for kids with learning disabilities. I was one 20 years ago and I've looked at their curriculum and training. They are not the answer. Managed class sizes are. Teachers also spend too much time on administration work. Over the last two years unfortunately I have seen more put on the teachers as the administration staff are also overwhelmed with reporting. This needs to be reviewed and managed better.

Dear Government of Saskatchewan, In response to the "Educational Governance Review Report" _____ School Community Council _____ supports the view of the submission being made the Board of Education from Prairie Valley School Division. The SCC does not agree with the thought of having appointed Board members as we currently live in a democracy and feel the our will be lost. The government members are elected not appointed as the voice of the people from their constituencies. Appointed members may not be acting in the best interest of families. May be more pro to government thoughts. Rather than proceeding with any of the options listed in the report _____ CC feels most of the school divisions are large enough to provide support to the children already. There are some further amalgamations the province should consider. Existing School Division should look for efficiencies in ways to save money province wide. This would involve sharing of best practices, province wide buying power for school supplies, technology, etc. Changing governance or major amalgamations as outlined in the report are disruptive to staff/students, very time consuming and come at a cost. Prairie Valley could be consulted to see how they have a significant amount of money for the efficiencies they used. Prairie Valley School Division is at an optimal size already and is already seeing high outcomes for graduation rates, reading levels, math levels, etc. Thanks you your time. Sincerely, _____ School Community Council Members

I am not in favour of altering our present organization of Prairie Valley School Division without some public discussion and thoughtful input and consideration by the general public. My and my family's opinion at this time is that the current operation of the PVSD is satisfactory, and while there may be some opportunity to improve with some amalgamation, there has already been some significant investment by the public in establishing a functioning system. I would vote for "no change" for the present.

Greetings. My name is _____ and I am both an educator and a parent of the Saskatchewan education system. As a proponent of youth and as a parent it have been deeply saddened by the narrow focus on what transformational change in education. While I agree that change is needed, I do not feel that fewer divisions and appointed boards will attain the change that is needed. Do you realize that in the current system that the school is the catch all of society? We parent, we get kids medical attention, we open the door to mental health, we advocate, we cloth, we feed and we work with parents to develop their skill sets. Oh, yeah, and when kids are ready to learn, we teach the curriculum. In Lloydminster, we are fortunate to have a local Board who understand and support what we do for our community. I do not feel that this would be the same if my board was in North Battleford, Saskatoon, Regina or anywhere else. if you do not know the kids or the context it is difficult to understand the situations faced in school. As a parent, if you decide to change our context in Lloydminster, I may lose my voice in my children's education. As you may know, Lloyd straddles both Alberta and Saskatchewan. As an Alberta resident I currently have voice as our city acts as a whole. I have an MLA who represents me in Alberta, an ELECTED board that is accessible to me and a division I can access. If we move away from this current model, as an Alberta resident, where will I have voice? Will I be one of 20,000 residents in the 5th largest city in Saskatchewan who has no voice in one of the most important of areas? This is hardly democratic! All we are asking for is the same rights as other parents in the province, a say in our child's education. This can only be accomplished with the Lloyd Public not amalgamating and with an elected board. I encourage the government to continue to work on change to the education system . I hope that the changes are child centered and not knee jerk reactions to poor economic planning. Concerns on governance can be met through legislation. Hold Boards accountable for spending and achievement. Work with the boards to support the children in the Saskatchewan education system.

After reading your proposals I can see no way in which this will improve the state of our children's education. I do believe these proposals will only hurt the viability of our community. In other words the town of grand coulee would cease to prosper. If this were to happen I certainly would not vote for this govt for another 4 years of placing the burden of mismanagement of govt funds on the backs of hard working citizens in this town and province. We moved out here so our son could experience a safe community and quality education while growing up. My wife also grew up in the town of grand coulee like many of the residents here who have also moved back here for the same reasons. Many of these residents have flat out said they will leave the community and possibly the province if your proposals were put in place which could result in the closure of our schools. I personally feel that your government is ignoring all of small town Saskatchewan when it comes to issues such as these. It's time to put our children and the people of our community first, not CFL football teams,not rich land owners and not politicians lining their own pockets. Its time to do the right thing for our children and that means not putting dollar signs and decimals first when it comes to the well being of our community.

My family and I stand behind our school community and school division in this time of proposed change. We agree that it is of the UTMOST importance to keep our school board locally elected, and to keep any and all decisions close to our rural community. We absolutely do NOT support any further amalgamations or changes to our subdivision boundaries. These are very concerning proposals to our family, our school community, and our school division. We believe that we are in a perfectly sized school division that benefits us with it's programs and services. I personally sit on our school community council and find it very rewarding to not only have a voice, but to have a voice that is HEARD. I very much appreciate our elected trustee, Janet Kotylak, coming out to most of our SCC meetings, getting to know us, hearing our concerns, answering our questions, and representing us at the Board level. I fear if the school division is any larger, our important and unique rural voice will sadly lose it's representation. Thank you for reading, and thank you for considering our VOICE regarding this extremely important matter.

These options are just intended to remedy an already underfunded system. You are not going to have fair and proper representation by consolidating into one or four or restructuring what is already in place. What I do know right now is what we have in place works and it works well for our community, their is always room for improvement, no system is perfect. Our school board does what it can with what it is given with the best interest of the kids. I like that fact that we get to vote in trustees that represent our School Board who know our community and what works for it.

Dear Honourable Brad Wall, elected officials and the Education Consultative Committee: I am writing with concerns over the proposed changes suggested by Mr. Dan Perrins in his Educational Governance Review Report. While I appreciate that our government and the residents of Saskatchewan are facing challenging financial times and there are difficult decisions to be made, I urge you all to consider the long term consequences to not only our children, but all rural communities should broad spectrum amalgamation take place. As stated on Page 22 of Mr. Perrins' report the role of the board of education is to "determine program and service levels to respond to community needs and interests." With further amalgamations of our school divisions, the board of education will be further out of touch and in fact work against community needs and interests. I am concerned that with further amalgamations, many rural schools will close. The legislated rural closure threshold of 51 students needs to be maintained. Further school closures would result in more children being transported on Saskatchewan highways and grid road systems. This extra travel is unnecessary and could be avoided. Interestingly, in Mr. Perrins report on page 22, he states that "during the transition period, a focus on restructuring may compromise the focus on student outcomes in the Plan for Growth and ESSP". This is not acceptable, failing our children to save money is unacceptable, these are our future lawmakers, healthcare providers, etc. I do not want my children to fall through the cracks during this "transition period". As noted in Mr. Perrins report the transition in 2006 took approximately 5 years. That is the entirety of my nieces remaining primary education and a large portion of my nephews'. Mr. Perrins reported that with one provincial school division, there would be "greater opportunity for sharing and implementing effective practices and results from one regional service area to another". There is absolutely no reason this cannot be done now, even with the current 28 school divisions. In 2017 electronic means of communication enhance the efficiency of sharing information. His opinion on this is wrong. What Mr. Perrins fails to consider is the fact that different geographic areas of our province are dealing with a variety of different situations, there are pockets of different cultures, different socio-economic status and different family circumstances that require customized approaches. Amalgamating 28 school divisions into larger school divisions will impede educators and school boards abilities to customize their approach to education. Amalgamation will not raise the performance of the students that are struggling, it will detrimentally impact the students that are meeting learning objectives. On page 23, Mr. Perrins reports that one large school division will allow for continued accountability to the community through school community councils. In many rural communities, the rural closure threshold must be maintained in order for those schools and their community councils to exist. I believe that if rural schools close, those communities will disappear. I find it interesting that Mr. Perrins reports that there would be more transparency with larger school divisions, in spite of him also stating that one large school division would result in "reduced communication between the board and community" and "the public's access to the decision makers would be reduced." Larger school divisions would be less transparent and less accountable to communities than our current 28 school division system. In summary, I want what is best for my son and my nieces and nephews. I firmly believe that Prairie Valley School Division is meeting the needs of my son, my nieces and nephew who live in _____ . I believe that having a strong support network of friends in the community and a school in the community in which we live is of the utmost importance to my children's success. We need to keep our school boards locally elected. We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. I do not support further amalgamations or further changes to our subdivision boundaries. Regardless of what decision you make, whether you choose option 1, 2, 3a or 3b from the Educational Governance Review Report, or if it is something else entirely, I respectfully request that you present your decision to the stakeholders and communities for public review and input prior to implementation or legislative changes. This would allow stakeholders the opportunity to point out any unintended consequences that may arise as a result of your decision. Sincerely,

As a teacher and parent of two children, we have many concerns regarding this report: 1) Loss of effective and accountable public voice. Each area is unique. The strength of our current division is the ability to respond to the needs of the students based on our data. 2) Unintended consequences of amalgamations and appointed boards. As a teacher AND parent, locally determined contracts are legally binding and provide supports for teachers and schools that would be devastating to the profession to lose. We want to keep teachers, and provide opportunities for them to grow as professionals. 3) Less say, control and input in your child's education. Our boards provide support for local initiatives and innovation. We have a local board that visits the schools and participates to support education and understand the needs. 4) Loss of relationships with parents, parishes and community partners. We are not the health system. Our needs are unique. Please carefully consider ways to make our education system stronger and support this critical area.

I have 5 children ages 2.5 - 12yrs of age. It is very important to my wife and I that we have local opportunity to discuss education opportunities with local governance boards. Seems to me that Option 3A: Restructuring Public School Divisions is the best option for my family and community. We believe strongly that division school trustees need to be elected and represent constituents without government partisanship.

To the members of the Advisory Panel: I would like to express my concern over the proposed changes to educational governance in Saskatchewan. I live in a small town in the north east of the province, where my three sons attend the elementary and middle schools, and I commute 60 kilometers north to work as a teacher in an elementary school in another small town. These towns, and their schools, are different in their populations and their cultures, even though they are only 60 kilometers apart, and yet they are well represented by our school division – the North East School Division – and the board that is locally elected. I do not see how these small communities would be well represented by elected or appointed representatives who are not familiar with the unique nature of each community. What is needed in this part of the province is very different from what is needed further south, or in bigger centres. Our needs are understood by our representatives, who live in our communities, and understand what it is to grow up in a farming community, or to be a First Nations family living off-reserve, or to be a family that depends on employment from a mill. If the federal government were to propose that the Prairie provinces be represented by six electoral ridings, rather than the more than 60 ridings that are currently represented in the House of Commons, the provincial governments and the citizens of these provinces would react audibly. Such is the proposition that our current 28 school divisions be reduced to one. Where is our local voice at the provincial level and how can we get what we need in each region if our communities are under-represented? I urge you to reject the proposed changes and recommend to our government that the school divisions with their representative boards are not broken and do not need to be fixed. The reason for the proposed changes is financial, not educational, and yet the financial gain at reducing the number of school boards is minimal – members of school boards receive a small honorarium and are reimbursed for their expenses – adding up to very little savings for the government. Finally, as local property tax makes up a large percentage of funding for education, it seems only right that taxpayers are given a local voice and that school boards are held accountable by those who are voted in by these same taxpayers. Thank you for taking this matter seriously and for making the right decision for small towns in Saskatchewan, as well as other centres in the province. Sincerely,

Hi: As a Lloydminster citizen, parent of children in LPSD and an educator myself, feel I am being faced with the options that do not support the educational service for the students including my own as fair and equitable. I feel this consultation process was rushed and purposely sent out over Christmas holidays - a time for students, families and school staff to spend time with their families and not think about voicing concerns. The short turn around for feedback does not allow people to engage and voice their opinions in a meaningful way. 1) Parental Concern: Moving to a provincial, regional or a divisional model by restructuring boundaries will not benefit our students - they will not have access to equitable services especially in a unique situation we have in Lloydminster, where 60% of students are Alberta residents. Being an Alberta resident, my right to access educational delivery of services for my children is removed, with options presented in the report - how is that fair. We are funded Bi-provincially - a concern for the school board if consolidated any communities outside of Lloydminster will not have access to the funds as they are to stay with AB residents, it turns into a have and have not. We have a Charter in the City that has been around and working for 84 years, moving to an appointed board rather than keeping an elected local board - they don't know the unique situation with Lloydminster being a border city of Saskatchewan and Alberta, it would not be understood well. The restrictions within the Charter, which somehow changed without knowledge of past and present school board, school division and city staff that make Lloydminster Public School Division vulnerable to amalgamation, would be difficult or impossible to provide seamless delivery of educational services across an expanded division. The charter was created to help with equality for residents regardless where they live, AB/SK, we need to preserve the status quo. This in turn would affect my children's education. It will be more difficult for myself and other AB families to advocate for our children having a centralized or Provincial school division who has no idea what is actually happening at my children's school. Being an AB resident I have no MLA to access for my children's education if considering these options and appointed school board, especially not equitable when the separate system will have a local board as they do not fall under these terms. How fair is this? 2) Educator Concern: In our community, our ELECTED school board does so much for our schools that some things wouldn't be possible without their support. They know our schools, they know their administrators and know how schools are performing. They want to be involved in ensuring their schools they govern are doing what they can to provide services for their students and provide support to improve our results. Moving to an appointed board, who knows where those members would live, would be detrimental to the services as well as opportunities we provide here in Lloydminster. Those appointed members would not have the relationships with the schools, students and staff would be just numbers, with no real interest or connection with our community. Our members of the school board, don't count for much in the budget items here in Lloydminster, if you really look at them compared to other school divisions, they are basically volunteering their time to make sure our schools, students and staff are served well. The money they get is nothing that hits our budget. In regards to budget, our board and school division have been "lean" to get better

efficiencies happening here and doing our part to save money in a variety of ways. Replacing democratically elected and accountable school boards with government appointed boards will only be accountable to the government and will not be looking at the best interest of the community they represent. As a school division, we have been making gains and growth in the Educational Sector Plan in regards to grad rates and reading - we are doing amazing things here - things we are proud of, parents are proud of and myself, being an administrator are proud of my teachers and EAs of all the blood, sweat, tears and countless hours to support our students here in Lloydminster. Consolidating schools boards or changing boundaries is not going to help the results, it will hinder and you will not see growth as educational services will be spread thinner to accommodate more schools. To provide equitable services in our city, they developed a municipal levy, which is embedded in our Lloydminster Charter - this allows services such a Pre-K and transportation to be accessed equally, regardless of where a student lives or school they attend. Pre-K had only so much funding but so important in helping our results in reading, writing all the way to graduation rates, we know from research that earlier children are exposed to literacy the more success they will have. Our board believes this and funds the extra money to allow our city to have more Pre-K classes - will an appointed board have the same view about our city? Parental or educational concern, we have some amazing services/programs for our students that can be accessed easily and efficiently and moving to an expanded school division, we would not be able to maintain these services/programs. All these have been made possible because of our local ELECTED school board. I feel very fortunate to have a supportive director, superintendents and school board, that know me as a person and value what I do in my school. They know my students, my staff and most importantly what is happening in our school. Being fairly new in this position, I can phone and talk with my senior division staff and they can support me and provide advice, because they know the school, the dynamics, students and staff - moving to an expanded school division, that support would be lost, success in buildings would not happen, you would just be another person under them, another school they need to govern - the relationship, personal connection and genuine support for my school would be gone. They are such a valuable resource to have as an administrator, that would be greatly missed. They stop into the school regularly to converse with staff and students - how would that be possible with an amalgamation. I think to myself, reading the report, what is the real goal in the review - it is very unclear. The restructuring, will it really help with the real problem Saskatchewan is facing - improving the delivery and quality of education to our children, my children, my family and my community of Lloydminster - no it will not. They are just looking at cost savings, which these options it will be detrimental to the education system not improving it. The report shows no real way of saving any cost. Please consider relooking at these options, will they actually help education and look at the unique situation that faces Lloydminster - there will be inequality amongst services moving to these options for our city. Thank you for listening to my concerns,

I have reviewed the options presented in the report and find none to be plausible. I agree with the need to consolidate some aspects, such as board and administration remuneration, resource allocation and some HR functions. However I feel the interests and needs of our rural and remote areas will further deteriorate if any of these options are carried out. We already see the disadvantages of a division covering a large geographic area at Living Sky. For example, bus routes are planned by someone 200 kms away who has never traveled the routes and has therefore no frame of reference for road conditions. This severely compromises the safety of our students. In other cases, students requiring speech therapy services have waited half a year to even be assessed due to the work load of the divisional therapist. This is unacceptable and I fear that the situation would only worsen as our smaller schools would be left by the wayside and have virtually no way to advocate for the needs of our future generations. Thank you for the opportunity to participate.

As with many other sectors in our province, I feel that the Sask Party would like to privatize education. I feel that the amalgamation of school boards is moving the education sector one step closer to privatization. Education is a long term investment and the education of our children and youth is far more important than the bottom line.

I do not support any of the models represented in the report. I do not think the electorate has received budgetary evidence supporting that implementing any of these models will result in significant savings, nor have I seen any evidence that amalgamation and governance changes will not result in poorer education for our children. Our students should come first and there have been no studies done to my knowledge on how these changes may impact the students and the communities. These are potentially huge changes which need to be thoroughly reviewed before being implemented. If there are significant savings the public needs to see where and how much, and what impact this may have on students. Only then can we evaluate whether or not these changes are good for our province. I feel as though the Government of Saskatchewan is rushing this process and jumping the gun without doing it's due diligence to see whether or not this is actually a good change for our province.

I totally disagree with the changes proposed. I am amazed that the government would even consider taking away locally elected boards. It is the same as if the federal government would take away our provincially elected government. What's next, no more city mayors, no more R.Ms? If you are looking to save money than you need only look at how the people running the divisions are spending the money. Just in our division alone money is being poured down the drain on consultants for students with learning disabilities. These children need the support right in the school and not from someone who comes out from Saskatoon to Humboldt and spends 15mins. with a student and then expects to know how to help that student. Those resources would be much better spent by putting an education assistant in every classroom to help these and all students who just need a little extra nudge. Our teachers would be less stressed and be more able to take time for the students that desperately need a strong education base in order to survive in the future work force. The last report that I heard, I believe on Global news, was that Saskatchewan education is rated very low if not the lowest in the country. I believe it is because we have strayed so far from the basics and from the things that were working just for the sake of doing something different. I have also personally experienced teachers who go above and beyond to do everything they can for their students but very little if any support from their divisions. On the other end of the spectrum, there are teachers who need to be made accountable for the bare minimum of effort that they put into teaching. This too is a major drain on resources when other teachers have to pick up the slack of others. The only way there can be proper monitoring of these types of problems is to have local eyes keeping things in check just like the provincial governments keep care of their own.

Good evening: I felt compelled to write today because I am very concerned about the proposed options for Saskatchewan School Boards. As a resident of Lloydminster, AB, I am in a unique situation. In Lloydminster, the Lloydminster Public School Division serves students from both Alberta and Saskatchewan. I am concerned that it will be difficult to ensure that students will receive equitable service, regardless of which province they live in, or which school they attend, as a significant number of our student population lives in Alberta, but is serviced by a Saskatchewan school division. Lloydminster is in a unique location, because it is funded by both provinces. In order to provide equitable service, the City of Lloydminster established a municipal levy, which is embedded in the Lloydminster Charter. This allows the Lloydminster Public School Division (LPSD) to ensure services such as pre-kindergarten and transportation are delivered equitably regardless of which province our students live in or which school they attend. Due to the restrictions within the Charter, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to provide a seamless delivery of services across an expanded division. Approximately 60% of our funding I believe comes from the Alberta government, rather than the Saskatchewan Government. I'm concerned that if Alberta citizens of Lloydminster send their children to the Catholic division, that they will have access to a locally elected board of education, whereas others who send students to the Public division will not have the same ability to have their voices heard. As citizens of Alberta, we have no ability to influence the direction of students' education from a governmental perspective, as we are not able to vote in Saskatchewan provincial elections. The only way in which we, as Alberta residents, can affect change, and have a voice in our school divisions is via conversations with our local board. This is a unique situation that does not exist anywhere else in the province of Saskatchewan. Our Board of Education believes that the challenges identified in the Educational Governance Review Report can all be met effectively through amendments to legislation, regulations and policy. It would be considerably less disruptive to continue with elected boards working under new mandates, regulations, and expectations. Thank you for reading my thoughts, and for doing what you can to help our unique situation in the city of Lloydminster continue to deliver education that is seamless, and fair to residents regardless of the side of the city on which we reside. Sincerely,

To Whom it May Concern: There are several parts of the Perrin Report that I find troubling. First of all, I think it is important that if changes must be made, then they should be made for all school divisions in the province and that city and separate divisions should not be exempt from proposed changes. Secondly, I am concerned that appointed school board members may have very little knowledge or concern for the students in our school division, and I believe in a democratic society where the wants of the community members are reflected in the officials they elect, and not by appointed members. Third, ours is already one of the most efficient and effective school divisions in the province, with graduation rates that exceed the provincial average while maintaining a low student teacher ratio. It will be interesting to see if this can continue considering our diverse classrooms and the loss of approximately sixty EA positions in our division last year. Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, there is no evidence that the proposed changes are going to be cost effective! A government that would make changes to make school divisions more efficient without any proof that it will work, thus jeopardizing student success, is a government that will not be getting my vote in the next provincial election. It is my fervent wish that you continue to search for different, proven solutions to make school divisions more effective and efficient. Regards,

It is thoroughly disappointing and frustrating to hear that we even consider larger school divisions. Without a division office nearby, it is extremely difficult - even impossible - to monitor teachers and students properly. As it stands, we are facing a regression in our education systems, as we cannot even provide assistants in each classroom for the students who need it. If the problem is money, should the school divisions not reconsider what the funds are invested in? Is it not our job to ensure that every student gets equal chances at education? Even in a city, we are considered "distant rural" and do not get the resources of a larger city. Students who simply need a few minutes of assistance get none because there are not enough educational assistants or teachers. Even children with learning disabilities receive limited resources because the division will not hire more workers. If anything, we should have smaller divisions so the schools can be monitored and have money put in the optimal places for the future generation's education. The most efficient and effective way to run a workplace is to become like a community and know what is going on at all times. By making larger school divisions, any division leaders would be distancing themselves from teachers and other staff, destroying the easy communication they could otherwise have. As a future education student and a teacher of generations to come, I strongly urge you to reconsider this self-destructive plan.

Why did the report not reference the how this change will impact the students and their learning? Students are not a priority in this report!

We support a locally elected School Board. It is especially vital that the Separate School Boards maintain locally elected members.

Hi: I am writing this email in reply to the request I received from our school to join in the conversation dealing with the review of K-12 Governance Review report. Firstly, let me say that I am not quite sure what you are looking for but here it goes. My first and foremost concern is for our children/students that they receive the best possible education regardless of their location, in our urban or rural areas of the province, or whether they are in our public or separate schools. Being a person who has worked at my local school and a mother of two, I have my concerns about what our children are missing. In my own local school we have already had cuts to classes; French and Music. We have already had a teacher position in Division II cut/not filled which resulted in two classes being joined together for most of the day. This year we have two more positions that are opening up as a result of two teachers retiring, one being in Division I and the other in Division III. There has been talk, thru the grapevine, that one of these positions may not be filled in the new school year of 2017-2018 due to our declining student numbers. Because of these rumors I feel that maybe it would be best for our local school board/divisions to amalgamate together. I understand that my local school division is already huge but I feel that maybe some cuts need to be made there instead of in the local schools/classroom. For a society with so much technology available we certainly are not using it to our utmost advantage. Why does there need to be meetings that require our teachers/administration staff/support staff to travel distances. There is the technology of Skype, use it, this would eliminate so many unnecessary costs. There is also so many other little 'extra' trivial spending that could be reviewed and costs saved. I.e: wasted photocopied paper. Do we really need two secretarial positions in some of our schools? Why do we have so many people in our division office; supervisors supervising supervisors? Let's really take a good realistic look at what/who is actually needed to get the real job done. In my past I have not seen any board members in our school except for this year, which leads to a question, what do they actually do? I fear that if we continue to cut teacher/support staff positions because of the monies that are not available our children/students are the ones who will suffer. We cannot afford to cut any more positions in our schools, this will only have our students less prepared for post-secondary education and the world. Thank you and I hope this helps with your decisions. Sincerely,

We think it is extremely important that there continues to be an elected local Board to guide and advocate for education in our community .

We request that home educating parents be part of any stakeholder groups such as the proposed provincial advisory board to the Minister of Education. We feel there is a great benefit in hearing our voices along with public, Catholic, First Nations and Metis, and Francophone students. We request that SHBE and HSLDA represent home educating parents as part of any stakeholder groups such as the proposed provincial advisory board to the Minister of Education. We request that home educators register with one province-wide registering authority, and that SHBE have input into the selection of that registering authority. Additionally, SHBE suggests the province allow SHBE to approve the ministry's choice, or to have the ministry choose from a list of nominees provided by SHBE. We request that there be a re-evaluation of home education funding in Saskatchewan with the purpose of ensuring that funding be directed toward home educating families. We request that SHBE and HSLDA be involved in the re-evaluation.

I would like to see that Board Members continue to be elected and not appointed. I would also like a focus on improving the quality of education. Studies show that we are lagging behind the rest of Canada.

To Whom It May Concern: I attended an information meeting this week regarding the recent Educational Governance Review Report; specifically on how it will affect our unusual city of Lloydminster. I live in Alberta and have had children in the LPSD school system for the last 16 years and should have for another 4 years. In Lloydminster, we recognize the difficulties that arise with government needing to provide legislation for our city on the border of two provinces, and we have been very pleased at the process that has worked for the last number of decades that has allowed a seamless education for approximately 4000 students every year. Out school board and directors have been able to ensure that students receive equitable service regardless of which side of the border they live on or which school that they attend in this division. There has been a levy in place embedded in the Lloydminster Charter that allows LPSD to ensure services such as Pre-K and transportation to be delivered equitably, again regardless of which province these students live in or which school they attend. This will no longer remain equitable with the proposed changes. The proposed governance options are also concerning. The provincial model will result in a board of education likely hundreds of miles away servicing over 600 schools including our 6 Alberta schools. There would be little awareness of the differences of needs, issues, and benefits of different areas. There could not be an expedient way to address concerns from someone without the background to the situation, so far away. As well am I greatly concerned to have someone appointed to then look after those needs that he or she knows and cares little about. When considering the Regional or Division Models, it is clear that the restrictions indicated within the Charter would make it very difficult, if not impossible, to continue to provide a seamless or equitable delivery of service across an expanded division. The Board of Education for the LPSD believe that challenges that were identified in the Educational Governance Review Report can all be met effectively through amendments to legislation, regulations and policy. This would be far less disruptive to students and staff, as well as allowing the present elected boards to work under new mandates, regulations and expectations. This would seem to cost less money than the proposed changes that also did not seem to substantiate the savings initially argued to be saved in this report. I am thankful that there is an opportunity for my opinions and concerns to be voiced and trust that they will be regarded seriously. Sincerely,

Locally elected boards matter. Our province is very diverse and we need to continue to ensure that locally elected people continue to steer locally delivered education in our province. Decisions and priorities are set by a locally elected board. It is simply not acceptable to take away that voice for the sake of cost savings. The negative long term costs would outweigh any monetary gains. Education cannot be run a like a business, My school board (Regina Catholic) has worked hard over the years to ensure that money is spend efficiently and effectively. They attained 1.2 million in efficiencies this school year alone. All the while, ensuring that the students and teachers have the most up to date technologies to prepare our students for the future. They have done their part to work within established budgets and should be commended and held up as the example on how to efficiently manage resources. The disruptions that any amalgamations would bring would have a devastating impact on student achievements. The focus needs to continue to be on reading, math, writing, graduation and attendance. The "one board" model proposed has never been done for a jurisdiction this size, and there is probably a reason for that. Forced amalgamations will only distant the relationship between rate payer/parent and school board. Schools and School Boards work best when this relationship is strong and vibrant. Finally, I implore you to listen the people and who have submitted feedback for this panel. Do not dismiss their concerns or their fears. Parents, teachers, and trustees have always had the best interests of the students as the guiding light for every decision they make. The same principles stand true for this issue. Do not take away the local voice. Do not take away locally elected trustees, and do not move towards "mega-boards" when it comes to education. Sincerely,

In a time of financial struggles everyone must tighten their belts, that is understood. What I struggle with is the first place government cuts is the education and health sectors. The two sectors that have carried more than their fair share over the years. Educators have increased their work loads, if this continues I can see extra-curricular activities being cut. As the parent of now adult children, that volunteer at their school's extra-cur teams, I have heard how disillusioned they have become with government. Two of my children want to become educators, but question how the government values education. Over the last few years my children have travelled and seen the benefits of valuing educators and health professionals. As my children are now voting age they are researching and asking questions. How can government support a growing province, can they support and value those that are teaching the next generation, why should I stay in a province/country that does not value knowledge. I do not want my children to leave Saskatchewan, how can I ask them to stay when they are not valued as educators, how can the government encourage and keep quality educators. Not by cutting financial commitments and supports of education.

What better way to have our concerns voiced to the board of education than by our elected school board trustees. I am not in favor of government eliminating elected boards of education and amalgamating school divisions.

After administrating and reviewing the results of both the PISA and PCAP assessments, and seeing the Saskatchewan students were among the last ranked in our country in reading, math and science, I began to ask why our students did so poorly. Saskatchewan students are really no different from other youth across the country. Our parents are no less dedicated or interested in a good education for their children. Our teachers are no less educated or dedicated than other teachers across the country. So what was different? Well, one of the things that was different, was that we went through a major change in our system called amalgamation. The ripple effect of the last amalgamation shifted the focus from students' education (at the point of delivery including school closures) to the upper levels of administration. Although it is perceived that there will be a saving of funds, those saving are not realized instantaneously. Initially, money that will be "saved" will have to be rerouted to ironing out all of the details of a new amalgamation, not to mention any surplus going towards the incredible debt that has amassed. They certainly will not be rerouted to the classrooms/students! It has only been in very recent years that school divisions are seeing a full "settle-in" of the last amalgamation. How many more years will a new one take? And, what will be the ripple down effect for our students when this province's focus will be on the restructuring process rather than their learning! Our students and staffs deserve better than this. And, if we have any hope of bettering results for our students on the national and international stage, the focus needs to stay on them.

I support locally elected school boards.

Just as it is important in Federal and Provincial politics to have a locally elected representative to voice our opinions and concerns, it is important for us to have a locally elected school board which is available and responsible to us. The further away decisions are being made about education, the less likely these decisions are to reflect the needs of our community. Please do not dissolve the locally elected school boards. I respectfully request that you leave the locally elected school boards in place rather than appoint one provincial board. Locally elected school boards are democratic and government appointed ones are autocratic. I trust democracy more than I trust autocracy even if democracy is a bit messier and possibly more expensive. Locally elected boards are responsible to the people who elect them...us. We would have no control over appointed boards. Locally elected boards are local and accessible and aware of local conditions and needs. Appointed boards are distant and would not have as much knowledge of local needs. Studies have shown that local boards work in most cases. My fear is that the institution of one provincial board would pave the way for elimination and amalgamation of school divisions and the eventual phasing out of Catholic education.

To Whom it May Concern: I have concerns regarding the proposed changes to education. I feel that the options being explored will be extremely detrimental to the public education system in my city, Lloydminster. Firstly, I am very concerned about the idea of removing locally elected school boards and our division office out of Lloydminster. This is of particular concern to me because Lloydminster Catholic School Division will be unaffected by these changes, and will reap the benefits of people who seek local autonomy and choose to move their children to the Catholic division. I am not Catholic and I do not want to switch my children out of the Lloydminster Public School Division. You do not have to be Catholic to attend schools in LCSD, as they are very flexible in opening their doors to whoever chooses their schools so as to keep up their enrollment. Essentially, we have two public school divisions in Lloydminster, but only LPSD will be affected by the proposed changes. A second thing that concerns me is that Lloydminster is a biprovincial city and receives funding from both Alberta and Saskatchewan. I am an Alberta resident, and I want my education tax dollars to stay in Lloydminster, not in some community in Saskatchewan because of re-drawn school division boundaries. LPSD has worked to ensure that there is not a discrepancy between services provided to both Alberta and Saskatchewan side schools (things like access to bussing, etc) and I do not support any change that is not seamless for LPSD. I am shocked to hear that the Lloydminster Charter was changed without consulting education ministers. This should be looked into as it seems very unethical to me. I support the idea of exploring whether LPSD should look at moving to Alberta education jurisdiction, if it would ensure that we do not get amalgamated and have our voice lost in our city. I have read the report and I do not see clear data that would indicate that the proposals will save a lot of money; and even if it does bring some cost savings, families and the education of their children should NOT be effected in a negative way because your government did not have money set aside in case of a recession. Our children and education system should be one of the last things looked at and changed because of the importance of education in so many facets of one's life. Please do not make changes that will negatively affect LPSD. I do not support appointed school boards, and I do not support boundaries being re-drawn that will affect the seamless services my children receive in this biprovincial city. Thank you for taking the time to read this,

I am not in favour of amalgamated school divisions and eliminating elected boards of education. Locally elected boards are accountable to voters and hold the provincial government to account. This represents the needs of the students by locally elected boards within each school division.

As a parent and employee the decision to amalgamate school divisions is completely disgusting. There is absolutely no thought given to the effects this will cause for families, students, employees and communities. Mr. Perrins has openly admitted that there is unanimous support to leave the school divisions with their status quo and that their current elected trustees have things running smoothly. If school boards are amalgamated and run solely by the government then we as parents, employees and communities have absolutely no voice on how to run our divisions. Who is going to be the voice for all our kids with special needs that require special programming???? If you do this, they won't have a voice and will be shoved aside like they don't matter. Who will be the voice of all the parents of these kids when concerns are brought up about their child's education and need???? No one because their voices will fall on deaf ears of the government. By amalgamating school divisions in this province you are taking away our rights as citizens to speak and make ourselves heard about our children's education and future. As I recall we have freedom of speech in this country so what makes you think you have the God given right to take that away. Amalgamation isn't going to help the government save any money. The only thing it's going to do is take away all the resources we so desperately need for our children in this current education system. In doing so your great projections of higher graduation rates, higher attendance rates, higher literary and numerous scores etc will fall Why? Because we won't have the needed programming, resources, staff and our voices will fall on the deaf ears of Mr. Wall and his government because he has an underlying agenda and couldn't be bothered to listen to the people of this province. Mr. Morgan and Mr. Wall have no consideration for anyone in this province. The only people benefitting from this absurd and disgusting decision are the Wall government. DO NOT TAKE OUR VOICES AWAY!

an employee for the last nine years. and very thankful for my union and our collective agreement. I am extremely concerned about the recommendations/options that have been put together in such a rushed fashion. I don't see how these options and I quote..." Will focus on student success while ensuring accountability and efficient operational structures within the education system". The government gave Dan Perrins three weeks to study the amalgamations/restructuring and write his report. Why did Mr. Perrins recommend reduced school divisions and appointed trustees? There has been no meaningful public consultation, and a change of this scale has the potential for many errors. Why is the government rushing this? There's no evidence or report that states amalgamated/re-structured school boards and government appointed trustees and CEO, will save money. It will only guarantee that the parents, workers and communities have no voice. Please stop this ! The public feedback supports our existing school division boundaries and keeping our democratic process of elected school boards. Why would the government want to change this? Why was this not brought up during the elections? I love my job working with students and they are my priority every day when I go to work. Why did the report not reference how this change will impact the students and their learning? Students are not a priority in this report! This is a business model, with government appointed school boards , Communication and feedback to and from parents/communities will be negatively impacted. I love my democratic right to elect a school board trustee who will be accountable and represent my community. Elected school board trustees have a vested interest in my community, not the governments mandate. How fast can major decisions, such as school safety issues, be made if there's no local contact or voice? I am asking that you hear the deep concern in our public voices... Local democratically elected school boards are the best choice for my community. Local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities. Sincerely,

I have strong feelings that the division should stay as they are. There should continue to be elected officials to the board. I would only agree with Option 3b of adjusting the boundaries. It is strange but the more you consolidate division the less parents and teachers want to participate in governance of the division. The division are big enough as they are right now. Fuller consolidation would be a disservice and alienate parents, teachers and staff and reflect negatively toward students. If there is a need for cost saving measures they can be found within the division.

The 3A model is best for my family and community. It is very important that we have the opportunity to discuss our children's education with governance members that understand the local issues that are important in Humboldt SK and neighboring communities. We strongly believe that divisional members must be elected and not involved with government partisanship. We recognize that changes in cost funding are necessary to create a sustainable approach to our children's education but need to be focused on both grassroots and high level administration. I am not comfortable with the combining of school divisions to only a few where undoubtedly urban centres are going to wield the majority of influence. Rural communities are key for long term viability of this province. Seems that this gets often overlooked in recent decisions by government.

I support a locally elected School Board. It is especially vital that the Separate School Board maintains locally elected members.

Relationships are at the heart of education, most importantly between students, teachers and other front-line workers, and parents. However, relationships are also important between school and division office support staff, and the community as a whole. Any plan that considers making an organization larger threatens to strain relationships so that they are weakened, thus compromising the whole system. Our school division proudly touts the motto, "Every Student by Name, By Need". I don't believe this pledge would be as easy to maintain in a larger school division. For good work to be done with students on the frontline, there must be strong support and assistance from the school division office. Having professionals such as speech language pathologists, psychologists, social workers, and curriculum consultants spending more hours on the highway, trying to cover an expanded school division territory, would do nothing to enhance relationships and work with students, teachers, and parents at the school level. I do not support the size of school divisions being increased.

As a concern resident with one child attending _____ and a grandchild preparing to start I have grave concerns on the governance review and the proposed 4 options. I am not in favour of the appointed board option as the voice of each community needs to be heard in our open society. If we move in this direction it will strip every community from large to small of the basics of democracy we have built not only in this country on but in this province. Grand Coulee has seen many new families move in and is thriving over the last few years. It recently gained status as a Town. It has the potential and is poised to grow in the next while and become an even stronger community. With that said option 3 without further commitments to the protection of the rural school thresholds I feel will put our school and therefore our town in jeopardy of its sustainability. I urge the consideration of continuing legislation on the Rural School thresholds to give _____ a chance in its effort to grow stronger and not dwindle into a shrinking community without a school. Concerned,

I do not support any of the models represented in the report. I do not think the public has received budgetary evidence supporting that implementing any of these models will result in significant savings, nor have I seen any evidence that amalgamation and governance changes will not result in poorer education for our children. Our students should come first and there have been no studies done to my knowledge on how these changes may impact the students and the communities. These are potentially huge changes which need to be thoroughly reviewed before being implemented. If there are significant savings the public needs to see where and how much, and what impact this may have on students. Only then can we evaluate whether or not these changes are good for our province. I feel as though the Government of Saskatchewan is rushing this process and jumping the gun without doing it's due diligence to see whether or not this is actually a good change for our province. I also do not support having appointed school board members. The communities voice should be reflected on local school boards and communities should have input into who is making decisions impacting their children.

I am concerned about the government's recent "transformational change" message and what "transformational change" means with regards to further amalgamation of our public school divisions in the province of Saskatchewan. Transformational change is viewed as a positive move in which people feel optimistic and excited about the future state of an organization. Transformational change has continued to be the message the provincial government sends to the people of Saskatchewan along with the message that 'do unto education what you do unto health' (yet again). Have we learned anything from the amalgamation process of 2006 in which the province of Saskatchewan was promised to see huge savings by the restructuring of our education system, in rural Saskatchewan? The result was 71 school divisions reduced to 19 to include 12 geographically large school divisions. The promise was that the amalgamation would allow for administrative and government savings, improve the equity for all property tax payers and increasing the equity in educational experiences for all students. What was not taken into consideration in 2006 and what repeats itself in the present reality is that Saskatchewan people have a strong voice when it comes to local control. They want to be able to be heard and speak to those that are in power. They want the best for their children, regardless of where they live in the province. Perhaps Craig Melvin (2002), stated it best when he said that the people of Saskatchewan "want the capacity to reach out and touch those in charge." By joining 5 to 8 school divisions into one large school division in areas of the province where the geographical size is as large as some of our smaller provinces in Canada, accommodating the size of the divisions was a huge challenge. The feedback from all stakeholders (students, parents, teachers and administrators) stated that the size of the divisions was an issue and they questioned if the decision-makers had been out of touch with the people of Saskatchewan for far too long? If the feedback, then, was that the 4-hour round trips could not possibly provide the professional support the schools needed and, that the size of the divisions limited the school boards ability to connect with people in the schools, how could we possibly think that we are making the right choice now for all students in Saskatchewan? The literacy scoring, alone, should be proof enough that amalgamation of school divisions is not in the best interest of students. How can we possibly say that we are putting students first? Providing Excellence for

Every Learner? That in amalgamating, our students are being given better opportunities, across the province, to succeed? Some would say that we are in a state of crisis in which we need to recognize that we are raising illiterate citizens. Hoshin Kanri approach to health will work for education? By taking the care right out of health care? By taking the local voice of the community out of schools? By saying that students are the product and that the teachers are the machines without recognizing that we are not a Japanese Car Production Company? People have emotions, they have different learning styles, different learning needs. A cookie cutter approach to education is not going to meet the needs of every learner. What happened to the promise of a small investment now will reap huge rewards in the future? Are we truly at the point where we are putting the almighty dollar before our students? Our future leaders? Considering the diverse needs of our province? The results we are showing are not completely accurate as there are a number of citizens of the province of Saskatchewan who are not included in the data--those that did not self declare, the First Nation students who attend on-reserve schools (until they came and raised the concern of lack of consultation or inclusion). Are we really at the point where we think that in choosing even one of the options that is presented, we are going to be able to change the reality of the last amalgamation in 2006? Boards expressed how hard it was and how much time it took, in 2006 to address the issues associated with the amalgamation of school divisions, resulting in years before they felt they had built a strong culture and the structures and strategies were in place to the boards satisfaction. Our school boards, have the local voice of the communities in which they represent. It took years to get here after 2006. Despite the challenges that presented themselves in amalgamating, the boards continue to be collaborative in their approach to ensure improvements in student learning. In making the divisions smaller, the decision makers may think that this is going to assist us in addressing the debt of the province but, in actuality, the realities of what we are seeing from the last amalgamation will be tenfold if the province decided to move forward with the plan. In fact, the very fabric of which we stand for, our students, is so far removed from the decision making that we are not even looking at the reality of our Saskatchewan students, today, in terms of their literacy abilities and their ability to be literate, successful, working citizens in the future. Without the local voice of our local elected public school division trustees, to provide leadership, direction, guardianship, and vision based on what they, collectively, know about the needs of their students in their community, are we really improving school effectiveness and student success in their community's school? In amalgamating, yet again, we are losing the democratic elected voice where parents feel comfortable to voice their concerns to the board members who listen with understanding and live in the area in which they serve. Bigger isn't always better. Amalgamation may seem like the answer to balancing the deficit however, at what price? When making the decision, ask yourself if that is the future state you want for your children? Your Grandchildren? I don't envy the position you are currently in, to make a decision that has proven to be unsuccessful in achieving the financial goals of the last amalgamation. I can only ask that before you make the decision, please think about the students of Saskatchewan and the reality of what this amalgamation will do to their education now and in the future. If it truly takes a community to raise a child, is this really the best we can do for our children? Your children? Thank you for taking the time to read the responses of the people to whom you serve.

I was employed at the Central Office during the amalgamation process of School Divisions in 2006, and it was not an easy transition. Bigger is not better. I witnessed some tough changes. Trying to service a larger geographical area just put Councillors, speech pathologists and other important service personnel on the roads longer instead of in the schools with students that needed them. I believe that the rural will get a bad deal and their voices will not be heard with the proposed transformational change. I also believe that there will be a loss of jobs, people with great qualifications will be lost.

As a parent with children in this school division I want to bring forward my concerns with some of the options that have been tabled. It's becoming apparent that some sort of amalgamation is on the horizon but I'm asking that cabinet considers all the factors and possible consequences before they make their decision. I live in a thriving small community where our school is fully utilized, and from my understanding one of the highest ranked elementary schools in the province in a number of academic categories. I believe it's absolutely vital to consider how the proposed amalgamation will affect schools in small communities like ours. Currently we are protected by legislation as we meet a minimum enrolment threshold. In the event of an amalgamation our school would likely become a part of a much larger school division (ie small fish in a big pond). I am asking that which ever option is decided upon includes similar protection for rural schools. I am also asking that we retain the right to elect the boards that represent us. This will be even more important if we move to larger school divisions. While I can appreciate that our province needs to find savings and look for efficiencies in difficult times like these I ask that it is not done by cutting corners when it comes to education. I firmly believe that rural schools play a vital role in this province and I'm hoping that consideration is given.

As a classroom teacher, I am cognizant, always, of putting the needs of my students first. I believe that the first step in helping my students to reach their full potential is to develop a relationship with them. We begin our year by establishing a tight-knit classroom community, one in which we respect and value each other at all times. We listen to each other, we respect our differences, we support each other in times of frustration, and we celebrate successes together. When we, as adults, look back on our education, we don't often think about our favourite unit of study or a grade on an exam. Instead, we remember the people who made a difference in our lives, the people who helped us to believe in ourselves and encouraged us to reach for our dreams. It is becoming increasingly more difficult to be a teacher. More and more demands are being placed on us and we are working diligently to do our best to meet them. However, in order to do our job to the best of our ability, we, too, require supportive relationships within our school divisions. In Regina Catholic Schools, we are blessed to have the support of superintendents, consultants and co-ordinators, teacher coaches, ...and the list goes on. These people work hard to develop relationships with the staff in our buildings so they can support the learning that goes on in our classrooms. We benefit from the knowledge and support of these individuals and, ultimately, our students benefit when we learn more and more about how to best meet their needs. I am extremely concerned that an amalgamation of school divisions will disrupt these relationships and will reduce access to these critical supports. Without these supports, and with the increased stress of re-organization, I am justifiably concerned that we will overburden teachers who are already stressed by the ever-growing and ever-changing demands of our profession. We will lose good people. In what way will that benefit our students? I am also a firm believer in the connection between school and home. I communicate frequently with the parents of my students and we work together to support each child and his/her individual needs. In Perrin's report (p. 23), he acknowledges that amalgamation of school divisions will affect the relationship between parents and their child's education: "The public's access to decision makers would be reduced...Participation in governance will be a challenge and parents and families in the public system would have different access to board members than in the separate and francophone system." Parents will feel disconnected from their child's education which may impact their engagement in their child's education. Parental engagement is extremely important to student success. How does this support our students? The provincial government has set some impressive goals for our students to reach by the year 2020. We are working tirelessly to support our students in reaching these goals, despite increasing demands being placed upon us. Amalgamation of school boards will serve to be a major disruption in our education system. Perrin's recognizes this in his analysis on pg. 22: "During the transition period, a focus on restructuring may compromise the focus on student outcomes in the Plan for Growth and ESSP... The time and energy required to accomplish the change will impact effectiveness in the shorter term." How will we meet the goals by 2020 if we are disrupted so completely in the near future? Our province is diverse, and that diversity is what makes Saskatchewan so amazing. We need to acknowledge our diversity in our planning. Education is not a "one size fits all" endeavour. On a daily basis, we adjust our teaching to meet the varied needs of the learners in our classroom. Our government needs to recognize and value that diversity in its planning for the education of our future. It is my hope that the government will carefully consider the feedback received from people throughout the province and that decisions will be made that will create the least disruption to the critical work we are doing in the classrooms every day. Education is about people, and people perform best when they feel connected to others. We need to maintain our local school boards so we can make decisions for the unique areas we serve throughout our province.

Looking at the report we already have less boards compared to Alberta and Manitoba. We need to keep our rural identity separate from the urban identity. There is still life in the rural areas. Our kids need to be heard in the rural areas. The only way to be heard is to have local people voted in by the people they represent. That is our way to be heard.

I looked through the published report, and it appears to be only a list of advantages/disadvantages. Obviously cost is a major driver for a re-org, but what is likely more important is the quality of the education we are providing our kids. I am sure the Ministry is aware of Saskatchewan's poor ranking in the recent assessment that occurred across the country. Where is this aspect of the discussion? I firmly believe that the curriculum should be reviewed for content, as this material does not help our kids. With regards to cost reduction, it does not appear that this is fully thought out. With the larger divisions, how much time and cost will be put into travel? With the fewer school boards, how much of this work (at a reduced cost) would now occur by higher-cost individuals? And even, what about the school-community councils that also fund raise and do much of the needed legwork for the schools for no cost. Was there consideration on the infrastructure developed, and the new requirements? A simple advantage/disadvantage list seems to be so far from what is necessary to actually weigh out the options, put some dollar figures into it and make a proper decision. I do not see enough material here to be even talking about reorganizing, let alone think to be at this stage

We do NOT support these actions, a one size fits all does NOT work for Prairie Spirit School Division. This is a dictatorship - NOT a democracy!

Our society seems to feel that larger health care divisions, corporate businesses and now larger school divisions are the answer to our problems and it seems to be a growing trend. This is at the expense of the patients care, small town business and now students education. This must stop! In our Health Care system, our family has personally seen the lack of support that patients receive due to people not understanding the needs required by the hospitals and health care facilities. They assume that what one community has, another has. There is no consistency. People in larger communities a distance away do not understand what is often needed and therefore the required support is lacking. If our education system takes the same route, this will make our divisions more impersonal, decisions will be made from a distance away causing problems and inconsistency. A lack of understanding for our communities needs, school facilities needs and ultimately our students needs will be compromised. Students and teachers in small communities need to have a voice and it will not happen if one school division is a priority. With increased classroom size, increased teacher-student ratio, decreased funding and teacher cuts, schools are already struggling to maintain a high level of education. If students education is of a concern in our province, address the funding provided for support materials, and address the class size. Provide more teachers so we can offer our students more electives in high school, more professional development and support in the classroom, and help the at risk youth and those requiring extra assistance. As with any corporation, or big business, more and more jobs are being created at the administration end. By doing this, it is taking help and jobs away from the teachers. This is the level where the focus should be made. We have a number of smaller community colleges in our province. Students choose to go to these instead of university. Students thrive at these institutions because of more one on one instruction and are more comfortable in the classroom. These settings are not overwhelming for them. Students must come first and be the top of our priority. In our small town Saskatchewan schools we have become a caring family that know one another and try to support one another. This is a personal atmosphere that can not be achieved by getting larger. We choose to raise our children in these communities. These children are the ones who will become our leaders, they are the ones who will look after us when we are old, they are the ones who need our guidance and support through our smaller divisions. They will become lost in the overwhelming large system.

I think that the government needs more information before making such a drastic change. How much money will be saved through amalgamation? Has the government approached the school boards to ask if money savings can be made within the existing situation? My family moved from North Battleford to small town to raise our family. Education is important and we felt fortunate to have a local member of our school board to contact when questions arose. Decisions for schools need to be in the hands of local boards- people that know the situation, the area, the school principal, and the challenges that the school community faces. Believe me, every school has challenges. As a parent, I do not want to have to phone someone in Saskatoon or Regina to talk about what's happening in Naicam when he/she doesn't even know where is. The North East has worked very hard to earn their parents' support and respect- DON'T throw that away! Shouldn't we be fighting against appointed boards- it's those who know somebody in power that get a position. Doesn't our government RESPECT and PROMOTE and BELIEVE in a free democratic society that can vote for a person that represents the people and their area? Isn't the reason we have so many MLAs is that they are needed to represent the great number of citizens of Saskatchewan? Do our children not deserve the same respect?

In consideration of the proposed changes suggested in the Perrins Report, I would like to voice some concerns. As a teacher, I was twice part of an amalgamation process . It was at times a very disruptive and unsettling experience for the students, the staff and the community. In the division that was eventually born from this process, we have seen benefits from ongoing improvements on a variety of fronts. Our students enjoy access to services and supports. We have the ear and the support of board members who are sensitive to and accountable for the particular needs we have in our rural area. Were we to increase the size of the division yet again with an appointed board far removed from our circumstances, I believe there is a strong possibility that it would negatively impact our present situation which would indeed be unfortunate.

It seems that the only way to get us to consistent decisions for students and have all students looked after equally is to eliminate local elected school boards and have one division. Our division now does not make decisions for all students. Please restructure school divisions. One would be more consistent and cost efficient.

I have some pressing concerns about the transformational change being proposed to our school system. I believe more research is needed before such a large decision is made which drastically affects the future of our children (in a province which is already behind in many of its scholastic endeavors). Why is this massive change being pushed through? Why is there no \$ amount provided on the costs of the proposed options? If board members are appointed, who is our elected voice? How will unique school divisions (or dual track schools such as ours) have any say in decisions? Why is there very little mention of students in the 35 page report ? Why these models? (That are unproven nation wide)

In consideration of the proposed changes suggested in the Perrins Report, I would like to voice some concerns. As a teacher, I was twice part of an amalgamation process . It was at times a very disruptive and unsettling experience for the students, the staff and the community. In the division that was eventually born from this process, we have seen benefits from ongoing improvements on a variety of fronts. Our students enjoy access to services and supports. We have the ear and the support of board members who are sensitive to and accountable for the particular needs we have in our rural area. Were we to increase the size of the division yet again with an appointed board far removed from our circumstances, I believe there is a strong possibility that it would negatively impact our present situation which would indeed be unfortunate.

Leave things as Status Quo -Rejection of the possibility of amalgamation!! -Keep elected boards -Agree to the efficiencies

I think option 3b would best balance efficiency while recognizing the need for regional governance.

I'm writing with regards to the current governance review. As a homeschooling family in Saskatchewan, we would like to make the following requests. 1) We request the presence of home educating representatives {SHBE - Saskatchewan Home Based Educators, AND HSLDA - Homeschool Legal Defense Association, for example} as stakeholders in meetings and discussions. 2) We request that home educators register on a province wide basis, as opposed to local divisions, and that SHBE have input into the selection of that registering authority. 3) We request that there be re-evaluation of funding for home educators in Saskatchewan, and that funding be directed toward homeschooling families. We request SHBE and HSLDA be involved in this re-evaluation. We request the careful consideration of the direction of funds away from public school divisions, and to families for actual costs of home education. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Unacceptable. Educational is foundational to the future success of this province and any further consolidation of the existing School Divisions will further erode the quality of education that my children receive. Saskatchewan already lags behind all of the other provinces in PISA metrics, languishes with the rearguard in PCAP metrics and has an embarrassing high school graduation rate in spite of tweaked requirements. The Perrins report is about saving money, not creating better educational outcomes for our citizens. Sacrificing our future to save some money today is appallingly short sighted. The option to remove local, elected boards and replace them with government appointees is highly problematic. Education will not meet the needs of the local population without a local, elected board. One of the principle tenants of democracy is accountability. If I don't like what my local board is doing, I can work to have them removed in the next election. This ensures that they listen to their local communities and represent their interests during the decision making process. School Community Councils simply give the appearance of local input, I have seen little in the way of meaningful impact on school or division governance result from their involvement. Nothing in my experience leads me to believe that this will improve if government begins to appoint board members.

Hi. I'm writing so I can let you know about my grave concerns for the proposed changes to the school system. I fear that the high risk and high needs children will be left behind, continuity of services is extremely necessary to achieve great outcomes for their futures. They don't have time to wait around while people stumble around trying to assess their needs and finally act on them, delaying them even further behind. Also we want equality at all schools here in Lloydminster, regardless of where we live and which school our children attend. Lloydminster has a municipal levy embedded in the charter so that all services like transportation and pre-K are delivered equally to all in this town. Due to restrictions in the Charter, it would likely be impossible to provide a seamless delivery of services to an expanded division, which would be grossly unfair to some children. I believe that the challenges identified in the report could all be met effectively through amendments to legislation, regulations and policy. This would be much less disruptive to continue with this elected board; who already knows the intricacies of working together with both provinces. They have done a great job with all 4 of our children,

. This is all thanks to an amazing school board, great teachers, and loving caring EAs'. We are very thankful we made the move to Lloydminster 10 years ago, because we realized she would be getting the best education. We made it, so this bright child had the best chance at a great life and it's been so worth it! Our year old is this model student, our year old needed extra help learning to read so he was enrolled in an extra literacy program, that extra help was amazing and he quickly was brought up to his grade level. The year old loves school and so far so good. I'm so thankful for the extra supports that LPSD has offered over the years and the personal attention. It's a great feeling when my oldest is around at school and the different members of the school board will stop and visit with her . Please leave our school board in place because they're doing a great job in this border town. Us residents are united as a town and not divided by that border down the middle. Sincerely,

The existing school divisions are working well. It costs way too much of the taxpayers money for all of this consultation and going through people's input. You are wasting our money. I feel as though you are doing all of this to create work so that you are needed in your job. Surely there are things to do to help education that are better uses of our resources. Every change costs us millions and this will be no different. Further amalgamations will mean that our small rural schools will be lost in the shuffle. Rural students deserve a high quality education as much as urban students. Let's get back to focusing on the basics - encouraging students learning and reading, writing, math and science. Elected school boards will not have students best interests at heart. They will be more concerned about making decisions that will keep them in this job. They will not risk losing their job by disagreeing with their bosses. They know that another yes man could be hired at any time. Please think about our children more than you have been these last few months. The amount of spending unnecessarily and poorly thought out decisions with this Govt is ridiculous already. School boards should be accountable to the parents and tax payers. K-12 Education Governance Review Advisory Panel, After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report we would offer the following feedback: We do not support any of the three models presented in the report and ultimately we wish to remain a part of Prairie Valley School Division. We do support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). Currently under the direction of the Prairie Valley School Division we celebrate some of the highest performance scores in Reading and Math as well as extraordinary High School graduation rates. What guarantee is there that these standards of excellence will be maintained through provincial amalgamations? It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! We do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. Our current Prairie Valley School Division board member is very visible in our schools and community. Provincially appointed board members will not be as accessible, nor will they know their communities' needs. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support the change to governance or how further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. We have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold. Rural communities thrive, grow, and revolve around their schools. Closing schools will "close" small town Saskatchewan. Nearby schools are at maximum capacity and there are great concerns for distance, safety, and time spent on buses for rural children. We need a permanent high school plan to accommodate the best interests of our students, their families, and our community, as well as a permanent high school transportation plan. We would rather our students be part of a smaller school, than being in overcrowded classrooms in larger centers. This is one of the reasons people choose to reside in rural areas. Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in. In Mr. Perrin's report the opening letter to Minister Morgan states that ALL stakeholders who approached Mr. Perrin for conversation UNANIMOUSLY support elected boards and NO more amalgamations! WHY would we continue with pursuing drastic changes? Regards,

Minister Morgan I am a concerned citizen and parent of six children. My children range from twenty-nine years old, down to four. They have attended schools across the province in different School Divisions. Because of this, I have a great sense of what was and is provided to them through our education system. Currently, three of my children are attending either High School or Elementary. I have seen many changes in the education system in SK over the years. The changes proposed in the Perrins Report concern me enormously! Deep, meaningful student education must be a priority of this government and must guide the governance and organizational structure. This report does not provide detail of how these proposed major organizational changes would improve system-wide student learning. There is zero evidence that any of these options for changing the education governance structure, will be more cost efficient or help improve the classroom learning of current or future students. In fact, there is a mass of evidence demonstrating that the exact opposite will occur. I see this 'Report' as unnecessarily rushed and not addressing all the options that should be considered by our citizens and you as our representative. The Rosthern Schools are in the Prairie Spirit School Division, which is noted for already achieving high effectiveness and efficiencies. This is the fourth largest school division in the province with over 10,000 students. It's important that you be reminded that the PSSD has made significant budget reductions totaling well over \$11 million over the past four years. According to Ministry of Education statistics, "Prairie Spirit is one of the most efficient and effective school divisions in the province"! It has low administration and governance costs and is one of the highest performing school divisions. The graduation rate for PSSD students (aboriginal and non) is well above the provincial average. With this being said, it begs the question as to why is Prairie Spirit School Division is directly named in the report, and potentially on the chopping block, when such a high level is being achieved?! It appears that the reason behind the government's rush to 'Transformational Change' in education is to try and balance the budget on the backs of our children's education. This is unconscionable!!! It's also seen as a power hungry grab for

control by removing the democratic process! Trying to re-open valid, signed contracts with our school employees shows the same classless mismanagement and is unconstitutional! Why are the proposed changes only on the public sector schools, and not separate, if they are truly supposed to be efficient?! Why are you not considering the ten separate school divisions in addition to the eighteen public?! There are two P3 schools in the PSSD with open door policies and, in reality, the only difference between them is a wall that separates them. One's governance is under review and the other's is not. How 'efficient' is that?! The Perrins Report identifies the strengths of the current governance model, which includes local accountability, communication, strong local voice and a local culture of learning. These strengths would be removed completely in the proposed governance models presented in the report. There is a reason that we formed school boards long ago... in fact before SK had a government! The need for the local representation/voice in our education was already established way back then! That 'local representation' means that our elected Trustees, have a constituency where they are meaningfully involved on a daily basis. This does not mean boundaries where a board is so far removed from local communities, that they no longer have the ability to be 'hands-on'. It is essential for Trustees take part in school functions (SCC), be readily available for local contact, and build relationships in our communities every day! That means local leaders, leading for our children's education, who are accountable to the local communities and government! With the feedback that was received from all the stakeholders (Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, Service Employees International Union, Saskatchewan School Boards Association, SSBA Public and Catholic sections and Saskatchewan Association of School Business officials, a parent group, the opposition education critic and members of the general public) it is alarming that all four options given consideration, directly conflict with what Mr. Perrins heard from these participants. They unanimously stated that they wanted locally elected boards and no additional amalgamation. This is not reflected in any of the four options! There is undisputed support that the report options are not in the best interest of the education of our children, by the very people who work with them every day! Why have their voices been discarded?! This government MUST actually represent the best interest of our children, not for political ones! I do not support further amalgamation or elected boards! The government needs to listen to the 'stakeholders' and not use any of the 4 options outlined in the Perrins Report! Stop this political agenda and do the right moral thing by providing proper meaningful inclusive education for our students!!!

After looking at the report that has been put forth I find it discouraging that the people would be asked to pick when all seem to have issues and is very vague in areas. Since the last amalgamation we find that the schools that it affected are just getting staffing and special support staff in a routine that works, and now going to do it all over. None of these models let the people know at what "cost" does this come with? Does this cost the people less or more in out of pocket money? Does this cost the gov't more or less? And or does this cost the quality of education for our children in the future?? And if so WHY would we harm the education level of our future - our children!! This province comes with a large demographical area and I do not see why we want to harm the rural education, not everyone can live in the city! or transport children any farther. The last amalgamation was done in the need of saving money and I would love to see someone show us the saving that was acquired. The PVSD council that we have voted in to represent us tell us they are not in favor of any of this so WHY would the government not listen to them?? Why are we not listening to the administration of our schools? We are told that they would like to see the system that is in place stay in place. If this is only getting looked at because of the deficit that the gov't is in then shame on you. There are other places to try cutting costs in this province and I do not believe it is in the area of Education of our children. Our divisions are large now, I do not seeing making them bigger is going to be better. The need of special needs is a concern of getting them around the divisions in the right time frame. Thanks

I love that the staff and students at our school know and recognize Horizon's Central Office staff and feel comfortable talking openly with them. I would hate for this feeling to be lost due to enlarged school divisions, where it would be impossible to keep that kind of contact with all schools. I feel school divisions haven't been given enough time since the last amalgamation to organize their operations as efficiently as possible. It takes time to reorganize, while keeping the best interests of the most important stakeholders, our students, as the number one priority. Any of the proposed changes will be like starting at ground zero again, wasting resources, time and money, while uprooting our students' identity once again.

Why did the report not reference how this change will impact the students and their learning? Students are not a priority in this report. Are students first in this report? No, because this is a business model. With government appointed school boards, communication and feedback to and from parents/communities will be negatively impacted. Centralized services do not mean cheaper, better or even equivalent services. Why was this not brought up during the elections?

I find it very unsettling this process has come about so quickly, not allowing the public to process everything let alone being able to adequately voice their concerns and questions. The provincial government has said that one of their mandates is to provide equality in education to each and every student in this province. By going forward with process of any type of amalgamation of public school boards, this mandate will no longer be filled as there will be very different school board structures and procedures for Public School students vs. Separate and Francophone School students. With the boards currently being elected, this allows for the public to have a voice in who will be on the boards. By having local boards, the opportunity is there for trustees to visit schools in their areas, in order to speak with staff, students, and parents and to not be at arm's length. There are opportunities to attend forums and annual meetings which strengthens the community/board relationship and also allows the community to clearly have a voice in the process. By having local boards, it allows for trustees to speak with students, parents, and teachers about various issues (ie. graduation rates) and then to best formulate plans to work on these issues. With most of the mentioned models, there will be a silencing of the public's voice and a decrease in the community/board relationship. By not having this I think it will be very easy to have students fall through the cracks and equality in education disappear. Most of the models are based off of Prince Edward Island which is at a scale not of any comparison to Saskatchewan (their entire provincial student population is 2 000 students less than Regina Public's total student population alone). It is scary to think that the students of Saskatchewan may be used as a "test" to attempt and pioneer something that has no clear track record or results to show that it can work in a positive manner for our educational system. I believe the best decision to allow for the best education of Saskatchewan's students, to continue offering equality in education, to not have any students fall through the cracks, and to allow there to still be community involvement and voices in the process is to have local school boards and to allow for public election of them.

Centralization of services in Saskatchewan's education system fails to recognize the uniqueness of each school and community in which our children learn, grow, and thrive. It removes decision making from those familiar with the day-to-day activities and needs of each school, reduces engagement of important stakeholders, and does not take into consideration the strengths, challenges, and cultures present in various areas across the province.

I think there is no need for a new governance model. The present elected school officials are doing the job they were elected to do. Each board is unique and deserves to govern itself accordingly. This whole notion of a new model of governance has not been requested by the school division administration or teachers so why are you trying to change it? I suspect money or the lack there of is at the root of this suggestion.

I think there is no need for a new governance model. The present elected school officials are doing the job they were elected to do. Each board is unique and deserves to govern itself accordingly. This whole notion of a new model of governance has not been requested by the school division administration or teachers so why are you trying to change it? I suspect money or the lack there of is at the root of this suggestion.

it is our democratic right to vote in our representatives to any school board. -keep the two school boards-- Let us vote on it, it is our province. -downside the number of school divisions in the province---keep the north represented---make them line up with health. -please make education the same on reserve-- so that the teachers can count these teaching years on reserve to his/her pension--they will have access to high quality educators. The kids deserve it.

My concern with all three options is as the division boundaries get bigger our rural school are sometimes lost in the shuffle. Rural and urban communities have such different needs and wants. It would be impossible to consider all. I also am concerned with collaboration and personal connections as divisions get larger. Even though Horizon is a large division, we have made strides on getting to know staff members - personally and professionally. With out celebration day and collaboration days we have started to build a sense of community. This has been a long time in the making and it would terrible to lose that for our staff and students.

Good evening. Lloydminster is a strong, independent place because of the effort of many, many individuals that have strived to make it so. Living in Lloydminster for many years, Colleen would understand that. Lloydminster has worked hard to have exceptional education standards for themselves and that of the children that attend. In saying that, it is important to myself, my family and those others whose children attend College Park and other schools, that agree that they function quite well as is and should not be messed with. Fixing something that is not broken, creates animosity, chaos, unstructured and unnecessary newness as well as teachers that no longer want to teach and participate because they school they love is no longer what it once was which portrays to the children and creates additional stress. Please remember how individual Lloydminster is and how hard we have worked for that name tag. Please allow us to stay as individuals and continue to love and thrive in the educational community that we have grown to know and love. Thank you for your time,

I am a Catholic and my taxes support the GSCS and I work at _____ School, _____ in the SPSD. Locally elected boards of education are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. They are important advocates for ensuring excellence in education. Who better to serve the needs of students - which are unique to each division, and even each school within divisions - than those elected by our community to represent our community? Please do NOT eliminate locally elected boards of education, replacing them with government appointed boards. It is NOT in the students' best interest.

My individual feedback: As an Alberta resident in Lloydminster I was already disappointed to find we (AB residents) were under the SK curriculum, that was 4-5 years ago. This was when I started trying my best to be the diligent parent and prepare to start this educational journey with my child. So changing gears to SK education and now we (our family and child) are almost finished elementary and I would still have to say, I am still disappointed. The curriculum itself and its focuses, the grading process/program. I invite a transition to an AB education system, not only as a tax payer but because education for our community should be held on high, valued, tested, challenged, and bettered every day we can. I feel this would be the better move. However (and maybe this was asked), if moving to an AB curriculum, would we continue to have our LPSD (which is the main subject here) or would AB also add us into a larger district in some form just like SK is proposing now? And finally, I guess if the several "options", either east or west, only come to adding us into a district solution then I can only say the one with least amount of chaos (option 3B?) & the better outcome (transition to Alberta curriculum). Thank you for your time,

Honorable Don Morgan QC Honorable Brad Wall Members of the Governance Review Panel: Dear Honorable Members: We, the _____,

_____ , are writing to share our concerns and perspectives as teaching professionals. Teachers are 'the boots on the ground' of the multi-faceted 'business' of educating children in the Southwest area of Saskatchewan. We recognize that from your side of the table, it does seem to take on the pretense of a business. We cannot deny that there are dynamic and diverse elements that need to transpire on the operational side of educational governance. Teachers entrust all of the nuances of educational governance to Educational leaders so that we can focus on teaching children and youth. We know and intrinsically understand it is our mandate to provide a high quality educational program to ALL students in Southwest Saskatchewan. The Democratic collaboration and consultation has always existed between our local boards, school community councils, our senior administration staff, and our sector of the government; the ministry of education. Teachers also recognize and acknowledge that the current economic climate is creating an appetite for change in the education sector. Teachers wish to be clear that we are devoted in working and teaching in the trenches of education and believe we have no choice but to express to you, our grave concerns. If the forthcoming changes to Educational Governance are not handled with the appropriate motive, the task of providing high quality education to our children and youth; Huttarian Brethern, Pre-Kindergarten, Elementary, Middle and High School, will indeed be in jeopardy. For teachers, as we conduct the diverse day to day duties of teaching, it is not the business of education that defines our profession, but rather the codes and standards of our profession and professional organization. When class sizes increase, one-on-one student time diminishes. Relationships and rapport lose authenticity. The ability to provide small group, differentiated instruction becomes less and less plausible. For example, in one 30 minute class with 30 students, upon giving instructions of modelling and teaching the concept at the commencement of the lesson, how much time remains for one-on-one instruction? Will on average, one minute per child as an acceptable standard for raising grad rates by 2020, be to the level that your ministry has set? When transformational change occurs at the expense of teachers, educational assistants, speech-language pathologists, educational psychologists, youth workers, school councillors to provide mental health supports for our vulnerable learners, who will stand in the gap for these educational partners? How will we continue to meet the targets established as priority by your ministry? Teachers fear the eventual outcome of your transformational change: larger class sizes, less educational supports, diminished one-to-one student time, diminished services to vulnerable children and youth with no reduction in expectations to assist students in reaching provincial learning targets, will impact high quality education for ALL. Further to that, in his news conference pertaining to the release of the Perrins Report, Minister Morgan alluded to the ideology that principals could perhaps take on more front line tasks. Teachers wish to respectfully remind Minister Morgan that for every light bulb, etc., getting changed by principals, one less student or teacher is being supported. The workload of a school-based administrator, at present, is already at maximum. As mentioned, Chinook School Division spans a vast amount of geography, with approximately half of colony schools in Saskatchewan existing within Chinook. Teachers are concerned with the unknowns attached to the dynamic of retaining educators in settings such as these. As well, we who experienced amalgamation, ten years ago, still recall the scars that were created when schools no longer deemed viable

and were forced to undergo closure. Within the heart of a community, truly is the school; and without such, it is only a matter of time before the community can no longer be sustainable. In rural Saskatchewan, this matters greatly, and even for families who no longer have children of age to attend school, events such as meal days, sporting competitions and tournaments, Christmas concerts, Graduations, and track days, are all sturdy threads which stitch together all members of the local community. Once those threads are severed, the wound sustained over the loss of the local school becomes too great to bear. Finally, it is noteworthy to consider that your government began a review of the funding model in 2015, to ensure that it was working as intended. As per the Perrins Report, this review is nearly complete. We would implore you to consider all such recommendations by the Funding Model Review Committee, prior to making any drastic decisions on boundary realignment, local board representation, etc. so that the deficit our province is experiencing does not get hung solely on the backpacks of our children. We respectfully recognize the value of public education, both in rural and urban. Teachers want assurance of respectful negotiations, both provincially and locally, and that all contracts are honoured. As teachers, we want to protect all our members, in this province, and in our local association, of the ability to attract and retain new teachers. We want to be a part of open conversations so that education is equitable for ALL students. We want services that support students and that are available for the needs of all students no matter of their geographical location. Thank you for this consultative period for communities, parents, board members, educators, administrators, and town councils to provide you with their concerns in regards to one of the very most fundamental facets of society. We look to you for leadership in modelling decision making that will exemplify integrity, trustworthiness and that you will take to heart how very much this matters to all stakeholders in Southwest Saskatchewan.

It must be noted that our family is very committed to the ideal that education is a parental responsibility and right as noted by the Supreme Court of Canada, and that by educating at home we as parents have chosen not to delegate that responsibility to the province as wonderful as it is. THEREFORE It is our desire that the province redefine registering authority as a department or individual who is appointed by SHBE, working from policy written and approved by SHBE, funded directly by the province to cover the cost of administration. It is our desire that SHBE be recognized as a stakeholder in education, just like the francophone schools, and has input to who is chosen as registering authority. We desire a registering authority accountable to home educators for their use of the provincial funding that is provided to support home educated students. It has become a recent ongoing experience that families need to voluntarily surrender more of their home education freedom and that is undesirable. Home education is growing in Saskatchewan and world wide, SHBE represents 2250 students, while Francophone schools represent 1600 students, according to School Division numbers. We need to have input into policy and any future legislation or regulation. It is our desire to have greater uniformity in notification, reporting and transparent /accountable funding across the province. We believe the selection of selection of understanding/sympathetic home education administrators will be of benefit to SHBE members by granting long-term stability for home education . SHBE was not consulted when the regulations were rewritten in the last decade. SHBE has not been consulted when policy has been written and rewritten. To the best of my knowledge, home educators have not been consulted on school division policies on home education. I recognize there will be no ideal framework and we should not buy into any view of utopia. As a christian I believe that Christ is king and until He consummates the new heavens and earth, and we worship God face to face, there will be no perfection on earth. Nevertheless we as parents homeschool by conviction. It always has and always will come down to whether it is right for us to obey God or someone/something/anything else.

I have 2 daughters in the school division and I am very concerned as to how this amalgamation would affect their education. We have just started to see improvement in our school district after our last amalgamation 10 years ago. Another change at this point would shift the attention from our children's education to administration and fixing the system. An amalgamation would put more strain on our teachers and principal who have just become comfortable with their current curriculum and policies. Please don't force an amalgamation- put our children first!!

There is certain things that we need in our school district that we may not get if our funding is not controlled by our local school boards. If the resources are put into making the change of an amalgamation we may not get the educational or recreational things that we need and look forward too like skating, swimming and ski trip. Please don't force an amalgamation.

Please do not change the current structure of locally elected school boards. The women and men who represent their communities are an invaluable voice at the board tables. These boards are accountable and transparent in a way that an appointed board wil not be. Please do not spend my taxes restructuring the public school boards. Resources need to be directed into other areas that will improve the student experience. School Boards do not need to be changed as they are currently functioning well. Leave them alone!

I believe we have been letting down our children for years with the way the education system has changed. The system has been dumbed down to cater to children having difficulties, rather than having them repeat the grade if they cannot sufficiently complete the work because "social aspects" of school have become more important than education. The same is for children who are bored in class because they are advanced in their learning - the education system works so hard to prove they are "normal" because they do not want to advance them for "social reasons". Our children are no longer going to university prepared because they are being taught to prepare them to work at a gas station as a pump attendant or if they are lucky to go to a tech school. Certain classes are eliminated from the curriculum because not enough students in the close rural communities requested them, so those who want to take classes like accounting, something that would help a student get into a business degree oriented course in university, cannot. They must choose from cooking or cosmetology, because the school administration is not even supportive enough to try to help the student find the accounting class as a distance learning option. This system has completely failed our children. I have been extremely frustrated having to send my child to school for many years because of the bullying that is not dealt with by school staff, all the way up to the principal, with the way we are designing the curriculum for students having difficulty in class instead of the teachers actually spending time with them to help them get through a curriculum designed as a middle ground, and with the fact that teachers are not available at all for helping students with work that they did not take the time in class to explain or answer questions about. There is no more help offered before class, over lunch hour or after class. Teachers no longer care about the students education, the job is more about a Monday to Friday job, between the hours of 9-3:30 with a lunch break, and having summer off. One of my daughter's teachers has them watch a documentary almost daily because "they explain it better than she could". So why does she collect a salary? The tv is cheaper. Due dates on work to be handed in is a joke. As long as it is handed in by the last day of the school year you do not lose any marks, so why should they hand it in on time? Our children are not learning how the real world works, this is shameful!!

To Premier Brad Wall, Education Minister Don Morgan, and Mr. David Forbes: I write to you, our elected representatives in the Saskatchewan government, to submit my views and concerns about what is written in the Perrins Report, as well as the Transformational Change initiative being implemented upon us. Our locally elected school boards play a vital role in our communities as they are a direct link between the wishes and desires of our cities, RM, hamlets, villages and towns, and the education of our children. Locally elected school board trustees are not only directly accountable to the citizens living with the boundaries of the Greater Saskatoon Catholic School Division, they have a profound understanding of the particular need and interests of the communities they are elected to represent. There has yet to be a solid case put forth by your administration to prove that removal of this local governance by a Transformational Change to a centralized-council will serve the greater needs of the students and families of Saskatchewan. It is my wishes that the government of Saskatchewan respect our current school divisions in terms of size, borders, and the local governance structures to ensure that our students are not harmed by ideological decisions. It is unclear to me exactly how the Separate/French school divisions will be affected by this change. However, I feel it necessary to express that Catholic education is an important option in this province. It is my concern that this Transformational Change will be working to eliminate the option of separate school divisions as a whole. I feel that this process has moved very quickly with not enough consultations with the general public. I would be interested in the opportunity to attend a "Town Hall"-style meeting to allow more information and and to facilitate discussions. Respectfully, Saskatoon

I am not for any of the options that were listed by the government. Looking at the benefit and challenge charts on page 22, there was no mention on how this will be beneficial to the students, which should be our and the government's main priority when making changes to our education system. These changes will make it more difficult to find support and resources for our students and will not benefit the communities. I understand that Saskatchewan needs to make cuts, but they should never be taken from the health or education systems since both are big and important investments.

I am sharing my thoughts here because as a parent whose first of three children just started kindergarten in Regina's Separate School System, I am very concerned about the future of our school system. I firmly believe that changes to the system that would see amalgamation of services would result in: 1) Loss of effective and accountable public voice 2) Unintended consequences of amalgamations and appointed boards 3) Less say, control and input in your child's education 4) Loss of relationships with parents, parishes and community partners We need to keep our school boards locally elected, and we need to keep decisions closer to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

I think that the board needs to be as closely aligned to the needs of individual schools as possible and as such, I am very concerned by the notion that we could lose elected board members and that the governance could be distanced even more from our communities.

To whom it may concern, I grew up in a small rural town south of the province and was in high school when the borders changed and many small towns around us were part of new school Chinook School Division. It changed our ability for funding, affected our school numbers, who we could have attend our sporting events etc. Now fast forward 10 years, and I've been an elementary school teacher for 5 years. I've taught in my small home town, and have been teaching in the city now for the majority of my career. As a teacher, I never realized how tough things were in our small francophone community until I came to teach in the city. We had limited access to resources, outdated technology and felt like no support from our school division. Getting support staff for students was a grueling proces. Councillors, tech services and consultants were miles away and we seemed to always be on the bottom of their priority list. I teach in Regina and still live in a small neighbouring community, and our small school of 120 students is flourishing. I worry that an amalgamation would leave these small towns with no voice. I do believe change is a good thing, but not when it will be cutting jobs, cutting corners and who will suffer in the end? Not teachers, but the students, our future. As a parent of a pre school aged child, I worry for his education and for the education of all the children in this province.

Dear Minister Morgan: I am writing on behalf of my family and as an SCC board member. We unanimously support our elected school boards and believe they are the best way to represent our students. Our school board provides local voice and representation for our local taxes. We do not believe that having government appointed trustees would be in the best interest of our children or our school. Forced amalgamation will disrupt our students and their learning. Our school divisions are large enough to run efficiently and we believe that additional amalgamation will not create cost savings. We are concerned about the impact of amalgamation on rural schools, vulnerable students and quality education. We trust that our school division will continue to find efficiencies that will not detract from the quality of education our children receive and that they will have our children's interests as a priority. Our children should be viewed as an investment in the future of Saskatchewan, not a way to save money. Amalgamating school divisions does not benefit them or their educational needs. As the Minister responsible for education, we strongly urge you to oppose the amalgamation of our school divisions and oppose government appointed school boards. Sincerely,
Mother & SCC board member

I am sharing my thoughts here because as a parent whose first of three children just started kindergarten in Regina's Separate School System, I am very concerned about the future of our school system. I firmly believe that changes to the system that would see amalgamation of services would result in: 1) Loss of effective and accountable public voice 2) Unintended consequences of amalgamations and appointed boards 3) Less say, control and input in your child's education 4) Loss of relationships with parents, parishes and community partners We need to keep our school boards locally elected, and we need to keep decisions closer to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

Why are they trying to fix something that is not broke. I would like more information on how this will affect our children.

I am concerned that the changes being made, are going to affect the quality of education my children will be receiving. I need more clear and concise information as to what these changes mean for the future of my children, and their dedicated, hard-working, teachers. What does this mean for us, as parents?! How is this going to have a positive outcome for anyone but the budget?!

I don't agree with this amalgamation and I especially don't agree that I wasn't aware of it until only a few weeks ago. I was made aware of a meeting in my hometown the DAY OF and it was too late to make arrangements to attend. More time is needed for all sides to have a say.

I believe Board of Directors for education should be elected by the people they represent. This allows average people in rural Saskatchewan to have a say. Govt appointments is just another way for government to get more of there "friends" who will march to Brad Walls tune into places of decision making authority. I do not agree with government appointments. I think moving to a provincial education board is not in the best interest of rural students. I would like to see the division model maintained. I believe there is opportunity for cost savings by cutting back on division administrative staff at head office. Back when Cupar School Division amalgamated to Prairie Valley School Division the idea was to cut administrative staff, but over time these staff pools at head office grew and grew. Education budget has been going to admin staff instead of teaching staff in the class room. I would like to see the Prairie Valley Division maintained, I would be ok with some small realignment of boundaries. I see the opportunity to go at Division head offices, I believe admin staff there could be cut by 25% and budget redirected to classrooms. I am very disappointed that the provincial government has put so much focus on "economic development" (GTHA, bypass, etc) and as a result our children - the FUTURE of our great province - have to pay. It's so unfornate.

As a retired teacher and grandparent I feel that big is not better. We MUST remember that our children's future is the future of this province.

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report we would offer the following feedback: We do not support any of the three models presented in the report and ultimately we wish to remain a part of Prairie Valley School Division. We do support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). Currently under the direction of the Prairie Valley School Division we celebrate some of the highest performance scores in Reading and Math as well as extraordinary High School graduation rates. What guarantee is there that these standards of excellence will be maintained through provincial amalgamations? It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! We do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. Our current Prairie Valley School Division board member is very visible in our schools and community. Provincially appointed board members will not be as accessible, nor will they know their communities' needs. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support the change to governance or how further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. We have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold. Rural communities thrive, grow, and revolve around their schools. Closing schools will "close" small town Saskatchewan. Nearby schools are at maximum capacity and there are great concerns for distance, safety, and time spent on buses for rural children. We need a permanent high school plan to accommodate the best interests of our students, their families, and our community, as well as a permanent high school transportation plan. We would rather our students be part of a smaller school, than being in overcrowded classrooms in larger centers. This is one of the reasons people choose to reside in rural areas. Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in.

To whom it may concern:

I am quite concerned with the direction that this government has taken in regards to education. I believe that the Government has created a problem for themselves by controlling the funding of school divisions and then making the minister responsible for this (p. 12). Having the Minister of Education responsible for every expenditure of each school board is a huge problem of accountability. This is why teachers, consultants, and administration are now hobbled for making decisions that are right for kids learning because every cent needs to be accounted for with direct results. I believe this model of thinking is a businesslike approach and similar to a manufacturing assembly line where expenditures and efficiencies need to be fine-tuned to create a profit. Changing the funding model to address each communities needs is better than trying to treat each community equally. Even though education is funded by the government and the public, we need to remember that the purpose of education is supporting learners to become critical thinkers that are informed citizens able to promote democratic compassionate society. Learning is not a commodity. It is a process that requires time and experience to ripen it. This ripening is necessary because the focus of instruction is for human beings to learn. Teaching human beings is unpredictable. One day the majority of kids or young adults in a class will engage with a teaching strategy and topic when the next period or day they will not. School divisions need to have the authority and autonomy within their budgets to spend and accrue to meet the needs of the dynamic communities they represent. Taking all opportunity away from community needs through a centralized education board will perpetuate disengagement of parents, students, and teachers creating apathetic citizens. I believe having a single centralized school division will not benefit learners and practitioners of learning. Of all the options presented by Dan Perrins option 3B seems to align with my beliefs and be the least disruptive to teachers and learners. As the government is looking to find savings for their budget I believe that the few million dollars that are saved this year with a restructuring of school divisions is not worth the years of adjustment that would be required. I believe that this present government is shortsighted in its vision for education and having one school division or four would create years of confusion for teachers, administration and ultimately to the learners. It is to the learners that education needs to be accountable to not the government. Sincerely,

I think it is of the utmost importance that we do not reduce the budgets for our school divisions. They're currently operating at a level of sustenance only. There is no fat to trim. Of all the places in our government this area should be held sacred. Our future literally depends on our ability to educate our future adults. The Saskatchewan Party must choose to make cuts in other areas. The divisions cannot properly function with less money.

I need more information about this issue in order to make an informed comment.

I strongly disagree with the changes that are potentially being brought forward to our rural community . I moved to so that my Son could grow up in a rural community . I believe in our rural schools and the educational settings they provide. I believe that our community should have a voice. I am against the amalgamation of our school divisions as well as the idea of provincial appointed members.

Because it concerns everyone, Why in Canada, in this case specifically Saskatchewan, are we not excelling in education? We are a top ranked country that sends aid and educational support to many other countries yet many of our children are getting to Grade 7 and reading at a Grade 3 level...or lower. Why are we looking to cause further detriment to our already lacking educational system in Saskatchewan? Should we not be striving to be an excellent example of working together on solutions that are best for our children; our future! How are we as a society going to function if so many of our children are not even reading up to their full potential nevermind their levels in math and the sciences?! As a parent, as an SCC member of two schools for several years, as a citizen of Saskatchewan, I implore all involved in this governance review to really and truly remember what's at stake and who is at stake here...our children and the future of Saskatchewan. Thank you,

Greetings, Our family believes that we should stay with elected board members and not appointed ones. Board members who live in the area, know the issues first hand and have a vested interest in creating a successful working environment for students and all involved. Thank you,

I've got two kids in the school system and two more on the way – it important to me that the school system stays sustainable and maintains a level of quality service. I think school boards should remain elected positions. This ensures they remain accountable to the parents and community and accurately reflect the values of that community. An analysis of the number of board members in each school division could be conducted to understand if some of these positions could be eliminated during the next election cycle without impacting the quality of service. I don't think major amalgamations of school divisions is a good idea. School divisions should be maintained at a reasonable level for the board and employees to understand the communities they represent. It allows them to understand the unique challenges that face the areas, especially in a rural setting. Analysis should be undertaken to identify savings and opportunities in sharing services such as IT, payroll, human resources, etc. Thanks for taking the time to undertake public consultation on this issue. Education and healthcare are cornerstones of our government and the way they are handled impacts how people vote. Thank you for allowing Saskatchewan residents an opportunity to weigh in on this important issue.

Children are the future of our province and they need the very best in education to be successful contributing adults. School boards should remain elected positions. This ensures they remain accountable to the parents and community and accurately reflect the values of that community. An analysis of the number of board members in each school division could be conducted to understand if some of these positions could be eliminated during the next election cycle without impacting the quality of service. I also do not want to see any further amalgamations of school divisions. School divisions should be maintained at a reasonable level for the board and employees to understand the communities they represent. It allows them to understand the unique challenges that face the areas, especially in a rural setting. Analysis should be undertaken to identify savings and opportunities in sharing services such as IT, payroll, human resources, etc. Thanks for taking the time to undertake public consultation on this issue. Education and healthcare are cornerstones of our government and the way they are handled impacts how people vote.

Removing local school boards will lessen the voice of those in small locations, especially the rural schools. There is a lot of good work being done by teachers and students in the rural schools that should be recognized and celebrated and I feel that will be lost in a move to a provincial or regional board model. How do appointed boards help with any of this? Those on school boards run for a purpose, because they want to help guide the education system. If board members are appointed, is their heart really in it? Wouldn't the credibility of the board be lost? Amalgamating divisions together again may sound like a good idea, but are you going to save money (if that's what this is all about)? \$1 Billion is a lot of to make up. What are all the other areas the government is looking at to do cuts in? There's 296 RMs in the province, is there a way to find savings in amalgamating 20% of them together? Is there talk of tax increases? We've gone many years with reductions or no changes in taxes, maybe it's time to look at that to offset this deficit.

In my opinion local democratically elected school boards are the best choice for my community. I agree that local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities. The previous consolidation held back education for at least 5 years and cost money rather than saving money. This would be the second time that forced amalgamation excluded Separate School Boards. It took at least 5 years for the Boards, formed only 10 years ago, to become accepted as the community's school system. Significant improvement in learning is just beginning to be achieved in the last couple of years. A large percentage of the funding for education comes from local property taxes still. While the Province sets the taxation rate, the local taxpayers still pay the toll. This is different from Health where all funding except portions of capital come from the Provincial budget.

The

We are a Pre-Kindergarten to Grade 12 dual -track French Immersion and English school. Because we are a dual- track school, we require extra funding to provide materials in two languages as well as additional Educational Assistants to provide help to students in both French and English. Our school division was restructured in 2006. This was a complex undertaking which took a several years of trial and error to get to the workable model we have now. If the government goes ahead with their plans to restructure the School Divisions, we feel that this could take several more years to figure out a model that will work and will take away resources, money and personnel from students' education. Currently our elected trustees have a good understanding of our community and school culture and are aware of our concerns. If trustees become appointed, we feel that our local voice will be lost, as elected trustees will not understand rural issues and funds will be directed away from rural areas as there are fewer students. Rural schools will lose resources, funding and personnel if school districts are centralized as well as their local voice. school currently is on a four- day school week. What this means for rural students is less time spent on buses, the opportunity to schedule appointments during the week without having to take students out of school, and allowing senior students the ability to help on the family farm. This would greatly impact our community as we have had a four-day school week for almost 10 years and we don't want to lose it because elected trustees don't understand our needs. We are strongly against what the government is proposing and hope that they reconsider their decision. Larger, urban-focused school districts, with government appointed trustees are not beneficial to our children. We urge you to put Saskatchewan's children first and rethink these changes.

Local democratically elected school Boards are the best choice for my community. Local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities. The previous consolidation held back education for at least 5 years and cost money rather than saving money. This would be the second time that forced amalgamation excluded Separate School Boards. It took at least 5 years for the Boards, formed only 10 years ago, to become accepted as the community's school system. Significant improvement in learning is just beginning to be achieved in the last couple of years. A large percentage of the funding for education comes from local property taxes still. While the Province sets the taxation rate, the local taxpayers still pay the toll. This is different from Health where all funding except portions of capital come from the Provincial budget.

I write to you in favour of maintaining locally elected school boards and local level decision making in our education system. The school divisions are large enough as they are. Amalgamating school boards may appear an attractive method to improve the Government's balance sheet in the short-term but it comes with too great a cost. Democracy is not a principle to be cast aside for the sake of political or economic convenience and it is not the school children of Saskatchewan who should bare the responsibility for the Government's financial mismanagement.

As a teacher who is passionate about the work that I do, my focus is always on the students in my classroom and in our school communities; what is best for them? How can I ensure that they will accomplish and succeed to the best of their ability and consistently improve their learning? The education system needs to be built with our youth, our learners, and our future leaders as the focus and with these questions top of mind. I do not feel that the governance models that are outlined in the Perrins Report would support the work and initiatives that educators are currently driving to see our students successful. The current collaborative nature of our work, communication, culture of learning, and strong local voice would be lost should one of the new governance models be implemented. This would not only be a disservice to educators, it would be a disservice to the students that we teach and the communities that they belong to.

I do have concerns over the amalgamation of school divisions, but feel we already have no vote really and change is always scary. If this eliminates some of the overhead, then I think it is a good idea. Too many people on top currently. We need more teachers and aids working with our students - that is the answer! In the end what matters is that our students get a good education - we do not have to offer everything to everyone, but we have to be really good at the basics. Using technology for offering more classes is a better option than magnet classes! This post was on someone's facebook page - "I also recommend any PVSD parents have a look into our CEO and Superintendents past indiscretions, reported by the Canadian Taxpayers Federation. It states that our CEO had retired to pull from his pension and then in the same meeting was rehired to recieve a salary again." - if this is true, then they should not be questioning amalgamations -- sounds pretty shady! We have some bug centers in our school division and the small schools are being neglected for upgrades, and this needs to be addressed as well! In the end - We need to do what is best for the students!

Option 3A is my first preference, 3B would be my second preference. I do not support the first two options.

Our local property tax dollars pay for our local schools. We deserve a local say in our children's education. There is nothing more to be squeezed out of education. Raise the taxes if we aren't generating enough revenue.

We would like to maintain the Division Model with option (b) . With the way things are currently, the rural has little voice in the decision making of our rural education. Our rural school has migrated toward the magnet program which does offer a large selection of classes to our students, however it is to the point that our academic classes are suffering. Academic classes are not being offered every year like they were in the past, we have terribly unbalanced timetables, and the required hours of class time are not always being met. If we were to move to larger divisions we feel our rural education would suffer even more. We have brought these issues up within our school Division and no one wants to hear about these issues or address these issues. If we are not being heard now, how will we be heard if the divisions are expanded?

It is my earnest plea that the current system that supports a democratic representation of parents and concerned members of the public through elected trustees be preserved. Thank you,

As an employee in a school and a parent of 4 children going to school I am totally against making our school divisions any bigger then they are currently. We live in small town rural Saskatchewan and we already have to travel large distances to meetings or sports events or personal development days, making the divisions larger would not make this better. We should NOT get rid of having an elected board and change it to government control. Each area of Saskatchewan has different needs, thus the need to have elected members within our separate divisions to support our different needs. I do not see the benefit to amalgamating some or all of our school divisions. Lets first think of the students not the financial bottom line.

My number one concern is that there is no plan about school bullying.... my daughter had to endure it for three years

Flexible seating for grade three is a joke as these kids will think about fun and not what seating they are more productive in. And then to ask parents to donate money or furniture for the flexible seating

I don't think any of these options look beneficial for Teachers or students. Perhaps finding solutions for continuing to work within the current structure would be better. I was a student through the Ottawa Public School system in a rural school and have until now had 2 children also in that system as they amalgamated an already stretched system. I suffered, my teachers suffered, and I see this happening here. I will not watch my kids suffer. If you plan to deteriorate this school system I am prepared to homeschool. Find solutions for the current system. Work with local parents and community volunteers, I guarantee they will provide you with creative and cost effective solutions that will work for their unique schools.

Recent comments by the Minister of Education leads me to believe that the Saskatchewan Government is considering reorganizing the Educational Board system effecting governance of the Catholic School System. I am extremely concerned about this and strongly encourage that every effort be made by government to maintain opportunities for choice in providing faith based education in Saskatchewan.

I do not feel that amalgamating or expanding school divisions any further would be in the best interest of our students. Every community is different and has different needs and schools are usually at the very heart of that. They say that children are the most impressionable before they are in grade 3-5..... and putting all schools into a cookie cutter box could be detrimental to our province and it's future citizens. Each school division has something unique to add which in turn shapes the development of our children and our future leaders in the province. I fail to understand any economic advantage we will gain either as school boards are creative with fundraising and supporting their local students. There will still be the same amount of students that need an education but less voices supporting each individual student. These things are important and in some ways have already begun to fail our kids as schools get bigger and teachers and administrators stretched thinner. I does take a community to raise a child especially when parents have to work to survive and school is where alot of this happens. We have always lived in rural alberta and when we moved to Saskatchewan the first thing we looked into was a rural school- opportunities for students here can be created and have been(by local school boards and dedicated parents). In short- a divisional approach is still best for our communities and students.

Decisions for children's education is best decided on a local level.

I WANT TO CONTINUE TO HAVE A SAY IN MY CHILD'S EDUCATION, AND ONE OF THE BIGGEST WAYS I FEEL I GET TO DO THAT IS BY ELECTING THE SCHOOL BOARD. I DO NOT AGREE WITH APPOINTING THE SCHOOL BOARD, THAT IS NOT GIVING THE PUBLIC THEIR SAY.

I hope that meeting student needs becomes more of a priority than just saving money by streamlining the division. We have overcrowded our classrooms by multi-grading and have taken away any Educational Assistants that can be cut out of the schools - the students with needs are still included in regular classroom curriculum but teachers are expected to give them all the assistance they need as well as maintain a high level of learning for all students they are also assigned. Division can always find reasons for cuts in the schools but not in their head office.

Wish that you could come and see the NESD on the day to day running of our schools. We are all working together to give our students the best education , healthy safe environment on a day to day bases. We all have one thing on mind..Students.

I am requesting a meeting to review to potential affects of steelworker members In the Creighton sk. School district.

I want to keep locally elected school boards. The needs of each division differs so having one elected government board for all of Saskatchewan is unfair to all students. Locally elected boards know the teachers and students and their needs and so can make better informed decisions! Government elected boards are not what we want. Getting rid of school division boards will ruin our school system and create a havoc, things will not run as smoothly because the people making the decisions will not be invested in the interests of the students in the division. I think changing things to save a little money is not the right decision. We want to keep locally elected boards!!

My comments are mostly against a single province-wide arrangement; however, they apply to the other options insofar as there exists any overlap in perceived benefits and challenges between the single option and the others. The report doesn't state and can't quantify potential savings or specific efficiencies, saying that it is basically crystal ball work (the extent of efficiencies can't be "prejudged"). Nevertheless, the report states that a benefit of a single province-wide division is that it "is likely to improve efficiency". This is not a guarantee. A single school board able to balance the diverse needs of the student population of Saskatchewan runs the risk of either bloating to the extent that there is no appreciable difference from the status quo or underserving our students. The latter option is the most worrying thing to me. Looking at the appendix, the stated benefits relating to accountability are that the single option is "more accountable to government" and provides "continued accountability to the community is through school community councils". However, the latter "benefit" is then harpooned by the following challenges, which relate to accountability and transparency: "reduced local accountability", "reduced communication between the board and community", and "public's access to the decision makers would be reduced". Notice that these changes are not tempered with the same probability and ambiguity as the promises of improved efficiency; the report seems to suggest the loss of community access to local decision makers will be lost, but maybe--maybe--"efficiencies" will be found. That should be enough for anyone to see what's truly at stake here. It's great that we want to find efficiencies in health and education. School divisions have been told to do this even in the boom times, when schools especially in the cities had to make their overcrowded spaces work. In tougher and more recent times, Prairie Spirit had to look for savings and tried to cut programs like band, and ended up cutting staff last year. Now, the loss of parents and community members to communicate with their local boards is on the table? All for what? We don't know. The efficiencies are not guaranteed and the savings are not elucidated. What looks like action is really confusion, and we plan on making a decision that has immediate negative effects on school-community relations because of the allure of possibly saving a buck or two? Please keep looking at other options. Nickel and diming certain departments while ignoring the fact that, to use one example, Saskatchewan has 296 rural municipalities belies the claim that "everything is on the table". If RMs are untouchable, why? Is it because amalgamation could potentially have a negative effect the level of local services provided to rural communities? Why, then, are we being asked (told) to accept those same effects on educational services in our province?

I am concerned with the proposed amalgamations and the loss of parental control over our children's education

The government has dropped the ball. I trust and expect our elected representatives to represent us and make responsible decisions for their constituents. I cannot fathom how they have allowed a one billion dollar deficit to occur within our province, but is it a surprise? All I know is that I did not vote for them. They are the epitome of irresponsible government with their mismanagement of resources. Elementary education is imperative to the future and rather than invest in it, the government is looking for ways to reduce funding. Already they have increased the amount of time teachers teach and have not compensated them properly for that. What kind of employer makes their employee work longer hours and does not pay them for it? One billion dollars? One billion dollars? Placing money in the education system has not created this deficit, why are they stripping us of it? Perhaps the government should step down and hand this mess off to someone else. I am very frustrated, disappointed, and not as eloquent as I would like to be. Fix it Brad.

I need to explain that I write this Email, not as an organization, but as a resident of an area that has featured large in the various re-writes of education in the past, as an individual that has been impacted by the last two major upheavals in Provincial educational governance theory, and as a link in a genetic chain that includes four generations who have been and are being affected by the whims of such theorists and experimenters. Redistributing tax money further afield was an underlying theme and goal in the rebuilds of 1944 and 2006 with a promise of better and more education if it was accomplished. My assessment would be that the 1944 eventually accomplished more, (high school graduations steadily increased), and the 2006 model offered some better education with the addition of more professional supports for students who struggled in one way or another. Neither was put in place to reduce money in education but rather to transport money to locations that had more people, hence students, and therefore more political gravity. Taxation was evened out as were educational outcomes. This is the first reboot that openly aims to cheapen the product as a primary goal, the carriage of such savings designated as efficiencies. I remember all too well the efficiencies of highway repair, reduction of hospitals in the rural areas and hospitals that served rural areas, (ie; The Plains in Regina). In every case the efficiencies earned were disguised reductions in service and/or accessibility. There is no reason to even dream that this proposal offers anything more or better. The Government's assumption of the power to set mill rates was widely acclaimed due to the property tax relief but it set up the dilemma now facing us. A one mill increase, .01% of assessed value, could make choices less draconian no matter who ends up making them. The Government's acceptance and promotion of the ESSP has cast a good light on them for practicality and a clear focus on foundational skills. The good choices being praised today will be forgotten in the rush to deal with impacts of poor choices that seem to be under consideration now. In closing: -School divisions are already large enough to cause communication and transport problems. They should not increase in size in any significant geographic measure. -Locally elected boards may be a poor choice in some individual's minds, but like democracy as a whole, it's better than any other choice. -No matter the fiscal stressing, having locally accountable boards make the choices of what stays or goes guarantees the best choices. From a political perspective it means the dozens of tough calls are off loaded to locals. The government of the day only wears the primary shortage. -The earliest school board I've been made aware of was set up in 1903, peopled by democratically elected community members. Traditions that precede our establishment as a Province must have worth beyond the flavour of the month.

To whom it may concern: I have been made aware of the possibility of changes coming to the school divisions. My thoughts are that an elected local board would allow schools to be governed by leaders who already are familiar with the local situations. Each community has its own strengths and challenges and needs would be better met by a local school board. I realize that there are likely challenges with trying to minimize costs at a provincial level. I am sure there is no easy answer, but I believe it is in the students best interest to have things remain as they are. Thank you,

After reading the Education Governance Review - I respectfully request that you not implement any of the changes outlined. Please leave things as they are as I believe this is what is best for all the children of our province.

I am concerned about the suggestion of wage rollbacks, cuts, and freezing increments for two main reasons: First, the message is strong that education is not valued. The threatening of agreements negotiated in good faith clearly tells the public that it is okay to devalue education, and that cutting the public sector is an option even when education did not benefit from the boom. Please treat us like the professionals we are and recognize that we provide an extremely valuable contribution to our society. Secondly, and most importantly, funding cuts hurt students. Even beyond the stress of uncertainty on teachers which can affect the quality of instruction, the students are affected by incomplete programming, overcrowded classrooms, and insufficient resources. Schools are not drowning in money and are not spending frivolously, and every cut to education decreases the learning experiences of young people who will in turn be a burden on the government in the future in terms of health costs, lower tax contributions (from lower wages because they could not attain higher education and thus a better job), and possibly unemployment costs. Please find cuts in places that do not cripple our children and our future.

I believe we should stay with local SCC boards and locally elected division boards. As a teacher and principal, I went through amalgamation. It did see benefits, but only because we had a local elected board that knew about the unique qualities of each school in the division. Travel became a huge issue and really did not save money. Centralizing services and cost-cutting measures without the knowledge of the local area will greatly impact the classroom and individual students. Decisions need to be made at a local level, by those who are connected and therefore accountable to the community. In that way, they will do their best to ensure that stakeholders – parents, students, teachers and staff, and community members – are heard. Thank you.

My comments are not necessarily reflective of the position of my employer, but as an educator that has worked in the sector for more than 30 years, I feel obliged to weigh in as an individual. The options laid out in the Perrins report seem to have a common thread - one of more centralized control and efficiency. The objections to the options in the report also seem to have a common thread - loss of local voice. I believe there is a need for both, and opportunity to achieve both. It has been my experience that in spite of school divisions and schools professing to be unique and have individual needs, there is more commonality between schools and school divisions than there are differences. They are not so unique that they "need" to have different buses, different report cards, different policies, different software packages or different resources. Certainly there are differences between rural and urban schools (or large and small schools), those with sparse populations, those with high concentrations of First Nations and Metis students, or those with high concentrations of immigrants who may be English as an Additional Language learners, and those differences need to be addressed. A challenge I see repeated over and over, is a lack of consistency in direction and focus among school divisions. True, the Education Sector Strategic Plan has helped, but there continues to be little accountability for the measures in that plan or any "authority" to direct more attention be paid to any of the outcomes or priorities. This, I feel, is the Achille's heel of our system, and would be at least partially resolved by having a more centralized body that directs the schools. This could be achieved through a number of methods - the Ministry could be given greater authority to direct the actions of school divisions, a single entity could be given the authority, either as a single public division, or as a "super-division" that was given some authority over other divisions, and to a lesser level of success, would be to just have fewer divisions. The need for local voice will continue to be requested (although there doesn't seem to be the same need for social services, justice, agriculture or the other myriad of services that are delivered provincially, but impact locally), and this would likely need to be addressed. Without a doubt, there would still need to be regional presence of administrative staff, this would ensure that there was a common face, a known contact to deal with specific school needs, much like divisions now have a superintendent assigned to specific schools. Regions could be administered, from an educational perspective, much like divisions are now, with teams responsible for delivering service to an area. However, there would be a single direction, a single vision, and a common set of expectations and policies to be administered, rather than the menagerie that is currently in place. School Community Councils would continue to be the conduit to the administration, and would be the way for local voice to be heard. However, having a single payroll system, a single SIS, a single accounting system, a single procurement process, a single reporting system - all those administrative things could be entirely centralized (but perhaps physically done through regional offices). I am not sure this model will save much if any money, and I care less about that than improving the educational outcomes for our students, which in the long run has incredible financial payoffs for the province. The loss of local voice was the cry when 82 divisions turned into 28. Now the claim is that the 28 is just the right amount of local voice. Change is hard. Loss of perceived control is hard. Knowing that a quarter of our students do not graduate, and that the rate has not substantively changed in many years is hard. Knowing that we are last in all three categories in PISA results is hard. We can claim those tests don't really matter, that other things are more important, but there is no evidence we are doing any better in any other ways either. I would be very supportive of any change to governance which provided a more common vision and direction for education in our province, and one that was able to make hard decisions and hold the system accountable for improving results.

I would vote for locallyelected boards of education

My vote would be for the division model. Restructuring and considering the of realigning of boundaries in the division is a good idea. As mentioned in the article, this has not been done in 10 years and a lot has changed since then. It is important that each community has a say in what happens in their schools. Each community is different and each school is different and may require different needs for their students. Decisions should be kept localized. I've never thought it to be beneficial that an individual that sits in an office in some city makes the decisions for what happens in a small town school. Unless you are personally involved in each school or small community, how could you possibly make decisions that are in the best interests of each individual school. Each community and each school is unique and has different needs. The school divisions should definitely be more localized!

I believe that the voice and concerns of students,parents and communities for K to 12 education in this province can best be expressed through Boards of Education as they exist today. The focus of the efforts of Boards and the government needs to be be on providing the best education we can for our kids and not on diverting resources to restructuring a system that works quite well.

I strongly feel that locally elected Boards are able to make the best decisions for our students and communities. We are a large diverse province with unique needs in each area. I do not think an amalgamation of any kind would be in the best interest of my children or my community. Sincerely,

Subsidiarity is an incredibly important principle for a healthy democracy. Subsidiarity is the principle that states that no decision should be made any further away from the people the decision affects than is absolutely necessary. This is because the people the decision impacts understand their situation best. It is important to note that this is the same principle Brad Wall is using to protest the imposition of the carbon tax. The government of Saskatchewan is in a better position to understand the impact on the people living in Saskatchewan than politicians in Ottawa, particularly when the party in power has only one Saskatchewan Member of Parliament. I support Brad Wall defending Saskatchewan's right to make decisions for itself considering decisions that impact people living here which is why I am so dismayed by the idea of amalgamating school divisions, particularly urban and rural boards. I grew up in a rural area; I know the needs of communities that have less than twenty students in a class are different than communities that have over thirty, particularly when assessing students which I can tell you is the most time consuming and stressful part of a teacher's life. I know that having preparation time is different than having six periods to prepare for without any preparation time for marking, planning or collaboration. I know that multi-grade classrooms have very different needs than single grade classrooms. I know that visibility of board representatives in schools is preferable to feeling like "we are in this alone". When you combine this with lesser supports and an increasingly diverse student body in most schools, the ability for teachers to feel heard all but disappears if school boards are no longer local and no longer have any hope of responding to the particular needs of those employed by any particular school division. I also know that LINK agreements are the only way we have to try and deal with so many of the issues we face in schools in a way that actually address needs in the classroom. The STF struggles to address teacher work life issues because it cannot possibly respond to the diversity of teaching experiences of the teachers it represents. Because workload and expectations seem to increase each year and the resources school divisions access also lessens, teachers feel the only way they can be compensated is through salaries. I know that if other student and teacher centered needs were able to be addressed, less focus would be on teachers needing a higher wage. The focus on wage becomes necessary because if the work we do is harder and the expectations greater and there is no other way to address our concerns, teachers will default to demanding increased wages for increased work; it's only just. Most professional staff I talk to feel that the government is very disconnected from the life of teachers. The amalgamation of school divisions can only add to this problem. If the life of a teacher suffers, it can only lead to a increasingly weakened education system.

As a parent of two and a local School Community Council member, I am tremendously concerned that ANY of the proposed governance changes will seriously and negatively impact the structure of rural education. This would directly affect our children, change the dynamics within our community, and most importantly, negatively influence the quality of education our children receive. I feel strongly that rural thresholds must be maintained to protect the education of rural Saskatchewan children throughout the province. Possible school closures, longer transportation times, and larger class sizes are NOT in the best interests of our children. While I support finding efficiencies, this must be done without changing our present legislation, changing school division boundaries, and taking away local voices and representation on school division boards. Centralization of purchasing, and other administrative functions are examples of efficiencies that will in no way impact students. That should be the ultimate goal... find efficiencies without impacting the children of Saskatchewan.

I like my small division.

My thoughts are that I am not sure we will have a better school system by amalgamating all the divisions. The different school divisions need to be accountable, but again by amalgamating them , will it be difficult to be accountable as it becomes a much bigger area to be accountable for. Who would be in charge of the amalgamation? Would it not be taking away from the quality of education as time will be spent on amalgamation instead of education! Thank you

I have reviewed the Educational Governance Review Report and unfortunately, I do not feel that any of the options provided will provide the results that the government is looking for. It appears the report is solely focused on cost savings without reviewing the potential negative effects these proposals will have on the quality of education for our children and the sustainability of our communities. I do not support the concept of an appointed Board of Education, nor do I support any of the 3 models presented in the report. Models such as these put my children's school at risk of closure - which is unacceptable. I would like to see a permanent solution for high school transportation in our area and am very concerned what impact further amalgamation would have on my children's educational future. I believe the existing school divisions are moving in the right direction and given the opportunity they can find further efficiencies and cost savings without jeopardizing quality of education and the welfare of the students. I sincerely hope the minister will take into consideration the opinions of those that will be directly affected by the proposed changes - the parents, the teachers, the school boards and weigh them appropriately. Sincerely,

The students in _____ School have experienced drastic, negative changes since the amalgamation with Prairie Valley School Division. Our educational services lack, and it is our children who deal with the consequences of that lack. One example, the division office in Regina now controls the temperature at which our school, _____ is set. During winter mornings, the children need to wear their winter jackets and mitts in order to stay warm enough until the school reaches the division's desired temperature, which usually takes until the afternoon. The diminished school division system the government previously adopted is failing our children. Moving to a provincial governance option with appointed board members further deteriorates the educational services and quality that our children receive. I have been a Saskatchewan Party supporter for decades - not any more. The Saskatchewan Party now fails this province and every resident in it on numerous fronts.

I am opposed to the government's proposal to amalgamate school boards and very opposed to the government removing the right of Saskatchewan citizens choosing who will be representing their school divisions. Saskatchewan is a vast province where the needs of the schools are varied. People need to be part of the decision making process to create the best environment for learning. Studies have shown time and time again people are more effective when their needs are considered in their work environment rather than being directed from top-down work policies.

I am very concerned about the suggestion about wage rollbacks, cuts and freezing increments. The teachers of Saskatchewan bargained in good faith and thus the government has a responsibility to honour those contracts. The teachers after bargaining in good faith were MANDATED by the government to accept said contract and were not given the choice to accept it. If teachers (or any employees) are in line for an increment in wages, that must be honoured as well as this was promised in a legally binding contract which the government fully supported at the time it was signed by both parties involved. We cannot afford to lose young teachers, many new teachers already are having to explore other career opportunities due to shortfalls in their chosen field; if the negotiated collective agreement stipulates increments then those must be honoured. The provincial government must provide full funding to cover salaries, not dishonourably tell school boards that they must scrimp and cut to fund shortfalls. By refusing to provide funding to school boards for salaries that the government negotiated and agreed to in the end it will effect the children of the people that our province is so strongly trying to attract to our province or remain in our province. By telling school boards they have to find the money somehow by cutting programs, Educational Assistants, etc. it is only hurting the next generation of Saskatchewan workers. The burden for poor financial management by the current government should not be put on the youth of this province to bear. Education has many benefits to society as a whole and through the government supporting education they can ensure that students do not suffer (through incomplete programming or overcrowded classrooms or insufficient resources in the classroom). This could then lead to our next generation not becoming fully contributing members of society and thus, as adults, become a drain on government coffers in terms of health costs, lower tax contributions (from lower wages because they could not attain higher education and thus a better job), and possibly unemployment costs. It is disappointing that the current government has mismanaged our provinces finances to the tune of a 1 billion dollar deficit. Education should not be the first place they start to look to cut costs. The province should look to invest in the future of their most valuable resource, the people and especially the youth of this province.

Having gone through two amalgamations, I would like to share my perspectives for consideration of the current K-12 Education Governance review. I am open and receptive to change. That is to change that is for the right reasons and result in improved outcomes, positive experiences and increased opportunities. Amalgamation comes at a cost, actually many costs. There are numerous financial implications; there is the emotional toll and stress experienced by everyone impacted by the change; the trusting relationships that have to be developed and sometimes mended and the sense of loss of years of hard work, of good work erased by the stroke of a pen. It has been 11 years since our last amalgamation, and only in the last couple of years has it felt like we have truly become one. Our foundation is solid, our leadership is strong, our dedication to our staff, students and communities is undeniable and our results are inspiring. We can fully dedicate our focus and attention on providing the best experiences and opportunities for our students and our employees. Is the current financial crisis driving the governance review? What are the financial gains of restructuring? We can't afford to put our students and progress on hold while our energy is refocused to the enormous amount of work that will result from restructuring. So before a decision that will impact the lives and livelihoods of many is made, one must first consider the reasons why, and will the end result be improved outcomes, positive experiences and increased opportunities for the students and rate payers of Saskatchewan. The real crisis will be if restructuring school divisions comes at the expense of our students, families and communities. Is that a risk we are willing to take?

I believe it is very important for each school to have a local voice. It seems if that is taken away the small schools get lost in the shuffle!!! Smaller towns and schools need to be heard and are just as important as the larger locations!! Keep the local voice!!!

I am a resident of rural Saskatchewan holding a Master of Science degree (Finance) and a Bachelor of Commerce degree. I also have school age children attending school in Saskatchewan. I am understanding that Saskatchewan's education level has fallen behind every other province in Canada and our current government wants to fix this problem by cutting funding to the education system (in the face of increasing cost-of-living). The Perrins' Report suggests that altering the governance structure of education in the province is the solution to eliminating wasted spending by having multiple structures in the province doing the same thing when it would be more efficient to have fewer (one) structure held responsible for the whole province. The Perrins' Report further suggests there are goals for higher graduation rates for students by 2020. Unfortunately the report doesn't actually address the problem of motivating/educating children to accomplish these goals. By focusing on structures, suggesting that one structure can accomplish the same thing as multiple structures, the report doesn't actually address the problem of how children will be motivated to learn any differently than they are now. The more centralized the structure, the more removed the children and teachers are from the decision makers. The teachers become enforcers of policies they don't necessarily believe in; they may even see evidence that these policies are making matters worse but they are required to enforce them anyway. The 'experimental' marking system currently in use by Sask Rivers does not hold teachers accountable for their grades and it is virtually impossible for a student to complain successfully. Distancing teachers from the decision-making process leads to more problems as the teachers attempt to cope with a dysfunction that puts money ahead of students. The teachers are required to address their problems to the principal, who (if he/she deems the problem is sufficient to be passed on) will report to their boss. This boss receives all sorts of reports from all sorts of principals and is required to sort through them to determine what, if anything, is passed on. This process continues up the chain. It is very possible that the motivation of the boss to pass on problems is based more on how it reflects on that boss's career than on the original student/teacher making the complaint. This 'observation' becomes even more critical when the council is appointed by the government (Department of Education) rather than elected by the people. Likewise, if the problem makes its way through the hierarchy, the decision to fix it will depend on the cost involved. Therefore, schools will be motivated to solve their own problems at their own level and their own way. This solution may not embrace the 'professional' ethic that is required of educators. One may find that charges against educators will increase in future as teachers become frustrated with having always to do more with less. Unfortunately, our education system is not very creative when it comes to generating revenue; the tried and true method of taxation is the easiest method and no one is motivated to even consider anything else. I heard recently on the news that Saskatchewan is dead last in the education race and the higher-ups in the system blame poverty for the problem. I have also read recently that Saskatchewan is the only province that does not mandate children be taught about finance in the schools or has no plans to mandate this subject. Since money is the tool with which we all purchase our 'necessities of life' and people have been known to commit suicide when their finances 'go to pot', one can believe that finance education should be at least as important as the three 'R's'. (I know of no one who committed suicide because they couldn't read.) Changing the structure of school governance will not fix problems that are currently in place, and it will very likely produce more problems in the future. Although I believe something needs to change, I believe those in charge are seeing the problem from completely the wrong angle. I believe a solution that motivates and rewards students and gives educators help and advice that does not have to be routed through the school principal would propel the school system forward; unlike the change in structure which will likely propel it backward. The rural students in Sask. Rivers already have less class alternatives than their urban counterparts. This lack of class choice means they are still offered the 'necessary' classes but have to take them only when they are scheduled at the school, which is often only once every two years. The scarcity of resources and class times can put rural students at a disadvantage when they are applying for scholarships at post-secondary institutions. For instance, students are often stronger in one subject than another, and rural students cannot arrange their class schedules to take the classes they are stronger in before scholarship deadlines appear. Having said that, it should be possible to amalgamate a portion of the school divisions such as the accounting and general oversight, but still have boards to make their presentations to the 'overseer'. I do not think the Perrins' Report did a good job in examining all of the alternatives available, and I do not think the Perrins' Report will accomplish the ultimate goal of better educating Saskatchewan's valuable future resource – its students. Note that I received a message that the content of my message may pose a security risk and I need to change it? There was nothing in the message that was a security risk of any sort and I am wondering why the government wants to control what people think? If you want the complete message, you will need to contact me.

I am a resident of _____ askatchewan and I am concerned about changes being considered to the education system in this province. I am opposed to the proposed school board amalgamations and I am opposed to the appointment of trustees. Thank you.

It is of the utmost importance to keep the Catholic schools operating as they are now. Since "God" has been removed from the public schools in every way shape and form it is imperative that one school system be allowed to invite God into the classroom. Therefore it is mandatory to keep our regional elected school boards so that the government cannot take God out of that school system.

After receiving the EESP, I have the following feedback: As a parent of grade 5 & 7 students at and a small town ratepayer, I do not feel that any of the options outlined in the above report align with the needs of my family or community. We lived through a major amalgamation in 2006 and the dust from that is just now settling. I feel that further efficiencies and cost saving measures could be put into place within the existing structure rather than disrupt the whole education process for a dollar savings that is as of yet undetermined. A major restructuring will come at a great cost and will set education as a whole back across the province while adjusting to new procedures and divisional cultures. As members of a rural community that is in close proximity to a large city, I have many concerns about how any changes will affect our school and in turn our community. Taking the time and effort to review all options is valuable, but I strongly feel that another amalgamation or restructuring of school division so close in time to the last would be an error in judgement when further cost saving measures and efficiencies are yet to be explored. Further, I agree with the following statements as discussed by our local SCC: We do support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! We do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. We do not support any of the three models presented in the report. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support that change to governance or further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. We have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold we are legislated by. We need a permanent high school plan, including transportation, to accommodate the best interests of our students, their families, and our community. Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in.

To whom this may concern, I truly believe it takes a village to raise a child. As an educator since 2002, I have seen many changes in the classroom and one change that concerns me the most is the amount of children that struggle academically and emotionally. I believe that these struggles arise home children's home lives, where their parents are struggling to "keep up" financially and emotionally. With these struggles, it is now more than ever, important to keep our "village" close with local supports and people. To amalgamate school divisions would be detrimental for students and staff who require a local supportive village. I believe this decision is not about the well being of students, only about money. Currently the board members we have, are passionate about education and children and they are visual support within our schools. When I need to support as a parent or a teacher, these members are there for me within 5 minutes. To move to larger school divisions, we would lose this connection and support. We would have people in distant locations that do not know our schools, our students, our teachers, or our communities and our needs. I have colleagues who have been through an amalgamation and they have confirmed that those students lost 3 years of academics due to the great shuffle, larger classrooms, and loss of services. This will without a doubt happen to students if the government chooses to make larger divisions. Today I communicate my concern as both a parent and a teacher who is passionate about the education of children. Please do not destroy our local villages of education. Sincerely,
(Educator and Parent)

Dear Honourable Premier Brad Wall, elected officials and the Education Consultative Committee: After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report we would offer the following feedback: We do not feel that the options presented in this report will result in significant cost savings without negatively impacting the quality of education for our students, eroding community voice, and affecting the sustainability of our community. We support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for students and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). We do not support the concept of an appointed Board of Education. We believe local voice is an essential part of a successful school-community relationship. We do not support any of the 3 models presented in the report. We feel forced amalgamation puts our school, and many like it, at risk of closure. We want to know what potential changes there will be to the rural school closure thresholds that are currently legislated. We feel this is a critical consideration in evaluating the options. We would like to see a permanent solution for high school transportation and are concerned what impact forced amalgamation will have on bus ride times for our students. We believe that further progress can be made in existing school divisions to find sector-wide efficiencies and cost-savings and recognize that the government may need to be more directive in requiring these sector-wide efficiencies to be realized. Sincerely,

I am against any further amalgamation of school boards. As a resident of a rural RM the children around here already get pennies of service for local tax dollars. I see further amalgamation as way to funnel more money away from rural students. There are many problems with our current education system but removing local control is not going to fix it.

Currently the local school board trustees are elected by and responsible to the rate payers and more importantly the parents of the children attending the schools in the division. The amalgamations in 2006 resulted in a size of organization that is big enough to have sufficient resources to meet the needs for the children and small enough to be able to respond quickly and effectively to the needs of the communities and parents. Issues such as bus transportation in the smaller rural divisions such as ours often take more than the numbers seen in an email or report in order to make the right determination and to keep the focus on students come first. Local boards of trustees help maintain the programming that is sought after and are identified as important by the communities such as wood working/carpentry/welding as well as band and athletics. The ability to identify and meet local priorities will likely be lost and or underfunded in a larger organization. The larger centres such as Saskatoon and Regina already get the lion's share of capital funding and a larger organization would likely expedite this. Opportunities for reducing costs could include a more extensive purchasing program for supplies that are used by all school divisions eg janitorial, having the licensing fees for various software programs covered under a broader provincial approach; purchasing of big ticket items like buses eg set up a standing offer with companies for this on behalf of all the school divisions; working with the school divisions to develop an agreed upon schedule for evergreening of IT equipment-this does not mean red circling some while others catch up but rather doing a 5 year plan. These are some of my thoughts

To whom it may concern; I am writing you to discuss my opinion on which avenue is best for the students within the confines of your report. The best for all involved is the 3b option, to let the system be, as much as is possible. We have elected our representatives within the school division, we have made our decision as to whom represents us and to remove them in order to create even larger divisions, or even one giant one, is against our rights as parents, and our rights as voters. Yes, the system needs improvement. However, I feel that the government's efforts would be better used in repairing our ailing health system, instead of reducing any chances our students have at the best education possible. If I may also add, the only way you'll have a world class education system, is if you stop treating students as your gross end product. Education is not a corporate business, and it will never make you money. That's not the point. The point is to teach students how to bring the most back into our civilization once they graduate, how to make the largest contribution to us all. If you wish to make money, hire them into your corporations, hire them back into all of the businesses in the community, make them ready for what the world needs. Education is an investment, and I think we would all benefit if the government stopped cheapening the value of said investment with cutbacks, efficiencies, school closures, etc. Leave the teachers to teach, and perhaps save some money on reducing the amount of managers, chiefs, bosses, etc that seem to always speak to us condescendingly, and hinder any possible progress. Just my contribution. Yours,

We need to continue to focus on improving student achievement. There is no evidence that these proposed changes will save money, but will distract from the important work being done in public school divisions. We need to have continued local voice in education. This process has been rushed without the time needed to truly study the options. I do not support further amalgamations.

I understand that changes are being considered in our education system. I support North East School Division in urging the provincial government to hold off on any thoughts of school board amalgamation until considering other options more extensively. Please consider my concerns and ideas: 1) LOCALLY elected school boards are the BEST choice for my community. They are responsible for placing student needs first when making decisions and are accountable to their electorate. 2) Taxpayers deserve LOCAL representation for education since a large percentage of the funding for education comes from local property taxes. This is DIFFERENT from Health Care where the majority of their funding comes from the Provincial government's general revenue. 3) As a teacher and parent, I am well aware of the steep learning curve there is when one starts a new job, moves to a new school, or must learn new curriculum or a new assessment model. Base on past experience, amalgamation will put the FOCUS on managing the administrative changes in policies and procedures while leaving less time and energy to focus on improving student learning. 4) Please allow School Divisions and their Boards to consider further cost-saving measures locally before considering the drastic options put forth in the Perrin Report. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from their community. The saying, "Necessity is the mother of invention" reminds me that LOCAL citizens have a vested interest in creative problem-solving that will reflect student needs. Working together,

I have great concern of the possibility of moving school boards away from being locally filled and run. Local representatives are better able to observe the needs of the schools which will allow needs to be met more appropriately.

I am writing to say that I 100 % disagree with this and do not want this to go forward. There needs to be more research done in more rural areas. This will impact our rural school immensely and as a parent of three kids, I do not want to see my children suffer any more. The students need to be your main priority. Please do not go forward with this. We 100% oppose.

Our Saskatoon Catholic School Board includes adults and high school students who have an invested interest in trying to create the best learning experience, and best spiritual direction for our children. Please hear our voice. Thank you.

As both a parent of a rural Saskatchewan student and as a member of a Saskatchewan community, I am deeply concerned about the 3 options put forth in Mr. Dan Perrin's Educational Governance Review Report and do not support any of them. First and foremost, the lack of forethought to impacts on all Saskatchewan students is a grossly ignorant and glaringly absent from the report. The idea of removing elected board members and replacing them with appointed board members, removes our right as Saskatchewan residents to have a direct voice about education. Those board members are elected in the same way our government is elected. Why should we, the people not be allowed to be represented in education through these elected members? The publicly elected board member for my children's schools, attend our School Community Council meetings, are available and open to discussions with anyone within our area. Appointed board members are not accountable to the people of Saskatchewan. They are instead, most likely already internal government employees being moved into positions by government and not the people of Saskatchewan. Provincially appointed board members will not be as accessible, nor will they know their communities' needs. They will not be at the schools; they will be in their offices. It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! Currently under the direction of the Prairie Valley School Division, we celebrate some of the highest performance scores in Reading and Math as well as extraordinary High School graduation rates. What guarantee is there that these standards of excellence will be maintained through provincial amalgamations? There isn't any guarantee. All forced amalgamations will be extremely costly to students, teachers, administrators, families and communities. The last forced amalgamations in 2006 saw students, teacher and administrators at a loss for several years while they tried to make things work. The cost and burden is directly put on students! The youth of Saskatchewan should not bear the brunt of the financial situation the province is in! There is no budgetary evidence in the report, to support the governance change or how further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. Changes as large as described in the report, will have large administration costs. How is that not thought of? Was there any investigation into the costs of the last amalgamation? If anything is gained, it will be a very small drop in the bucket to the overall debt situation. I am deeply concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold. Rural communities thrive, grow, and revolve around their schools. Closing schools will "close" small town Saskatchewan. A government for the rural people of Saskatchewan have given little to no thought of the impact to rural Saskatchewan. My community and I have great concerns for distance, safety, and time spent on buses for rural children caused by closures. We need a permanent high school plan to accommodate the best interests of our students, their families, and our community, as well as a permanent high school transportation plan. We would rather our students be part of a smaller school, than being in overcrowded classrooms in larger centers. This is one of the reasons people choose to reside in rural areas. Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in. In Mr. Perrin's report the opening letter to Minister Morgan states that ALL stakeholders who approached Mr. Perrin for conversation UNANIMOUSLY support elected boards and NO more amalgamations! WHY would we continue with pursuing drastic changes? Sincerely,

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report we would offer the following feedback: We do not feel that the options presented in this report will result in significant cost savings without negatively impacting the quality of education for our students, eroding community voice, and affecting the sustainability of our community. We support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for students and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). We do not support the concept of an appointed Board of Education. We believe local voice is an essential part of a successful school-community relationship. We do not support any of the 3 models presented in the report. We feel forced amalgamation puts our school, and many like it, at risk of closure. We want to know what potential changes there will be to the rural school closure thresholds that are currently legislated. We feel this is a critical consideration in evaluating the options. We would like to see a permanent solution for high school transportation and are concerned what impact forced amalgamation will have on bus ride times for our students. We believe that further progress can be made in existing school divisions to find sector-wide efficiencies and cost-savings and recognize that the government may need to be more directive in requiring these sector-wide efficiencies to be realized. Sincerely,

As a group-SCC we have had a large group discussion and compiled the following feedback:

Feedback Re: Educational Governance Review Report January 2017 Option #1 Pro's -access to programs may improve for all members -less \$ spent on board level administration -more standard distribution of money (problem is equal is not always fair) -transparency Con's -Time lost on restructuring -various variables between communities (rural and urban) Ex: inner school vs affluent school vs rural school -to align the various contracts of the different employee groups -public, catholic, first nation can't be all the meshed in the same pot -communication becomes more complex with a governance setting -impede the parents ability to communicate directly with the board (especially special needs) -lack of a superintendent really knowing my school Questions Will administration cost us more -have you considered to try this as a trial run with 1 region instead of the whole province. -have you thought through what the organizational template is going to look like (who reports to who etc) Option #2 -able to do a pilot of this option (1 section of the province -director is closer to what is really needed, they can advocate for that particular region - purchasing power is still a plus - -what would be the cost savings with senior administration look like Option #3a -cost savings possibly -easier and more input and voice at the local/smaller level -easier to get your voice heard -may be able to back your teachers/schools better with this smaller level - -could be lashback from the different schools that are being affected -realigning the boundaries is too much of the same of what we have right now Option #3b -restructuring like this would be schools with similar size (Warman to joining Saskatoon school division) -bussing of kids to different schools -bussing distances to furthers schools - General Comments -organization chart for all 4 options -average out all the cost of the various divisions (all employs) -pilot on one new division first to see if it works and saves money

Dear Sir/Madam,

In regards

to amalgamation, bigger is not always better. With a broader span of kilometers of a school division, there are logistical encumbrances that will occur. Busing is only one example of the logistical issues that would arise.

If large scale amalgamation occurred, logistically, my children would be closer in kilometers to School than the school that would be able to service their needs in the current school division. There has been chatter regarding the possibility of getting rid of our Division Board Members. This would be a great disservice to our schools and communities. Our Division Board Member, attends our meetings, meets with our community at community functions, attends our students functions and serves as a vital link from the School Division and ourselves. With a Division Board Member, he is more in tune with what our community or school may be struggling with and require support on, than someone who would just sit at a desk perhaps looking at emails of concern from Administrators, Teachers, Council Members and Parents. A Division Board Member is invested in that School or Community that he/she represents, they are a first of all a ratepayer somewhere in the group of schools he represents, secondly the success of the educational system within his district is directly tied to the success of the community and surrounding rural areas and most importantly, most of the Board members carry a wealth of historical data with them that helps guide the school community, staff and councils on what has worked, what has been tried, where to go for things needed and most of all what has not worked in the past. Speaking from a School Community Council prospective, now is not the time for huge change. The most important job we have as parents, community members, teachers, administrators and government officials is to ensure we are doing the best possible job for our students and children. After the last amalgamation, it took years for all staff, students and communities to settle into what was the new norm. With getting rid of the local boards and creating the School Community Councils there was a huge mind shift of responsibilities for the parents of what say they had in the child's education. In what is best of children academically especially in their younger years is consistency. I have seen from a parental prospective how constant change affects a child's learning. I have also seen from a parental prospective how constant and continually unchanging environment excels a child's learning. In short, I know that lots in the world breaks down to dollars and cents, but do we want to perhaps sacrifice or jeopardize and entire generation's learning? I hope that their needs factor heavily when deciding on what changes must be made. Thank you for you time.

I prefer a democratically elected school board in which i can hold accountable. I do not want someone in Regina deciding on what is best for the education of my children. As a voter who has supported this Government since its inception. I feel I should have a say due to my taxes will be paying for this. The last consolidation held back education and ended up costing us more money than it saved. Our school in is the core of our tiny community. Someone who is not from our region would never know that, they are disconnected. Please take my thoughts into account, as a change in this education policy will see me withdrawing my children from your current system and home schooling. I wonder if I should withhold that percentage of my taxes as well. I hope that it does not come to that. I have shared my thoughts on this matter as a taxpayer and a voter.

I feel that the government should keep the school divisions the way they are.

We live in rural in Saskatchewan where some supports only come once a week for example speech and language pathologist and if Monday is holiday they don't come at all. So if the divisions are bigger I feel that support will even be less. I also feel that our taxes we pay will not be going towards our school but any school in the division which isn't right. If you have a problem within your school at least with the current set up you can probably get a answer that day or the next from the division but with the new system it may take a week. The children cannot afford to have a disruption in their education and especially ones who have disabilities as change usually doesn't go well with the students as they like routine. The change would definitely hurt the rural schools probably more than the cities. I feel that with the change the government is trying to eventually close the rural schools which would hurt small communities tremendously and would mean longer bus rides for students that live in the country, If this change happens you may find more children being home schooled which would not benefit any of the schools or the communities. So again I say that the government needs to keep the school divisions just the way they are. Its a good system that works why change it maybe look at ways to make it better by keeping the divisions the same.

I'm disheartened by government's plan to "seek efficiencies" in the K-12 system. Too often we see millions paid to outside consultants rather than ask the people working in the division - all the people who work there, not just the board members - where things could be made better. This "top down" approach does nothing to ensure that students are getting the best experience possible, when all they do is cut services from the bottom.

To Our Government: "Democracy is the worst form of government except all those other forms that have been tried from time to time." (Winston Churchill, November 11th 1947). I wonder does our government have a problem with democracy? At a time when the government has increased provincially the number of elected representatives which resulted in a larger voice for themselves and of course a smaller voice for the opposition they now have tasked themselves with a governance review of Education. Now that may seem like strong language but I feel that is exactly what is happening here. First it was Health Boards, now Boards of Education and in the near future, Municipalities. In Health Care we saw a reduction, over time, of the number of districts to elected boards then a mix of appointed and elected to just appointed boards and now, as per the provincial announcement, we are to have one provincial health district. The irony is that the biggest advocate for health care seems to be the federal government given the recent demand from them justifying our use of private MRI clinics here. But I digress. We are here to talk about Education or more to the point the governing of education. I have to admit it looks pretty bleak. We have 28 boards with something over 250 trustees. It seems like over half of them are acclaimed (and what's the difference between appointed and acclaimed right?) with at least half of that being former educators or administrators and maybe 80 percent overall not even having children of their own in school. I mean who is really being represented here? But like Winston I'm not a fan of the alternative. You may not like it, I may not like it but if that's what the people vote for that's what they get. No one can argue that but there are things we can do better to nourish democracy and the quality of governance we have. Lucky for you I'm here to make some suggestions. Number one for me is the glaring misconception in the Perrin report that the government provides funding with little or no ability to direct how those monies will be directed. Legislatively you have seized control across the province of education's access to taxation and are the majority on the bargaining committee with the STF. Instruction I might add is by far the largest single expense of any board accounting for somewhere between 70 to 75 percent of any boards budget. After infrastructure and transportation there is a measly nickel of every dollar in those budgets for administration and a penny or so for governance. My point is you can't keep reducing your obligations to education through a finance formula, preach a "do more with less" mantra, and be responsible for the largest part of a board's expense then claim you have no say and it must be time to review governance and the expense it generates. It would be funny if it wasn't so serious. I'll take time right now to mention that even the Perrin report acknowledges that the provincial government hasn't even finished a review on how it funds education but the government already knows that they need to blame, I mean examine, education governance for any shortfalls in student outcomes. So my recommendation would be instead of pitting rural against urban, catholic against public, elected vs. appointed and reneging on financial obligations that we all sit down and work together to provide a fair equitable solution for all parties involved within the financial constraints we are now facing. In the meantime the public would appreciate if the government would put on the grown up pants instead of hiding behind intrigue and a speedy process that raises more questions than it answers. If the government is truly concerned with what is best for the students then it needs to stand behind elected boards, provide them with educational opportunities to foster improvement and ensure sustainable funding to education as a whole so they can grow. I know these suggestions aren't glamorous, they will take time and patience but in the end wouldn't the results be more satisfying? I know in four years you just might have my vote. Thanks for your time. Sincerely,

I am not in favor of joining all Saskatchewan School divisions into one division. There are vast differences between the needs of urban and rural schools. I fear a lack of understanding of rural school needs. There is frequent communication between our school and our local school board. I value this open line of communication, and would be devastated to lose it. I fear if we all become one large division, there will be school closures and loss of jobs. Our students currently have excellent education in a smaller populated setting. Each student receives the attention and help they require. There are students in our school that I feel would highly benefit by having an EA, but are currently with out. I am grateful, these students can at least receive extra attention in our small school. These students would be lost in the cracks of a larger school. Please do not enlarge our school division boundaries, as it is large enough already.

It is of extreme importance that we keep the school boards locally elected. We must keep the voice of families and students closely connected to the communities they are representing. The options that have been outlined pull the voice away from the people. This is our community, our province, our children, our future and we must ensure that our needs are met. Who better to make sure we continue on a road to success, a road to best education, best teacher to student ratio, a road where the needs of all students and schools are being met than our own community members? Keep our school boards locally elected.

Dear Wall Government: In the past I have supported the direction of the Wall Government, believing that this Government works for the betterment of its people – striving to make the best possible and progressive Saskatchewan possible. I am proud to be in a province that has a government who will stand up for it's populous – i.e. the carbon tax. However, I am very dismayed and disappointed; almost ashamed by this Governments recent "bull dozer" tactics to push through on many "transformative" changes without due consult from the people it affects. Now this is where a typical government would insert a typical BS line about "Well we gave you an opportunity to have your say but..." For you, as a government to say that you have done enough to educate and allow for input from the people before making sweeping changes in the health care system and now to apply these despicable tactics in an attempt to overhaul the education system, is appalling. To say that you received input from the public regarding the health care changes, when approximately 300 voices were heard from a province of over million people, is wrong! Shame on you, to lower your standards and to find this is an acceptable way to run the province of Saskatchewan. To pat yourself on the back and say that you have done your job, for the people of this province, is a farce. This Government needs a wakeup call. When your decision affects the lives and futures of my children, you better make sure you hear my voice as a parent. You don't present a dry 40+ page report, written in government language a day before a 2 week Christmas holidays and then expect a typical busy parent, during the busiest time of the year for families, to find, no dig for it on the Government website, read, formulate an opinion and report that said opinion back to you within the limited time frame of 3 weeks you set and expect to hear from the masses. But then again, isn't that your end game, that you don't have to hear from the people, who's lives you will be affecting so that you can be content that you did a good job and heard from a few, who were savvy enough to find the report, make an opinion and express it through a single digital reporting option, within your short deadline. We are a province built on "Coffee Row" we deserve the opportunity to have open, transparent and honest discussion with each other as communities and with the government. I was always impressed how Mr. Wall would say that he, himself, has a personal opinion, but it is only one opinion and if the rest of his party did not agree then the he would go with the overall voice and his own opinions would be set aside for the party and for the province, and for the most part he has reflected this idealism when it comes to running this province, but not as of late. If you are no longer able to see that it is not just the government's opinion that count, but the peoples, then maybe it is time for the government to reevaluate how it wants to run the Province. It is not the just the will of the government or the just the will of the people, we are one province and we need to discuss this. We trust in you to be open and honest, trust in us, that if you give us all the information we need to make the best possible choice, we will. We are not stupid, please don't treat us like we are.

I support amalgamation, as a cost saving method for school divisions. I think there are benefits that go beyond, such as access to alternate programs. That being said it had been shown when divisions amalgamate they are protecting division staff, over teachers and therefore students. The unfortunate reality of this is, I believe if amalgamations happen a mandate of student teacher ratio or no front line job loss will need to accompany it. It's very unfortunate that the school divisions have not made this choice in the past, and your government has taken the hit for it. My only issue is amalgamation that includes urban and rural. These schools have very different issues and leaving Regina and Saskatoon as their own school divisions will protect rural schools, and their students.

I feel that the divisions are already big enough in area for the most part . Also I feel we need elected boarded not appointed to keep a small town voice

After reading, and re-reading the report compiled by Dan Perrins, I am still struggling to make sense of how his proposed "options" will benefit my children, our School, and the Horizon School Division. While the report in its entirety is concerning, there are several points that lead me to believe that Minister Morgan and his colleagues are planning to suck the life out of small town Saskatchewan.

Thank you for this opportunity to voice my opinion on education. With whatever plan is put forth, it is important to consider the percentage of administration cost versus the percentage of the budget delegated to those people working directly with the students. It is paramount that the greater percent needs to focus on the day to day education of students.

As a parent the thought of amalgamation or appointed boards is troubling. In Sun West we have a board and leadership team committed to our students, communities, teachers and all others that have a stake in my children's education. From this commitment I truly feel that what's best for my children is at the forefront of their decision making. In Sun West there has been a continuous innovative and transformational Change that has resulted in amazing opportunities for my children to be the most successful they can be in their education. The thing that excites me the most is that no matter who they are the focus is still the same, Sun West is learning to be adaptable to all learning styles and levels to be able to deliver an incredible education to all. I truly believe this is a direct result of the system we are in. Having locally elected boards gives the division direction from a grassroots level. I am a trustee now but things were happening before I got on the board. We had a board that recognized the diversity and challenges of rural education and knew the status quo wasn't good enough. The board at the time had the foresight and vision to intentionally seek out and find leadership to take their division in a direction to change education to make it equitable for all students and what an incredible change is happening. The personalized and blended learning that is taking place in all our schools is transformational and will be a key to the continued success of all our students. This type of teaching and learning gives our learners, my learners, the opportunity to really succeed and excel in all aspects of their education. As a parent I am very thankful for the way our education system is set up and I see the impact our board of trustees has had on my children's education, my community and also the schools and communities across our division. In rural Saskatchewan losing that local voice to be able to address the local issues that are specific to an area or a larger issue shared across the division would be a shame. Could a local appointee be as affective as an elected one, maybe, but being elected carries a different level of accountability. Do we need to work on this area of public awareness, sure we do but it's still the best way to have the voice, share concerns and successes with the board that makes the decisions. As far as amalgamations go, these rural divisions are large enough already. A little thoughtful, well planned tweaking here and there may not be too invasive but large wholesale changes will have a negative affect on my children's education. With amalgamation comes more windshield time for all the people who make the decisions on how my kids are educated. From the board to the administration team, they'd all have to spend more time behind the wheel which is costly and ineffective. These people have a great deal of influence on my kids education and making it less practical than it is today for them to be able to spend the time needed to do their jobs appropriately will be very concerning for me. Without the board and administration team knowing and understanding the successes and challenges in every school we have, leaves them in a reactive position as opposed to a proactive position allowing them to get out in front of upcoming challenges. Larger divisions will have a huge impact on student achievement both from the time it takes to get through amalgamation to just not being able to be as effective after. I really value the education governance system we have in place today. I know it is having a huge impact on the success of my children's education experience.

I am nervous about large scale changes happening. Like in everything we do, we need to do a check to make sure what we're doing is working and in this case I see it is. No doubt, like I said before, some well thought tweaking may be appropriate but wholesale changes will greatly impact my children's education.

large scale changes will make my family make tough decisions going forward on her education. A system in upheaval is not an ideal place for high student achievement.

Please note that I am NOT in favour of government appointed boards. I believe locally elected boards are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. They are important advocates for ensuring excellence in education. Each division is unique, as well as each school. Who better to represent our community than those elected by our community? I believe it is vitally important to support the Greater Saskatoon Catholic School Board of Education in their endeavour to keep elected boards of education, for the schools, our communities, and most of all, our students. Thank you.

I do not support the three options presented in the Perrins report. We need an elected voice within our school system not an appointed board.

Advisory Panel for K-12 Governance Options From: retired resident In consideration of the options outlined in the K-12 Governance Report, I will offer a few of my thoughts on the matter. In his report, Mr. Perrins states that the Report's purpose is to determine the form of governance needed to achieve the outcomes in the Plan for Growth and Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). Given that much of the Report relates to the reduction or elimination of school boards, it is worth noting in the Report that Mr. Perrins acknowledges that the ESSP was not a government mandated proposal, but rather it was a plan developed "...through cooperation among all educational partners" and "...was approved by the 28 Boards of Education." The Report also states that after only two years, the ESSP is showing positive results. So, if school boards are involved in the development and implementation of the ESSP, why would the Government of Saskatchewan consider dissolving school boards that are demonstrating such leadership and successful implementation? Present day school boards are clearly providing valuable leadership. There is another reason I oppose those options that would reduce the number of school boards that currently exist. The entirety of our province's history includes the important role of elected trustees and school board members in providing caring and informed governance over the schools of the communities that they represent. It seems inconceivable that a single provincial board or several regional boards could provide that same quality of governance – governance that needs to be tuned to the various needs and issues of the schools and communities in this province. Parents and residents care deeply about schools – next to family life, there is no other single entity that has as much impact on a family or a community. To dissolve school boards takes away from residents the democratic process that has served this province so well. As well, it must not be overlooked that we all still pay a local educational tax on our properties, and that there exists a long standing relationship between taxation and representation that must not be overlooked. Some of the information in the Report relates to the cost of operating School Boards. The report states that the cost of governance is 0.6% of the total operating funding. We would do well to remember that democratic entities must expect to have costs associated with democratic representation. In addition, I would hope that the Government of Saskatchewan would not conclude that 0.6% is the amount of money to be saved by eliminating School Boards. It is clear that in the 25 days that Mr. Perrins took the Report from commencement to presentation, he did not have time to develop any kind of costing of the alternatives. So, it would be inappropriate for the Government of Saskatchewan to dissolve School Boards for the reason of saving money when there is no indication how much there is to be saved. What is suggested in the Report is that if School Boards were dissolved, there would be the need for advisory groups and perhaps some kind of professional staff to fill the void. Obviously there would be costs related to that. As well, the Report indicates that a single provincial board (and perhaps regional boards?) would have to be comprised of appointees with specific skill sets. Most certainly these board members would also need compensation at a significant level. So, it is evident that a critical element of any decision related to finance is left wanting – that element being to count the cost beforehand. Further to this, the report does acknowledge that the work of restructuring a large system is significant. This is work that would be time consuming and costly. The proof of this can be found in the experiences of previous amalgamations. Incredible resources were poured into the amalgamating of school divisions leading up to the current situation. School boards were tasked with merging and re-writing policies, merging systems and departments, re-aligning staff, and re-negotiating contracts. This was work that was multi-year in nature. Were there any efficiencies achieved? Yes, certainly. The architects of that plan to amalgamate created the current number of school boards in order to find the optimum size for school divisions. So, that work has already been done. There would be no such similar efficiencies to be found through further amalgamation. In conclusion, I reiterate these points: 1) It is wrong to eliminate School Boards because they prove their worth by the leadership they provide; 2) It is wrong to eliminate School Boards because they are an integral part of the democratic process for communities in Saskatchewan; 3) It is wrong to eliminate School Boards because they can best represent community interests and needs; 4) It is wrong to eliminate School Boards in an attempt to save money because any possible savings have not been quantified; and 5) It is wrong to eliminate School Boards in an attempt to achieve efficiencies, because that has been largely achieved through past amalgamations.

Good Morning. As an Educational Assistant, I feel a wage freeze or decrease would not be beneficial to anyone concerned. I have been with my school for 20 years. I have 3 children. One in grade 12. I found that in order for him to enjoy playing hockey and other sports, I have had to get a part time job. I clean a couple nights a week so we can afford the travel, rink fees, ect. If all school divisions are controlled by one entity, I feel the local schools, who know the community, would no longer be able to help the students in need with the proper personality fit for the individual. As the saying goes, "It takes a community to raise a child." If the local Board is diminished, the students are the ones who suffer the effects. Thank you for your attention in this matter and keeping our students your number one priority. sincerely,

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report we would offer the following feedback: We do not feel that the options presented in this report will result in significant cost savings without negatively impacting the quality of education for our students, eroding community voice, and affecting the sustainability of our community. We support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for students and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). We do not support the concept of an appointed Board of Education. We believe local voice is an essential part of a successful school-community relationship. We do not support any of the 3 models presented in the report. We feel forced amalgamation puts our school, and many like it, at risk of closure. We want to know what potential changes there will be to the rural school closure thresholds that are currently legislated. We feel this is a critical consideration in evaluating the options. We would like to see a permanent solution for high school transportation and are concerned what impact forced amalgamation will have on bus ride times for our students. We believe that further progress can be made in existing school divisions to find sector-wide efficiencies and cost-savings and recognize that the government may need to be more directive in requiring these sector-wide efficiencies to be realized. Sincerely,

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report we would offer the following feedback: We do not feel that the options presented in this report will result in significant cost savings without negatively impacting the quality of education for our students, eroding community voice, and affecting the sustainability of our community. We support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for students and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). We do not support the concept of an appointed Board of Education. We believe local voice is an essential part of a successful school-community relationship. We do not support any of the 3 models presented in the report. We feel forced amalgamation puts our school, and many like it, at risk of closure. We want to know what potential changes there will be to the rural school closure thresholds that are currently legislated. We feel this is a critical consideration in evaluating the options. We would like to see a permanent solution for high school transportation and are concerned what impact forced amalgamation will have on bus ride times for our students. We believe that further progress can be made in existing school divisions to find sector-wide efficiencies and cost-savings and recognize that the government may need to be more directive in requiring these sector-wide efficiencies to be realized. Sincerely,

Dear Minister Morgan, I am writing on behalf of _____ School Community Council. Our school community council unanimously supports our elected boards and believe they are the only way to represent our local voice, we do not believe that having government appointed trustees would be in the best interests of our children. We unanimously support no more amalgamation, we believe our school divisions are large enough to achieve all significant economies of scale, additional amalgamation will not improve student outcomes and we do not believe it will result in other savings, and it will cause an unnecessary burden on our division. We trust that our school division will find sector-wide efficiencies that will not be detrimental to our students, and that they will have our children's interests as a priority. We believe our children are the way of the future, and amalgamating school divisions does not benefit them or their educational needs. Minister Morgan we strongly urge you to reconsider the amalgamation of the school divisions. Sincerely, _____ School Community Council

In response to Dan Perrins' report on Education Governance Options I would like to express my grave concerns if the province were to choose either option 1 or 2. Both of those options leave the smaller rural communities without a voice or locally determined options that meet the specific needs or concerns of a community. As a parent of children in the Good Spirit School Division I have been grateful for the access to local board members and for school division leaders who are intentional to meet the needs of both students, staff and support staff in our rural communities. I have no doubt that they would willingly comply with restructuring changes (option 3) that would cause the least interruption to the excellent, education they are offering to our children presently. I applaud their dedication and integrity in decision-making, allocation of funding and the high level of excellence in instruction and outcomes that they seek for all students in the division. Our children are our future in Saskatchewan! Please do not rob them of the best education possible by moving to a provincial or regional model that will not address and allow for the unique differences that each Saskatchewan community has to offer and the learning opportunities that need to be offered on a local scale. Our kids come first!

This is nothing more than an attempt to control the school divisions with the least amount of backlash to what Brad Wall instructs Don Morgan to instruct the school divisions to do. We need community input and voice. We need elected boards because they are a part of the community. This government needs to get their finances in order as they have failed to do so since they were first elected and not benefitted from the prosperous times when we were a have province. This government should not be dictating to anyone on how to be efficient as they have failed at this themselves.

Having been through amalgamation once in my career already I do not consider amalgamation to be a cost efficient measure. It certainly wasn't the last time in either education or health care. Further, what are the anticipated benefits or improvements to student learning? This is noticeably absent in a report which has been put forward supposedly with student learning first in mind. Lastly, why is this to only impact the Public School Divisions when tax dollars pay for separate school divisions as well? Difficult to see student learning and equity for students as priorities within this report.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the governance review process. As a non-educator who has worked in the education sector for the last 10 years and a parent within the system, I have a few thoughts on the options presented. The classroom teacher is only one piece of the puzzle in educating students of Saskatchewan. While teachers are critical in developing and implementing the curriculum for our students, there are many more behind the scenes supporting our students. Consultants supporting new teachers as they develop into proficient teachers; educational assistants supporting students with the highest needs; caretakers ensuring the buildings students enter are clean, safe and welcoming; secretaries and library technicians who provide support to the teachers, administrators and students in the school. There are people at central office who are supporting the learning needs of students, ensuring teachers are in the classroom, and ensuring employees get paid properly and on time. The goal for all of these positions is to provide our students with the best opportunity for success. There is likely efficiencies to be found on the business side of education. Creating a plan similar to The Education Sector Strategic Plan would create goals and outcomes for the business side of the education sector. As a parent in the system, I want to know that my voice is being heard. One way for that to happen is through my duly elected trustee. I have had a say in who is at the table speaking on my behalf when it comes to matters of educating my child. If I have issue with the job they are doing, I know that I can take action to change the direction of the board with my vote.

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report we would offer the following feedback: We do not feel that the options presented in this report will result in significant cost savings without negatively impacting the quality of education for our students, eroding community voice, and affecting the sustainability of our community. We support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for students and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). We do not support the concept of an appointed Board of Education. We believe local voice is an essential part of a successful school-community relationship. We do not support any of the 3 models presented in the report. We feel forced amalgamation puts our school, and many like it, at risk of closure. We want to know what potential changes there will be to the rural school closure thresholds that are currently legislated. We feel this is a critical consideration in evaluating the options. We would like to see a permanent solution for high school transportation and are concerned what impact forced amalgamation will have on bus ride times for our students. We believe that further progress can be made in existing school divisions to find sector-wide efficiencies and cost-savings and recognize that the government may need to be more directive in requiring these sector-wide efficiencies to be realized. Sincerely,

I am writing in regards to the governance review taking place. I was educated in a small town school and I believe not only did I receive an outstanding education but I also received a sense of community, responsibility, and pride that is the very core of most small town schools. Not to take anything away from larger schools as obviously they have their benefits too. In a province as vast as this with communities both small and large there is no one way to do things. If a sweeping change were to be made with appointed officials and the closure of many small schools I believe that would be a detriment to our education system. I work in healthcare so I understand very well that money talks, but what saves a dollar on one end is not necessarily worth it the outcomes of these children's education. I had a graduating class of 21 students, and most have gone on to be successful to at the very least have jobs and contribute to society. School "drop out" was basically nil because that was just not accepted. Our community as a whole lifted people up to be the best they could be despite their differing abilities. I feel that we didn't see much in the way of anxiety and depression in our small town school as everyone had their place and someone looking out for them. The school was the heart of that community, as it is here in . Without a school, many families would not move to the community. It is apparent that we are one of the smallest schools and closest to the larger center so we may be one of the first to go. I urge you to please consider alternatives to this. Who better to speak for our small communities than the very people who live in them? Someone sitting in an office in a city would have to spend an awful lot of time out here to truly understand how important this school is to our community. I thank you for giving us the opportunity to voice our concerns.

We believe in the benefits of having a distinctive catholic education as it provides so many opportunities for moral and ethical development which leads to strong students and citizens for our province and country. Keeping our catholic system and schools separate is extremely important for our kids and community.

I am very concerned about the suggestion about wage rollbacks, cuts and freezing increments to the public sector. Collective bargaining is done in good faith. The government has a responsibility to honour those contracts. These threats to opening contracts after our school boards did not receive the full funding for the increase from our last negotiated contract is damaging the relationship between the government and the people in the education sector. The amount of money saved from wage rollbacks or freezes would be a drop in the bucket compared to our 1 billion dollar debt. It seems that the government is using the public sector to deflect the fact that it created a large deficit through mismanagement of money in a time of prosperity in our province. Further cuts by the provincial government will mean that school boards must scrimp and cut to fund shortfalls. These shortfalls will impact our youth. Our children's futures are not the place to save money. The recent turn in natural resources in the province should serve as a reminder that commodities are always in flux. In this we are forgetting what our most valuable commodity is, our human resources. The world is demanding us to be innovative, and success is being redefined on a global scale. The only way to stay in the top of the change in the world is through education. Education should be our largest growth sector. By investing in education we are investing in the future of our province in a way that can not be matched. Financial fixes should not be resolved through large slashes and cuts that harm the hard working public sector in our province. The education sector should be looked at as a way to generate the future value that our province is searching for.

I would like to share that I am not in agreement to an amalgamated Board system for all school divisions in Saskatchewan. Currently, there is no First Nation voice at our Board level. This is one issue. The other issue would be the lack of understanding for the community needs. It may be cost efficient for Saskatchewan to have 1 Board to manage all of Saskatchewan. However, the communication process, the support to schools and students is paramount. It doesn't seem realistic for 1 Board to manage and oversee the issues within every school in Saskatchewan. The need to train and support our young learners is paramount and essential for strong, Saskatchewan leaders!

As a parent with children in a rural school I am concerned with the shift to a single board of education. I don't believe that change will do anything but hurt our smaller schools. Actually the only way that this change may be fair would be if that board was located in a community of under 10,000. Or to be VERY clear not located in Saskatoon or Regina. I don't feel that people who live in larger centers understand the unique challenges our educators face living in smaller communities in rural settings and this would be one way to make sure that our voices are actually heard. The same applies to making our (already too big) school divisions larger. My next issue is with the fact that the Catholic School board is not included in this restructuring. I am fully aware that they are a separate entity but if they receive funding from the government they should, as well, be facing the EXACT same restructuring. If our public schools are going to have one board so should the Catholic - or lose the provincial funding they received from the government. As this proposal is all about saving money I don't feel that there should be allowances based on religion. In closing I would like to take this opportunity to say that I don't think these changes will result in actual money savings for the government. I feel that making larger divisions and/or one school board of education will result in more money spent on mileage, meals and travel. Our resources are already stretched to breaking points with regards to speech/language therapy and occupational therapy. Many of these people spend more time driving than they do assisting our children in need. This will get worse with larger divisions or become something that will not be offered in our smaller communities. I believe that we will, ultimately, end up failing our students. And at the end of the day our students and their educations should be the priority.

Mr. David Buckingham, Saskatoon Westview: I understand changes are being considered to our education system. Just as it is important in Federal and Provincial politics to have a locally elected representative to voice our opinions and concerns, it is equally necessary to have elected boards of education available and responsible to us. Saskatchewan has a very diverse population within our cities, towns and rural constituencies. As such, it is important to the education of both current and future generations of our children, to have locally elected school board members who listen and bring forward the concerns and needs of the schools in their community. I am very concerned that the voices of the people of Saskatchewan will not be heard if our school boards are taken away. I ask you to keep representatives within our communities. Sincerely,

Definitely some questions to be asked. Look back at the last Division amalgamation the Province made, there was no money saved. What makes you believe you are going to save money now? How much money will be handed out as Severance Packages to the current Board Members? In your report you state that there may be Appointed Board Members. How will our local communities be represented? How long of a bus ride is acceptable for a child when you start closing schools? What costs will be involved in changing Division boundaries, and longer bus routes? How will longer travel times benefit children? Less time for extra curricular and studies at home. Amalgamating School Divisions does not work. It didn't work the last time in Saskatchewan, it didn't work for Manitoba, and it will not work now.

To whom it may concern, On behalf of _____, School Community Council, SK. I am writing to express our concern with the amalgamation of the school boards. Schools and students have come a long way to get where they are now after the last amalgamation and the stresses, changes and challenges it created. We work as a team, collaborating on school goals and supporting those goals. The SCC's and School Boards are a strong team. We believe that the current school board and its structure work well and should remain the same. Student success could be negatively affected during another provincial amalgamation. As stated in the governance report, focus would be on the restructuring and may compromise focus on student outcomes. During the transition period there will be anxiety created by this level of change for teachers and school officials that could directly affect the students. We feel the current model works well for our community. Our model gives small communities a strong voice that is heard and keeps parents and teachers involved. We have been given hope with the structure we have and remain hopeful that when we speak up about issues or successes we will be heard and be supported. We feel that this voice would not be heard anymore and will diminish due to a lack of local representation and resources. Outsourcing to someone/something larger stretches thinner the resources already being stretched. We do not feel that losing this local support and representation would be in the best interest of the students, faculty, parents or the community as a whole. Our local board trustees are involved in our communities and meet with the SCC's regularly, supporting us by carrying our voice to the appropriate persons when needed. Board members know our community and its needs, its strengths and weaknesses. Who would replace this support system? Who would know our community and what is best suited for it? If the boards are amalgamated and taken further from the communities, who would fill the gaps created? SCC's do so much already for our community and school, without the local support system we believe that these SCC's would not feel motivated to keep doing what we do, if we are not heard, and would not/could not be expected to do more. Thank you for your time and we hope you consider the small communities and how much local representation and support benefits our schools, students, teachers and parents.

Neither options 1 nor 2 presented in Mr. Perrins' report are viable if the goal is to enhance K-12 education. As an individual who participates on boards of directors, in my experience it is unrealistic to expect that a single board, or even 4 boards, can efficiently correspond with and address the varying interests that arise from 606 different school community councils. Options 3A or 3B seem more realistic and viable to manage the system. The combination of public and separate school divisions should be considered as an option. It would enhance management efficiencies and allocation of resources - ex. the new public-separate schools. If the sole reason this is not considered an option is the 1901 School Ordinances of the North-West Territories then why doesn't the government pass new law and repeal the School Ordinance? Also, while the School Ordinance provides Protestant or Roman Catholic individuals in a district the right to establish a separate school, it does not expressly grant the right to a separate school district - see section 41 of the School Ordinance. Establishing K-12 school divisions based on religious denomination is an archaic concept which should have no place in SK's education system in the 21st century. Public and separate school divisions should be combined in association with any restructuring of school divisions.

My concerns are: By making changes only to the public system you are creating very different and potentially very unequal school systems. Changes should apply to everyone, not just the public school board Appointed board officials - these positions should remain elected to maintain local voice and input into children's education. Even if numbers are low - parents are the ones that care and are paying attention at election time and their input matters. How do SCC's communicate opinions/suggestions to an appointed board? Improving sharing of best and common practices is important but so are local community programs that support the diversity of different communities. There are no measurable outcomes stated. Where is the money saved in the first three options going? Into schools and classrooms? or is it just being allocated somewhere else completely? This also means that any savings in education will come directly from the public system and not from the others. Unless this saved money is going directly to teachers and classrooms, to put librarians back in schools and lower the teacher/student ratio (among other things that have been cut back), then I don't support the first 3 options.

After reading the report, the option 3 B that relates to the restructure of the division model seems to me the most beneficial for it does imply less disruptions to the current system, and the government will increase its oversight in the governance strategies without undermining the structures in place. Moreover, the community will still have a strong voice in how the education of their children is managed.

We need to keep our school boards locally elected. And decisions regarding our schools, programs and education in our communities. we need to put our children's futures at the top of all decisions

A) NO APPOINTED school boards ever at all. Too much opportunity for the government of the day to exert their influence on the decision made under those circumstances. Appointed boards and their members remind me of government crown corporations. B) A reduction in the upper management, ie: Superintendents etc. of a minimum of 50% immediately and a further reduction of 15% in the next 10 months not to go past the next full school year. C) An amalgamation of the school districts into larger districts with fewer elected officials due to the reduction of the number of districts. D) A new form or structure to have oversight over the discipline and authority to remove the bad apples from the school system. At present, deals are made to allow individuals to stay in their positions based on who they know or what they know about the person or persons who are in the position to discipline them. This is a much more common and unacknowledged or non-revealed fact in both school systems public and catholic. E) Much more fiscal oversight on a ongoing basis to hold all parties feet to the fire when it comes to budgets and the use of resources financial and non-financial. In other words more scrutiny to protect the interests of the tax payer and the parent and student and the government of the day. F) Special legislation to immediately reduce the pay of all school employees by 2-5% and a wage freeze for the next 2 years. As well to indicate to the public of Saskatchewan all MLAs to have their salaries reduced by the same amount as administered against the school systems. Also a wage freeze for the MLAs for 2 years. All School system employees who are non-teaching a wage reduction of 2% to begin immediately and the 2 year wage freeze. G) NO Major capital expenditures for the next 5 years unless agreed to by the whole legislature meaning both the party in power and the opposition with a 70% majority to carry the bill to be passed.

However you organize the school system, can you please integrate mindfulness into the system somehow? Mindfulness makes people more internally efficient, less forgetful, less wasteful of their own and other peoples' energy, less violent, and less of a burden on staffing and teaching resources. Which is what you're going for anyway, and if we don't integrate it into our system here in Saskatchewan, we'll be even more behind than other more innovative provinces who already look down on us, no matter how we're sectioned off. I know it seems irrelevant to what you're doing, but think about the bigger picture. Mindfulness. With all that's going on in the world, and with all our divisions here at home, we need it here in Saskatchewan and it all starts with education.

I like the smaller division.

I feel that not enough information has been presented on why further amalgamations will be beneficial to students and how it would better our current system. It seems more likely that further amalgamating will cause a greater strain on resources that are available and the services that are provided which already are extremely strained. It would be nice to see evidence and have explanations on how further amalgamating would lessen this strain.

Thank you for conducting this consultation on K-12 Education Governance options for our province. I am a member of the _____ a teaching order that has served in Saskatchewan since 1919. Over the years 125 of our Sisters have taught in some 60 rural and urban, public and Catholic schools in the province and have accumulated a wealth of experience to support the vital importance of having locally elected school boards. As a community of teaching Sisters, we have experienced again and again the value of having school boards that are well versed in local situations and that are fully committed to the best possible functioning of their schools. In my own teaching career as a school principal in an urban Catholic elementary school and as a high school teacher in both rural public and urban Catholic schools, I have experienced the necessity of having school boards that are elected by the community. The principle of subsidiarity - that of having decisions made by the people closest to the situation - when applied to our education system ensures the most efficient functioning of our schools, provides the most reliable process for hiring administrators and teachers and offers a guarantee of the best possible education for our students. Please protect our current structures of locally elected school boards. Respectfully submitted,

Please remember to put our CHILDREN first when making your decision. Huge administration changes mean our teachers and other staff spend 3-5 years (or more!) focused on procedures and policies and NOT focused on educating our children!! There has been so many GREAT improvements and additions to education, please don't throw that all away or set it back to make administration changes. Ask the school divisions to stretch their borders and make their areas a little larger. Leave the School Boards as ELECTED members from our Divisions. And ask they School Boards to WORK TOGETHER to create more efficiencies (like purchasing software). But most of all PLEASE PUT OUR CHILDREN FIRST!

Hello! Thank you for all of your hard work on this! Three things I would like to ask are 1) Saskatchewan Homeschool Based Educators be counted as a stakeholder 2) The province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students and 3) any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators. Thank you!

The truth must be universal...

I strongly believe that the vast majority of our rural public School Divisions are large enough. I do understand that there are a couple of very small Divisions that could be amalgamated with their neighbouring Division and there are always areas where efficiencies can be improved upon. To look at changes to the larger Divisions however, such as PVSD, that currently covers 27,000 square kms, would not result in positive changes. Disruptive and time consuming amalgamations take away from a focus on student learning. They waste valuable resources on the administrative side that is required to carry out these amalgamations and will shatter the cultures that have taken the past 10 years to build! A move to an appointed board undermines our democratic process that I believe makes our Province and our Country so strong! An appointed Board Member will have no accountability to the public that it represents and will not understand the communities it represents. You will strip away our public voice in Education! I believe the Government and current Ministry needs to look at areas over all where efficiencies can be gained across the Province without redrawing borders in a drastic way! These areas can be payroll and benefits administration, IT, even Transportation, just to name a few! As a parent of 3 children, a rural community member, and the _____ local SCC, I STRONGLY urge you to please leave School Boards elected and not drastically change borders of our public school divisions.

School Community Council

I do not support any of the proposed models in the restructuring of K-Grade 12 education. Appointed boards disallow parents and community stakeholders who have the best interests of our children's education in mind from being part of the decision making and governance of our schools. I fear appointed boards will reflect political loyalties and have nothing but meeting budgets at whatever cost in their agendas. Our teachers do not need to be forced into more restrictive environments than they already are. I do not support the amalgamation of schools into larger divisions as the smaller schools will be at risk to get lost in the shuffle and absorbed into bigger schools. Our classrooms do not need to be larger - this will impact the ability of our teachers to deliver their teachings and for our children to receive the time and attention they deserve. I do not support more control being given to the government - parents and invested and informed stakeholders need to be the leaders in this area, not government officials.

I don't believe that the government should be considering this restructuring move for education, because standardizing provision of education presupposes that all children are the same, and requirements within a set of standards. Flexibility is lost, and personal attention to student needs becomes impossible. I think that this is foolish, undemocratic, and will spell disaster and reduced growth in student education.

I feel very strongly that the idea that children get participation ribbons, no failing marks, no consequences for work not done, etc. is negativity affecting our children. Children who are not doing their work on time or to the best of their ability should be punished by failing grades. By letting them off the hook in case their feelings get hurt is setting them up for failure once they graduate high school. When they go to university and find a real job, the behaviour they get away with in school is going to cause them to flunk out of university or get fired from their job. What incentive does my child have to work her butt off to get good grades and do her best to get good grades, when the mark she gets is hardly higher than the marks the kids get who don't try their hardest are even do the work. Why would my child work their hardest and practice in sports, when it doesn't matter if you end up in first or last, you get the same prize. That is not fair to my child to be not recognized for her effort and practice and it's not fair to the child who doesn't give it his all because he is getting rewarded for less than adequate behaviour. Our children are far better off when they get the marks and prizes they deserve. The children who work hard, practice etc., will get the prizes they should rightfully get and the children who come in last or get a failing mark will realize they need to work harder next time. Rewarding them for less than satisfactory behaviour is detrimental to their wellbeing. We need to go back to the actual marks for schoolwork where if you do not do what is expected then you fail. Children who come on first place in a game should get rewarded for that and the kids who come in last place will learn that they need to try harder next time and keep trying their best. Children need to learn that their feelings will get hurt throughout life. By sending those kids out into the world after they have went through the first 18 years of their life getting participation ribbons and not getting into trouble for less than satisfactory work, we are setting them up for failure. Reward the children who deserve it and get first place so they know their effort is being recognized. They deserve higher grades and better prizes than the children who do not do as well. What are we teaching these achievers when they aren't getting the recognition they deserve because we are scared to hurt someone else's feeling or leave them out. We need to go back to the actual number marks and if kids aren't doing what they are supposed to, give them a failing mark. The same goes for sportsmanship all other activities. When I went to school in the 80s and 90s this is what it was like and I can tell you for a fact, we didn't have the issues with kids we do these days. Kids need to be disciplined and what I see happening every I go is that children have zero respect for anything or anyone and it is very disheartening and scary. Children need to be rewarded and punished for their behaviour now so the world doesn't kick their a** when they go out into the real world.

To members of the Advisory Panel: I am a retired high school teacher (36 years with the _____, a parent of three children who attended Catholic elementary (bilingual) and high schools, as well as a grandparent of nine grandchildren, seven who are / will be attending the Separate School System schools. I wish to express my concern relating to the consideration the government of Saskatchewan has for possibly creating one large school board for the province of Saskatchewan. As a supporter of the Catholic system (philosophically and through my taxes), and a system that has been preserved, protected, and guaranteed by the constitution of our country, I am very concerned that the existence of Catholic school boards may cease to exist. It is my belief that, similar to the recently-created public/separate schools, the anticipated savings - if there is a creation of one large school board for the province - will be negligible, if any. Difficulties may arise if the Catholic community decides to legally protect its constitutional right to a Catholic education. Lost in such a possible development leading to a one school board province, may be the quality of education, so deserving by the students so affected. We may spend more time, money, and effort on the 'system' rather than consideration for what is really important - children's opportunity for quality education. As a committed voter in our civic, provincial and federal elections, I urge you to allow for the existence and preservation of the Catholic Separate School System in our province. The Greater Saskatoon Catholic School System, which goes beyond the borders of the city of Saskatoon, has already proven that a larger separate school system has been operating very successfully. Furthermore, it has become an option for parents who wish to have a choice in which system their children will be educated. I am convinced that allowing for the existence of the Catholic Separate System School Board in our province - even as one of two possible options: separate and public - will continue to provide quality education for our students and an option for parents, Catholic or public. Under the present system - the existence of Catholic Separate and Public boards of education - my children have the option of having their children (my grandchildren), educated in a system of their choice. For such a choice and opportunity I am very appreciative, and hope that such a choice is not taken away in the future. Thank you for giving attention and consideration to my submission. Sincerely,

Hello! My name is _____ and I have children in both elementary and secondary public schools in Saskatoon. Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback regarding the recent governance report on education. First let me say that I cannot accept any of the recommendations in the report prepared by Mr. Perrins. The report only focuses on students and parents in the public school system and not the separate or francophone system. I find this extremely discriminatory. Why should religion, language and culture give you more of a voice and different rights than others. We all know that many people enroll in both the separate school system who are not catholic but because it is closer to their home or they get free transportation. Similarly the Francophone school division now accepts students whose parents are not Francophone. This leads me to the conclusion that we should have one school system regardless of religion and language and culture and offer different types of religion, language (currently we already have a French immersion program) and cultural programs within this one system. This would serve to broaden everyone's understanding and acceptance of one another and increase cohesiveness in society instead of promoting division. Other provinces have taken on constitutional reform so I think the province of Saskatchewan should do the same instead of just focusing on what is the easiest way to save money. Furthermore, the report does not provide any detail on any of the recommendations so this also leads me to the conclusion that this is merely a cost saving exercise and there would be very little to be gained at all to improve learning outcomes. If you want to treat everyone fairly why not look at ways to gain operational cost efficiencies that apply to all school divisions like centralizing procurement and payroll systems as an example. Also, if the government really wants to save money, I really wonder why we don't look at reducing the high cost of operating so many Rural Municipalities. We have the highest number of rural municipalities of any province in the country with 781 of which 296 are rural. We spend approximately 28% of the budget for rural municipalities which make up 17% of the people. I would suggest that we should look at ways to gain significant savings from changing this model instead of removing money from the education budget. We need to be increasing our funding to education especially in the cities where we have such diversity in student' needs by putting more money into the classrooms. Everything starts with education...better health, increased self-esteem and improved financial outcomes for everyone in this province. Education is the only way to level the playing field among all of our citizens, especially those that our disadvantaged. So in conclusion, our voice needs to be maintained at the local level so we can continue to tailor our education needs to the needs of our students. We don't need more centralized decision makers that are out of touch with local needs. Sincerely,

We have very many concerns regarding this amalgamation. We need more time to reach more parents and become more informed and engaged before such drastic changes are made to our schools. This is a very bad move, one that seems driven by money and politics, not the evidence based, best interests of our students in our rural area.

Thank you for the opportunity to add my voice in the "transformational" conversation regarding school divisions. I have heard from my community of _____ and area how important education is to our students and with that how important a "close" local voice is in helping make decisions for our unique area and unique local needs of our students. Community voices and locally elected boards contribute to a more democratic and transparent education system. Saskatchewan already has the fewest number of boards and board members in Western Canada and I do not see how reducing those numbers even further can be good for our students' education. Does change need to be made? Yes, but I believe that we can work together to help improve efficiencies and consistency while preserving and strengthening the voice of communities; while continuing to focus on student outcomes. For the past number of years, students, staff and the board in Sun West have been enthusiastically pioneering an innovative educational path, which is based on the belief that students - each with their own unique strengths, weaknesses, interest and preferences - need a voice in determining how and what they are learning. We have seen wonderful changes as our school have come to embrace this way of thinking. We have seen changes in how the classrooms look, in the language that our children use at school and then at home, and in the choices that our children have in regards to their own learning. They are taking charge of their learning and are excited about coming to school. Along with this we have witnessed the creative integration of technology in our classrooms with access to computers or tablets and a limitless library of digital resources to help them explore topics of personal interest to them as they develop the fundamental knowledge and skills mandated by the Province. We have developed our state of the art Distance Learning Centre (DLC) to provide equitable opportunities within our division and it is available to all Saskatchewan students. It is a huge resource to both our students and teachers. And because our students can work at their own pace, there are opportunities to succeed and grow in way they cannot when expected to keep up or wait for their peers. We are creating young citizens with the character and critical 21st century skills - leadership, technology, collaboration, social accountability - that are necessary to excel in the workplace and contribute to successful communities. As a citizen _____ I know that what we have is unique in this province and with transformational change I am very worried that our initiatives may be put on hold while the rest of the province catches up. Innovation is a key piece that elected boards bring to education in our province and what Sun West has done has been successful and within our budgets. The present governance model allowed _____ the freedom to identify the skills deemed necessary in a new CEO to move the system forward in an innovative way. Policy 18 around 21st century skills and the use of technology to help prepare students for the future. While technology is only a tool, we have been using it to help our students focus on the skills of collaboration, critical thinking, creativity and digital citizenship to align with your Vision 2020. Three models of learning: online; blended; and personalized were developed and then merged into Sun West's PeBL (Personalized electronically Blended Learning) model. This model allows students to direct their learning allowing them voice and choice in meeting curricular outcomes while helping them become proficient in 21st Century skills. Sun West has received Canadian recognition for PeBL in garnering 4 national awards within the last 3 years. I believe that Sun West is on the right track with our new learning models and my biggest fear is that possible changes in governance in our educational system might jeopardize the progress that we have achieved so far. Please consider the good things happening in Sun West when you make your deliberations. Thanks.

Having been a board member during the first round of amalgamation, it did not improve services nor save money. Centralization means more travel and less hours of work with students for specialized staff. It alienates the grassroots - parents and taxpayers, which leads to discussions of private schools, home schooling and separate schools. Bigger is not always better.

My children are already in overcrowded classrooms with overworked teachers. _____ that we have found the most relief and support from her school, teachers, division employed counsellors, and NESD as a whole. Will your proposed changes allow for that? Because she is not the only one. We wait for up to 3 months between appointments with _____ for 5 minutes of their time with 3 hours of driving. I shudder to think of where we would be without _____ and NESD. In addition, if I am understanding this all correctly, you are claiming money that was fundraised for our Elementary School's playground, by MANY parents over MANY years as surplus and to justify this inane, band aid proposal. This may work to your advantage in the long run. Uneducated people are less likely to ask questions. Please don't do this...don't isolate us anymore than we are

I support cost saving systems, strengthening the educational outcomes and standardizing boards, however the wide sweeping changes proposed are unacceptable. Further amalgamation is not in the best interest of RURAL students. I suggest centralization of procurement and payroll to reduce costs. We need locally elected boards, they are our local voice. What happens to communities that lose schools? They die, they cannot attract families. Bus ride times are a concern; kids should not ride buses for extended periods of times. Thank you, _____ Sk

The benefits outlined in the first two options of Perrin's report seems to revolve largely around increased government control and increased efficiency in items such as payroll. I believe that these efficiencies can be achieved even if there are a large number of school divisions. The government would still be able to have checks and balances for new initiatives and expectations, and even take over sections like payroll for the province. The largest concern that I have with larger school divisions (and especially with only one school division) is that the public will be far removed from having input into the education of their children. Schools are a vital part of every community and it is important to have decisions made about those schools coming from people who are close to it. People with a vested interest in the towns, schools, and local children are the ones who are best able to make decisions that will affect all of those areas. Amalgamations into larger school divisions will create a dichotomy within the province that is difficult to justify. Families with students enrolled in the separate school systems will have an access to decision makers that other families in the province will not. If one of the main goals is to create increased equity within the province, larger school divisions will not help; instead they will make the problem worse. It seems to be in keeping within Canada that provinces of similar size and population to Saskatchewan have many school divisions. Given Saskatchewan's size and demographics, having one school division, or even very few school divisions, does not seem to be the most effective model. Geographical size alone would ensure that, so we should be careful when comparing our province to others that are much smaller than our own. Also, within school divisions, demographics can make a huge difference in the administration of the school division. In the last few years, there has been much progress made while working toward the 2020 goals. I know that my school division has implemented many ideas that are helping our student learning. The options outlined in Perrin's report could impede this progress for many reasons. First of all, putting time and energy toward amalgamation will divert attention and resources from student learning. Also, school divisions are a wonderful source of support for educators. Even though my own school division is quite large, educators have been able to find ways network and learn together. These types of supports are imperative in our field, and I believe that if school divisions were any larger than my own, we would not be able to find the opportunities to meet and learn together. It should also be noted that our school division has been doing many things to create efficiencies and improve student learning. We have seen many benefits and I believe that we will be able to continue to make improvements as we progress in our division. I also do not see the benefit of an alignment of health and education systems that is often mentioned. The differences between the health and education systems, and what people expect of them, are vastly different, thus aligning the boundaries of the two systems is not necessary, and definitely even detrimental, now that health has decided to go to one system.

Dear SK Govt As a school community council at _____ we have read and discussed the Perrin report. We are concerned that the recommendations for changing the current school division system will have little benefit for our school and other schools in the Prairie Spirit School Division. The reasons stated as the basis for needing a change include a desire for school divisions to be more efficient, and to have a shared vision of success for students, measured by graduation rates. Our division was one of the first to be affected negatively by the funding model implemented in 2009; as a result, PSSD is now one of the most efficient school divisions in the province in terms of cost per student. Our graduation rates are above the provincial average in most cases. We are worried about the effects of a zero percent funding increase, or worse, a decrease in funding levels for our division for next year. Our enrolment numbers continue to increase, and we feel that our markers of success may decline without adequate financial resources to provide the excellent educational experience we have achieved in the past. Our division is also expanding to include schools from the separate division in 2017. Our SCC is aware of the atmosphere of competition in regards to how families choose a school for their children. We are confused as to why the separate school divisions are not included nor affected by the adjustment to school divisions proposed by the Perrin report. We feel that education needs to be a unified entity and something that can bring people together in our province, rather than causing division and stress. In regards to the suggestion that we have a school board comprised of appointed members rather than elected representative, we are opposed. We feel an elected representative has more insight to the needs of his or her community and has earned the trust of the voters to communicate those needs. We are uncertain an appointed board member would be as approachable or truly have the best interests of our schools and community as a priority. The SCC is grateful for this opportunity to express our concerns regarding the observations and implications of the Perrin report. We are optimistic that an alternative solution can be found that preserves our school division identity and cohesiveness as well as retaining a focus on educational success amid the need for financial efficiency. Sincerely,

I think the idea of larger school divisions is wrong. I want to have a local elected school board that I can go to if I have concerns not talk to someone in Regina or miles away who really doesn't know much about my community. Please do not make the proposed changes. It would be bad for our students and everyone involved.

I feel that the current model and size of the school divisions is working well. I also feel that an elected board is by far more responsive to the needs of the students and parents. I also think that by the time you have spent a bunch of money and resources amalgamating more school divisions how much farther will you be ahead financially? If I had a choice between the 3 options mentioned I would choose the Division Model. Although I think the current size of PVSD is appropriate.

Dear Minister Morgan; I am writing on behalf of the _____ School Community Council. Our SCC unanimously supports our elected boards and believes that they are the best way to represent our students. Our school board provides local voice and representation for our local taxes. We do not believe that having government appointed trustees would be in the best interests of our children or our school. Forced amalgamation will disrupt our students and their learning. Our school divisions are large enough to run efficiently and we believe that additional amalgamation will not create cost savings. We are concerned about the impact amalgamation would have on rural schools, vulnerable students & quality of education. We trust that our school division will continue to find efficiencies that will not detract from the quality of education our children receive & they will have our children's interests as a priority. Our children should be viewed as an investment in the future of Saskatchewan, not a way to save money. Amalgamating school divisions does not benefit them or their educational needs. As the Minister responsible for Education, we strongly encourage you to oppose the amalgamation of our school divisions and oppose government appointed school boards. Sincerely;

We recently moved out to _____ because we wanted to raise our children in a small community but with an easy commute to the city as both my wife and I work in _____. Our son was registered in kindergarten at _____ and because of where our daycare was located; he spent nearly an hour on the bus each day. One of the reasons for moving was to avoid this issue. Our new daycare is a short 5 minute walk or 45 second car ride to the school. Our son has more time to play and be a kid as opposed to being stuck on a bus. Our son consistently tells us how much he likes his new little school compared to his old school. Our school, _____, is the heart of the community. Like us, many other parents moved out to _____ for the community and the school. A school that teaches about what it means to be part of a community, respecting others, and the curriculum. As a parent with a child _____ we were and still are more than impressed with our little school. I would hate to see anything happen to it because of the proposed amalgamation. Kids need time to be play and be kids... not sitting on buses being transported all over the province!

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report I would offer the following feedback: I do not feel that the options presented in this report will result in significant cost savings without negatively impacting the quality of education for students, eroding community voice, and affecting the sustainability of my community. I support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for students and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). I do not support the concept of an appointed Board of Education. I believe local voice is an essential part of a successful school-community relationship. I do not support any of the 3 models presented in the report. I feel forced amalgamation puts our school, and many like it, at risk of closure. I want to know what potential changes there will be to the rural school closure thresholds that are currently legislated. I feel this is a critical consideration in evaluating the options. I would like to see a permanent solution for high school transportation and are concerned what impact forced amalgamation will have on bus ride times for students. I believe that further progress can be made in existing school divisions to find sector-wide efficiencies and cost-savings and recognize that the government may need to be more directive in requiring these sector-wide efficiencies to be realized. Sincerely,

I wish to STRONGLY urge the government to adopt a more reasonable and cooperative approach towards the K-12 system in this province. This push towards "transformational change" is disturbing. The phrase itself is meaningless...(as any public school student with a decent dictionary will tell you, "change" and "transform" are synonyms.). The phrase SUGGESTS widespread and irreversible change. Certainly, the options offered up in Perrins' report WOULD BRING widespread and irreversible change to our public school system. But the government has offered NO evidence to suggest such change would be productive. Nor has there been any firm evidence given to show exactly how these changes would result in cost savings or significant "efficiencies." Further amalgamations would be extremely disruptive to everyone involved in the public school system...ESPECIALLY students (some of whom were entering Kindergarten when the previous amalgamations occurred.) The cost involved in ripping apart a system that has ONLY been in place for a decade would be substantial. And what efficiencies would result? Fewer services, programs and resources for students? Fewer support for teachers and staff? Amalgamations WOULD likely allow the government to tout the "savings" achieved by eliminating some of those "administrative" positions. But, these "savings" might well be mitigated by COSTS that nobody is mentioning. Administrators in the public system deal with many areas: student services,

transportation, buildings and maintenance, staffing and payroll and more. These are ALL important issues that impact students...DAILY. In which of these areas are you prepared to sacrifice student's best interests in order to save a buck or two? I find the government's apparent distain towards "administrators" somewhat odd. After all, EVERY MLA IS AN ADMINISTRATOR! Hired by the public through the process we call an "election" to administer the affairs of this province. Frankly, there are those who might suggest that had this "administration" done a better job of administering our affairs during times of plenty, we would not be having this discussion right now. At any rate, this brings me to the more crucial issue: the apparent move towards eliminating elected School Board members and replacing them with individuals appointed by the government. This would effectively REMOVE THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM FROM THE PUBLIC'S HANDS. As a parent of an elementary school student, I VERY MUCH VALUE my ability to ELECT School Board representatives AND pass my concerns on to those representative, so that I can KNOW that my concerns and MY CHILD'S BEST INTERESTS ARE being heard when decisions are made. How exactly would eliminating this constitute an "efficiency"? Is the government hoping to save money by eliminating School Board elections? Certainly, if one really wants to save money, eliminating those COSTLY Provincial Elections would result in substantial "efficiencies". But then without those "costly" elections WE HAVE NO DEMOCRACY. The same holds true with School Board elections. The PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM is meant to be there to provide a quality education to ALL children. But parents/guardians of those children can have no input, no access to those making the decisions that impact their child and NO WAY TO HOLD ANYONE ACCOUNTABLE for decisions that are made, without the checks and balances that come with democratically elected School Board Members. But maybe that's the point. Throughout this process, it certainly seems that EVERY attempt has been made to pass these changes through while attracting as LITTLE public scrutiny as possible. The review by Dan Perrins was announced mere WEEKS before the report was tabled. There was NO public consultation, and all of the talks Perrin HAD been having with Education officials had been regarding FUNDING INEQUITIES, NOT GOVERNANCE. Then, the report is released just DAYS before Christmas. Yes, a panel WAS set up to gather feedback from "stakeholders", but those who appeared before that panel were CAREFULLY SCREENED. So the ONLY way that the public could contribute was through an online submission process that an ALARMING number of young parents that I spoke to knew NOTHING about. Perhaps it is the "cost" of having a PUBLIC voice at School Board table that the government hopes to eliminate? Perhaps the "efficiency" that the government hopes to find here involves doing away with the system that makes School Board Members accountable to the PUBLIC? As the parent of an elementary school student, my child and I are MAJOR STAKEHOLDERS in this. The same is true of EVERY MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC WHO HAS CHILDREN ENROLLED IN THE PUBLIC SYSTEM. Members of the public who DO NOT have children are stakeholders too. Everyone is impacted by the education that students receive, since the education those students receive will impact each student's ability to be contributing and productive citizens within their communities. Yet throughout this entire process, THESE STAKEHOLDERS seem to be the ones that the government appears to be the LEAST interested in hearing from. A process that appears to be designed to bring about undefined "transformational change" in the PUBLIC Education System WITHOUT allowing for any thoughtful or meaningful PUBLIC DISCUSSIONS about these changes does LITTLE to inspire PUBLIC TRUST. At this point, the government should place Perrins' report on the nearest and most convenient shelf, take hold of the solid data we DO HAVE available from our School Divisions, and then SIT DOWN WITH members of those School Boards (who, as elected representatives, will be there to speak for the public as well) and work towards meaningful and productive changes that DO save money and may well find ways of improving education for ALL students. Moreover, any significant changes which are considered should NOT be undertaken without meaningful PUBLIC DISCUSSION AND OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC INPUT. Respectfully yours,

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report I would offer the following feedback: I do not feel that the options presented in this report will result in significant cost savings without negatively impacting the quality of education for students, eroding community voice, and affecting the sustainability of my community. I support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for students and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). I do not support the concept of an appointed Board of Education. I believe local voice is an essential part of a successful school-community relationship. I do not support any of the 3 models presented in the report. I feel forced amalgamation puts our school, and many like it, at risk of closure. I want to know what potential changes there will be to the rural school closure thresholds that are currently legislated. I feel this is a critical consideration in evaluating the options. I would like to see a permanent solution for high school transportation and are concerned what impact forced amalgamation will have on bus ride times for students. I believe that further progress can be made in existing school divisions to find sector-wide efficiencies and cost-savings and recognize that the government may need to be more directive in requiring these sector-wide efficiencies to be realized. Sincerely,

This is a very bad move to be messing with children's education and shutting down rural schools. school can't handle any more students as they are already using portable classrooms and I hear s almost the same. The school portion of our land taxes we pay out here more than covers the costs to operate our rural schools. This is NDP mentality! Who is running the show in there? I thought the Wall government I voted for stood up for rural sask?

I do not think the public has received budgetary evidence supporting that implementing any of these models will result in significant savings, nor have I seen any evidence that amalgamation and governance changes will not result in poorer education for our children. Our students should come first and there have been no studies done to my knowledge on how these changes may impact the students and the communities. These are potentially huge changes which need to be thoroughly reviewed before being implemented. If there are significant savings the public needs to see where and how much, and what impact this may have on students. Only then can we evaluate whether or not these changes are good for our province. I feel as though the Government of Saskatchewan is rushing this process and jumping the gun without doing it's due diligence to see whether or not this is actually a good change for our province.

To whom it may concern: is not in favour of school board amalgamations or appointed board members. We as a family also agree. Locally elected boards will protect our children and reinsure that they are getting the best education possible and continue to do so. Student achievements and results have never been better. So why would we want to change a good thing? If the government wants to save money, this is not where they should do so. Our kids education is the most important thing to insure the prosperity and the future of this province.

I am a parent of two students that attend My primary concern is for the education of my children and the children at our school. That's not saying that I am not concerned about other schools or students but based on the 2016-2017 PVSD Strategic Plan Update and Budget our students receive \$563 less per students then any other Pre-K-Grade 12 schools in our division. On the high end we are receiving \$4077 less then the school that receives the highest amount per student. I understand that there are many factors but when I see what our CEO, Ben Grebinski, is making per year it is frustrating that he sits 52 km away from us behind a desk. My research also lead me to a write up from the Taxpayer Federation from 2012 that was very interesting. It seems as though out fearless leader was treated to a bonus at a board meeting, where they passed a motion for him to retire and draw on his pension, which is an unfunded liability, but in the same meeting they also passed another motion to hire him back. So while our children are in the bottom five schools for funding he is enjoying two pay checks and the board thought that was okay. I agree that we need to amalgamate and get rid of this type of CEO and board members. Who is obviously in it for the cash and not for my children. The money these people make could be better spent on education, starting with the teachers and administration in the schools who know best where the funds should be allocated. The SCC should also be playing a big role in this as they are the parents, teachers and community members from those areas. I also feel as though the board members are not interested in the amalgamation because they would lose there cushion. I believe board members are making between \$25,000 and \$30,000 plus travel costs for about 10 hours of work per week, except in 2008-2009 when Janet Kotylak cost us \$55,000 in pay and expenses. The Taxpayers Federation write up also told me that our board members and trustees spend their time at retreats in Moose Jaw, at the spa, and at Goodspirit Lake, where they held a meeting that people who would have wanted to attend would have had to travel to. I feel that the amalgamation would be best for our children and the future of our schools as long as the funding that is freed up is used to better the future of all the those closely involved. So all I ask is that the people who truly want what is best for our children are left in charge and the front line works and SCC get more say in what is going on in our schools.

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report we would offer the following feedback: We do not feel that the options presented in this report will result in significant cost savings without negatively impacting the quality of education for our students, eroding community voice, and affecting the sustainability of our community. We support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for students and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). We do not support the concept of an appointed Board of Education. We believe local voice is an essential part of a successful school-community relationship. We do not support any of the 3 models presented in the report. We feel forced amalgamation puts our school, and many like it, at risk of closure. We want to know what potential changes there will be to the rural school closure thresholds that are currently legislated. We feel this is a critical consideration in evaluating the options. We would like to see a permanent solution for high school transportation and are concerned what impact forced amalgamation will have on bus ride times for our students. We believe that further progress can be made in existing school divisions to find sector-wide efficiencies and cost-savings and recognize that the government may need to be more directive in requiring these sector-wide efficiencies to be realized. Sincerely,

Dear Sir: Please keep the education in Sask. in the hands of the school divisions and elected boards of education. There is no reason to replace these with government appointed boards. A concerned citizen,

The education of our children is of the utmost importance, and cannot be taken lightly. I believe that local democratically elected school Boards are the best choice for my community. This ensures accountability, and that the students in my community are always the highest priority. The Board members need to be true representatives of the area they are serving. Forced amalgamations and consolidations are disruptive to the education system, which was exemplified by the previous consolidation 10 years ago. Have the cost-saving benefits been published, to prove it was a move in the right direction? Our children's futures are too important to take that to chance. Thank-you

Please DO NOT restructure our school divisions! They are all ready too big! People should Be able to choose aka vote for their board at a local level. If school closures are a result what kind of regulations are there going to be on length of bus rides! Longer bus rides put our youth at risk. It's the most dangerous part of their day! They also take away a large portion of there day. Taking away from study time and adding fatigue! I have always supported the sask party. And hope they listen! Thanks!

If there are changes to be made to the governance of the K to 12 school system in Saskatchewan we ask that the needs of the home educated students also be taken into consideration. We have read through the "Perrins-Governance-Review-Report" and there is no mention of home educated students though they are a significant minority. 1) We ask that SHBE be counted as stakeholder in these discussions, 2) We ask that the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students, and 3) We ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators.

I offer the following opinions and observances as someone who has taken a student through the Prairie Spirit School Division from kindergarten to currently, halfway through grade 11 and has served on a high school School Community Council . Governance The current model seems to have two major areas of dysfunction: 1) School Community Councils (SCC) SCC's do not appear to understand their mandate very well. They are mostly made up of current students' parents, with minimal, if any, general community members. An SCC is typically a group of "room mothers" focused only on Bus Driver Appreciation Day or, in many cases are just fundraising organizations, in direct contradiction to provincial legislation. They fail to attract broader community membership because of the minimal role they actually play in the educational system. PSSD does not provide adequate leadership to keep SCC's on task. They attempt provide training sessions each year, which are poorly attended and offer very little specific direction, other than to "support the activities of the board". Last year PSSD cancelled their SCC training session due to lack of interest. In response, our SCC hosted, and paid for, a "regional" meeting with six other local SCC's. PSSD attended and presented their typical, limited "overview" of the role of an SCC, along with a brief discussion of the music/band program, as we had requested, due to the attempt of PSSD to eliminate the program. We had also asked for the agenda to include discussion on the bussing system operated by PSSD. Bussing is an excellent example of something that a local SCC has direct, daily experience with, and, given further resources, can offer input to create greater efficiencies in its operation. PSSD chose to leave this topic off of the agenda, frustrating many SCC members. Training for local SCC members should be improved and mandatory for all members, and a path of input to the school board improved. Support for SCC's to attract local members needs to be explored and improved as well. Unless we move to a single provincial school division with appointed board members, we need to establish a stronger, more informed, grass roots base of SCC's that can attract community support and provide actionable direction to the school boards they represent. 2) School Boards Board member representatives often seem disconnected from the SCC's that they serve. It is my experience that many make no appearances at SCC meetings or any school events throughout the entire year. Participation of board members with SCC's they represent should be mandatory. Past elections have shown that board members are repeatedly re-elected, almost always by acclamation. Community members seem unaware of who these individuals are, what their jobs are, and how well they do them. Boards should be restructured with a great responsibility to, and direction from, local SCC's. SCC's should also play a greater role in recruiting, and promoting the election of, board members. Administration The administration of the educational system by the school boards lacks leadership and the fractured system is highly inefficient. Some of the roles of the boards need to be taken away, and centralized provincially. There needs to be the establishment of a single provincial administrative body to drive consistency and efficiency in many areas. Grade Reporting - Some schools use PowerSchool to track student performances, attendance, etc. Others do not. Some send out written grade transcripts some do not. Some use percentage grading, some a 1 - 4 scale, some A - F ? Who knows? One system needs to be implemented and improved training provide so that those that use it, understand how to use it as well. Information Technology/Communications - Some schools send a weekly newsletter out to parents, some send a

monthly one, some probably none at all. Some schools provide a hand drawn calendar of events, some publish to Google calendars, some use the calendars on the school website. Total chaos. School administrators that can't send a .pdf file in an email. Staff members that cannot do an update to their smart phone. Some school book parent/teacher interviews online, some make you call the school. The list of examples is endless. Core communication skills of staff and administration needs to be improved and the tools they use need to be common province wide and provided by the provincial administrative body with proper training. The role of the SCC to communicate with the community is often hampered by the inability of the school itself to communicate well. School Supplies - Generally this is a list that has been photocopied, unchanged, seemingly for decades. It often includes a dictionary or atlas, which I assume in today's world have long been replaced digitally. Some schools request 2 boxes of Kleenex of all things, yet others do not. Why is this even a requested item? Confusing to say the least. Requests for a myriad of loose leaf, pencils, eraser, pens, rulers, excetera, excetera send families out on annual shopping sprees. For some families, it is affordable, but for some it may not be. We have seen some schools go out and purchase necessary supplies in bulk, and resell them to students. We have heard of teachers purchasing items with their own money and providing them at no charge to students. A provincial administration body could tender for and supply all necessary supplies for students as well as supplies for staff. The new, but lower, cost of these supplies should fall upon the new provincial administration and be funded by the provincial tax base, just as all other operating costs are. The effect on the individual taxpayer would be negligible. School Fees - Schools request fees from students, yet provide no accounting of what they are for. SCC's are asked to review school fees, yet they are often undefined until well into the school year, if at all. At some schools, it is as simple as a yearbook fee and an SRC fee, clearly defined. Others request an arbitrary amount of money for "things that may come up". This is ridiculous. Optional extracurricular activities, that do not include all students, should be well defined and charged individually. This would include team travel expenses, band trips, etc. Other extracurricular activities that include all students such as taking a class swimming, or to a museum, should come out of discretionary budgets provided to each school, and again funds should be taken from provincial revenue, not collected from the students. This will become an additional expense to a school budget, but again, it should be fairly collected through the provincial tax base, not students. Students' families will be spared the possible hundreds of dollars each year, and the average taxpayer will see a minuscule tax increase. Conclusions: I expect there will be a general negative reaction toward the single school board option in the report. Schools are essential assets to any community and the thought of losing their school, or control of it, to "efficiency" creates fear among parents, teachers and school boards. On the other hand, the status quo is not acceptable either. I believe the system does not need to be replaced, but only needs to be improved with some fundamental adjustments like I have touched on. Creating more of an overlapping relationship between school boards and SCC's will draw communities more into the operation of their schools and help to attract community members, who currently see serving on an SCC as a very misunderstood and non-productive use of their time and skills. This, in turn, should help groom more community members to step up into a role on their local school board. The level of responsibility placed upon the school boards seems greater than can be managed with the level of members it attracts. Centralizing some of those responsibilities will make their job easier, create efficiency for budgets and provide school staff with a simpler and well defined system of operation. The shifting of such items to a provincial administrative body, adding a line item to the provincial budget and a potential minor tax increase, would be received positively by the public if it is done as an "elimination of school fees and school supplies" effort in your press release. Regards,

I have real concerns about the gov't plan to possibly eliminate local school boards. I am quite certain that the real expertise in education lies in the hands of the people who daily devote themselves to educating young people. This is done on many local levels by administrators and teachers who are in touch with students and parents, the real stakeholders in this most important process. The removal of local boards will distance the decision making process from those most important stakeholders and will place the decision making in the hands of people lacking the real local knowledge necessary to make sound decisions. Fundamental change like that which is being proposed and considered requires sober second thought. Please slow down this process before it is too late and great harm is done to education in this province.

As a Saskatchewan teacher of twelve years, it is with a deep sense of regret that I write this response to the government's proposed changes to education in this province. Repeatedly, from government spokespeople, we have heard the message of improving efficiencies in education as a rationale for the government's proposed amalgamation and standardization of education in Saskatchewan. My understanding is that the government shared this same goal in its attempt to implement Lean methodologies in healthcare, a move now widely believed to be one of the most disastrous and wasteful government measures in recent provincial memory. The current problem lies in the government's

employment of business models as models for success in all sectors. Healthcare and education fall into the category of caring professions. While there are certainly fiscal processes and concerns at hand, the core of these professions lies inherently in reciprocal human relationships, and not in transactions. If one applies a business model to education, it begs the question: what is the main commodity in such a sector? Is it the education that we provide to students, or is it the young learners themselves? I should hate to think either, as anyone who has worked in a successful teaching role understands that the brightest aspects of the teaching and learning relationship transcend the mundane exercise of transacting, as well as all the greedier aspects of any capitalist ideology. The single-track business-oriented mindset of the current government has not allowed for this understanding. Central to education is the teacher-student relationship, one of reciprocal teaching and learning, critical thinking, and cyclical creativity. It is dependent on well-trained, caring professionals being well resourced, well valued, and well supported by local overseers who fully understand the immediate learning needs and life needs of the young people whom they serve. Obviously, the full support of the provincial Ministry of Education is also integral. A proposal whose key motivation is to improve efficiencies ahead of improving education certainly cannot centre the diverse holistic needs of all students in our constantly changing multicultural, multi-demographic province. It is unfortunate that following years of purported growth in Saskatchewan, closely followed by a massive and alarming government deficit, that it is our children who are being asked to foot the bill. It is not difficult to project that mass standardization projects will follow the centralization of educational oversight in the province, as newly appointed board members attempt to streamline operations and save money. With the current billion-dollar deficit as clear proof of fiscal mismanagement, it is difficult to trust that the current government will be successful at any rate in applying fiscally motivated changes to the very structure and processes of our student's education. Centralizing management may be an easy move. Centralizing good management may not be so simple. In the school where I teach we do our best to create authentically responsive instruction for our students. Responsive instruction is teaching and learning that take into account the diverse needs of the students in a given classroom. The only people who know and can champion the distinct needs of each student in a given classroom are the classroom teacher and educational assistants. The only people who know and can lobby for the varying needs of students in a given school are the school staff, administration, and local overseers. The same goes for local boards and so on. As oversight and management grow farther and farther away from the local level, local needs become increasingly missed and therefore not met. One part of responsive instruction is differentiation, a process whereby a qualified teacher uses varying methods, resources, and levels of teaching to reach students, based on their unique skills, interests, and abilities. It is a difficult process that requires professional training, and is a challenge that Saskatchewan teachers take on every day. Most all of the best research in education points to differentiation as an essential tool for quality learning, certainly for learning that is to be responsive to student needs. One can easily see how centralization and standardization will stand at odds with this educational strategy. Differentiation requires: the knowledge of students' unique, localized needs; the resources to support those needs; and closely situated overseers with a responsibility to ensure that the needs are fully met. The delivery of impactful education in the province depends on these factors, and the full support of the provincial government. If we move to a single, appointed school board in this province, board members become accountable only to the government who appointed them, and not to their electors nor indeed, to the students within their board boundaries, as is the current case. With the looming amalgamation of already geographically-stretched and resource-stressed boards, the move to appointed rather than elected trustees, and the foreseeable thinning out or abolition of local educational overseers, the days of quality differentiated and responsive instruction are numbered. All of this immense risk is worsened by the foreseeable ease of appointed rather than elected board members to make unilateral decisions about the range of students province-wide, in the spirit of standardization and improving efficiencies. In education, standardization unfairly disadvantages those students who live outside of the mainstream or "standard". Obviously, this approach increases the likelihood of systemic ills like racism, sexism, classism, ableism, and heteronormativity to pervade our schools and curricula even more than at present. For example, standardization may lead to the endangerment of special programs aimed at educational indigenization; the scaling back of local level mental health resources; culturally responsive initiatives; and nutrition programs in schools. This scenario gravely endangers positive educational outcomes for all students in our province. Bear in mind, standardization is just one example of how Saskatchewan education may deteriorate in light of the proposed changes. I must strongly urge the Saskatchewan government against the proposed mass amalgamation of school boards, and must urge the people and the educators of Saskatchewan to oppose this option, and any option that endangers the ability of school staffs across the province to appropriately and fully respond to the diverse needs of their unique student populations. The future of quality education in this province depends on it.

I believe that each school division, especially Catholic School Divisions, have a unique culture that is nurtured and developed (in part) by the trustees that the stakeholders elect. The trustees are held to a trust by the citizens who elect them. Appointed boards would not have this element, and in fact the idea of appointed trustees reeks of cronyism. A centralized, appointed Board would not be able to meet the needs of each School Division...and in fact would feel no consequence if they didn't. It would be antidemocratic to get rid of elected local boards. And there is no evidence that it would be good for student outcomes...I can see it being detrimental instead.

I really feel that there was not enough thought or public consultation put into the new structuring models. As a tax payer, I want the right to elect trustees that will represent me. Please reconsider any changes that you may be considering. Bigger, is not always better and amalgamation of school divisions will not necessarily save the province money. Why is this being brought up now, when it could have been brought up during the Provincial Election?

Our small rural schools are going to be swallowed up by larger boards. We will be joined with city schools and it will always be about what is best for the city. Again forgetting about rural kids and their unique learning needs

To Whom it May Concern: I've read the Proposal to reduce the number of School Divisions in Saskatchewan. I realize we are at an early stage in this Proposal. I believe that Education is the last place that a government should look at to reduce spending and make budget cuts. I urge you to reconsider reducing the number of School Divisions in an effort to save money and to look further into other areas. We need to make sure that all schools have a voice in the governance of education. Thank you, A concerned parent,

Option 2 is the preferred in terms of maximizing output, measured success, and less disruption. Option 1 is the second preferred option. Any other options are simply band-aids that wont address or fix the current system. Our province wide student achievements are low compared to other provinces; retention of quality teaching staff is a challenge. The quality of principals is shockingly poor. Options 2 and 1 can be successful with strong and empowered SCC's. Our students are behind from day 1...implement junior Kindergarten! Grade 7 students entering a high school is an absolute tragedy. High school should begin in grade 9. Exposing Grade 7 students to the peer pressures of high school is child abuse. They should be in middle school - grades 6-8.

My kids go to a small town school with a k to 12 school and I am a member of the scc. I think going to a bigger division would pretty much take us little guys off the map with no local say in what goes on in our own school

A large percentage of the funding for education still comes from local property taxes. While the Province sets the taxation rate, the local taxpayers still pay the toll. Taxpayers deserve local representation for education. This is different from Health where all funding except portions of capital come from the general revenue fund of the Provincial budget. Locally elected boards are responsible for placing student needs first when making decisions, and are accountable to their electorate. They are responsible for ensuring all students within their jurisdiction have equal opportunities to reach their maximum potential. This may be lost with larger elected boards or appointed boards who may be more influenced by politics because they are responsible to the government who appointed them.

As representatives of the _____ Student Community Council we would like to express our concerns with the options provided in the Educational Governance Review Report. We value the connection we have with our elected Board member and do not feel a move to appointed boards would benefit our remote community. We fear loss of our local voice will negatively impact our students experience and performance may suffer as a result. We are very proud to say our students currently rank in the top of provincial results. We feel this document and the options provided are merely cost saving options and do not take into account the accountability and efficiencies PVSD has found since the last amalgamation. The document options clearly acknowledge that changes to the current system may compromise student outcomes, reduce accountability, reduce community communication and access to decision makers, put more work on SCC's and disrupt our schools. The negatives far out way the positives as we read through the options proposed. We fully support finding cost saving systems such as centralizing the purchasing of larger items such as paper, IT equipment, copier machines, etc., strengthening our educational outcomes and standardizing expectations of our Boards, but we can not support wide sweeping changes as proposed in the document. We hope you will consider our submissions carefully and remember that we must do what is in the best interest of the students. Sincerely, _____ Commity Council

I am AGAINST more amalgamation. I would like to see locally elected boards stay in place. Being from a small rural area I feel we were lost after the amalgamation 10 years ago and I'd hate to see what happens to small rural schools with the currently proposed changes. We pay our taxes and we need someone who will fight to keep those taxes in our schools and benefitting our students. We deserve a voice!

To whom it may concern; I support cost saving systems, strengthening the educational outcomes and standardizing boards, however the wide sweeping changes proposed are unacceptable. Further amalgamation is not in the best interest of RURAL students. I suggest centralization of procurement and payroll to reduce costs. We need locally elected boards, they are our local voice. What happens to communities that lose schools? They die, they cannot attract families. Bus ride times are a concern, kids should not ride buses for extended periods of times.

I support cost saving systems, strengthening the educational outcomes and standardizing boards, however the wide sweeping changes proposed are unacceptable. Further amalgamation is not in the best interest of RURAL students. I suggest centralization of procurement and payroll to reduce costs. We need locally elected boards, they are our local voice. What happens to communities that lose schools? They die, they cannot attract families. Bus ride times are a concern; kids should not ride buses for extended periods of times.

As a concerned parent, I am against creating one large school board with government appointed members. We need to keep our schools a top priority in Saskatchewan. We live in a small town where our school is at the "end of the line" in the division. If our school were to close, it would basically buckle our community. I know that my husband and I are not going to be sending or kids on a bus 1 hour each way to attend school. Please use common sense when deciding our provinces educational future. We live in a great province, let's keep it that way.

Per the Perrins report: "To meet current challenges and to prepare for the future, Saskatchewan's K-12 education system requires a governance system that is structured to: Achieve improved student outcomes in keeping with Saskatchewan's Plan for Growth and the ESSP; Maintain and improve the quality of instruction for all students, wherever they live; Achieve cost-containment by maximizing the use of resources; Ensure consistent, effective and efficient business processes; Improve accountability and transparency through clear lines of authority and responsibility; and, Preserve and strengthen parent and community voice." Also, per the Perrins report: "[The government will] develop a two-year plan to require third parties that receive significant provincial funding such as health regions, school boards and post-secondary institutions to demonstrate financial efficiencies such as joint supply purchasing, shared back office services, LEAN initiatives and workforce adjustment targets that can be directed towards supporting front-line services" (Government of Saskatchewan 2012)." Were these goals achieved by the Regina Catholic School Division? Were other school divisions not successful, requiring a proposed change in governance? Are the school divisions trying to hit a moving provincial target? I agree 100% with the importance of all the aforementioned goals for our province, our education system and our children (mine included - age 9 in Grade 4). However, these goals should not be at the expense of a local voice in education in our communities. I am trying to understand the core issue. Is the problem the quality (ksa's) of board members and their ability to make good decisions - financial and otherwise? Is it the inability of the province to affect these decisions? Or both? Per the Perrins report: "As well, the Plan for Growth includes a commitment to "continue to deliver smaller, more effective government ... as part of an ongoing process to ensure the programs and services delivered by government are being delivered as efficiently and effectively as possible and are aligned to the government's priorities." For me, none of the three options in the Perrins report suggest smaller, more efficient government. Bottom line ... I don't want a change in governance to draw much needed attention and resources away from the classroom and negatively impact my child. I don't want amalgamations to create chaos and uncertainty. If changes are made, EVERYONE needs to know and understand with this means for them (all stakeholders including parents and students). From my perspective as a parent, the biggest risks for me are: 1) Too much power in the hands of one player ... namely the provincial government. When the political stripe of the party in power changes, so could the overall goals, direction and daily operations in my child's school division and school. 2) The inevitable uncertainty, negativity, and dissatisfaction wholesale changes to governance in education will create in education. Will the process of the changes in governance actually create an environment to achieve the stated goals or will they get lost in the process and confusion. How many years will this process take and when can students/parents/taxpayers expect to see results? How many man hours will be required and at what cost? Questions that need answers. Perhaps a fourth option is possible whereby democratically elected boards and public representation is preserved. Perhaps the province can have appointed positions on these boards with very specific powers to better achieve their goals for education.

We live in a very Christian like society in Saskatchewan and in a world that is trying to fragment and break down our values it is very important to keep our separate school system intact. Being a Christian is much more than merely attending a church service on a Sunday. It is about time for reflection, a kindly deed, an encouraging word, maybe O Canada. And indeed I think we can spare a minute in our day for the Lord's Prayer and the catholic school that we attend from time to time does all of these things.

We as the SCC for have a number of concerns about the upcoming transformational change in Education. As The Perrin report refers to Parental participation in new, larger school divisions, he says one of the challenges will be, "Participation in governance will be a challenge and parents and families in the public system would have different access to board members than in the separate and francophone system." This is a concern to us as we truly appreciate our access to our elected members when we have suggestions and or concerns. Our feeling is that as boards (elected or appointed) get larger, our voice will become but a whisper. A second concern is the extended implementation time that such changes will take. Our children are in the schools now and will be effected by these changes either physically or through the effects and stresses that such changes will take on teaching staffs for years to come. As Perrin says "There will be disruption at the school division and local community and school level through organizational changes,.....". We are more than happy with the education our children are currently receiving and are worried that drastic upheaval will have negative effects on not only our children but the school and our community as a whole. Thirdly we are not convinced that these changes are, as Minister Morgan has said, "In the best interest of students" but more an attempt at cost cutting to our children's detriment. Our school staff are currently stretched to the limit and we are truly concerned that larger division's or a single division will take away from the Student Centered feeling and change to Survival Mode and that will not be healthy or positive for anyone. Lastly we would like to point out the tremendous things our division has done as one of the highest performing school divisions in the province. Our graduation rates, both aboriginal and non-aboriginal, are well above the provincial average at the same time as having one of the provinces highest pupil to teacher ratio. All four of the suggested options have PSSD being either swallowed up by another division or split up, having different borders and we fear the things that make us great, may be lost in the transition. We are very proud of our students and staff and want nothing but the best for them. We feel that any of the proposed changes that are suggested will take it's toll on them leading to a much less successful and positive school experience for everyone involved.

It is my opinion that the changes proposed by the governing party in the transformational change document are not representative of the wants and needs of the public. Replacing locally elected school boards with appointed officials removes the right of the public to appoint their representation. Furthermore, it is worth noting that locally elected representatives are members of our community and have vested interest in what is best for the community. While I am not questioning the competence of their suggested replacements, I do wonder why one would appoint an individual who is so far removed from a community to make decisions on their behalf when a process already exists to do so. As a teacher it is important to me to know who represents me and the members of my community and I know this is even more important to those who live in rural communities. It is impossible to act in the best wishes of the public when one does not have an active role in that community. In addition to my above concerns, I worry that the amalgamation of school divisions will have a negative impact on our students. No two schools are alike, no two school divisions run the same way. They are designed to fit the needs of the people they serve. This will surely prove to be a struggle when budgets are limited and the government is given yet more influence over the allocation of money to schools. I'm addition, amalgamating school divisions will force job cuts, even if that is not the immediate goal of the governing party. Not only will this negatively affect the entire economy of the province, it will reduce personal interactions between teachers and supervisors and further depersonalize the education system. In closing, I believe it is our right as members of a democratic society to have the ultimate say in issues such as these. Education is an institution that affects the entirety of our society, and such important descisions should not be made in haste or without the majority of stakeholders being heard and involved.

I believe that we need to stay focused on student outcomes in this province. Transformational change in the education sector has already begun with the Education Sector Strategic Plan. I believe that further amalgamations of school divisions or establishing appointed boards rather than elected boards will cause disruption in the education sector and draw our focus away from the needs of our students. Our students need consistency and continuity. They will not benefit from moving decisions further away from the school community. I know there are fiscal issues in the province. I do not believe that structural changes at this time will benefit our students nor will it provide any cost savings. I believe that Boards of education are committed to be responsible stewards of educational resources and continue to find efficiencies in order to ensure that our students have the best quality education possible.

I am catholic and to have the ability to send my kids to a Catholic school is amazing! I went to a Catholic school and my mom got cancer and the kids in my class were the kids in my church and I saw them all the time. To have the ability to make life long friends cause I was with them all the time benifitted me and I want my kids to have that community that I got where you saw your friends everyday in a learning and worship aspect. Keep the Catholic school separate!

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed restructuring of the education system. I do not feel that the options presented are the only options. In fact I feel they are unnecessary and that the challenges identified in the Educational Governance Review Report can all be met effectively through amendment to legislation, regulations and policy. This would and should be the first option as to have the least amount of disruption to the current divisions, schools, and most importantly the students of Saskatchewan. Specifically I am totally opposed to any change made to the Lloydminster Public School Division. Lloydminster is a very unique situation that also has many obstacles involved when talking about change. Due to the fact that we have a municipal levy that ensures equitable services I feel that the options outlined in the review would be very difficult to seamlessly deliver services across an expanded division. I also feel that the Alberta residence would be losing their position in the education system with any changes. It seems impossible to ask the Alberta government and residence to contribute to the education system that is servicing a system that would be unequal. Please take into consideration these issues and reconsider your options. This all has happened too quickly without careful consideration and input allowed. The brakes should be put on to slow down this train wreck. The issue of saving money is not the result of these changes and in fact previous changes has proven that. The students, and services provided for them, should be the number one concern. Sincerely,

Locally elected boards are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. They are important advocates for ensuring excellence in education. Who better to serve the needs of students—which are unique to each division, and even each school within divisions—than those elected by our community to represent our community. The cutbacks the government has already imposed have caused problems and because of that quality has taken a dive in the Education sector (cramped classrooms, less teacher instruction). Keep your fingers out of the pot!! You the government doesn't need to micromanage everything. At this rate it will no longer be Saskatchewan people it will be Brad Wall Province - democracy gone!!

I understand changes are being considered in our education system. I am very disappointed to learn that amalgamating school divisions and eliminating elected boards of education and replacing them with government appointed boards are possibilities. School boards need to be elected locally, by local people with local interests in mind. These local representatives are involved, know and understand the unique needs of the students in their own area/neighbourhood. I know this is a cost-cutting measure, but such measures are not always effective and definitely will not benefit our future generation who already face many challenges. Thank you,

The purpose of this paper is to provide options in response to the question "What system of governance and structure is needed in Saskatchewan's K-12 education sector to achieve the outcomes established by the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP)?" (pg. 3, Perrins' Report) "Complicating this situation is the current financial situation in which the education sector is being asked to examine expenditures. There is a need to examine the balance between local and provincial interests, within the context of improving results and containing costs province wide." (pg. 12, Perrins' Report) The above two excerpts speak volumes. It says to me, how can we achieve those outcomes the cheapest way possible? It is a mandate to do more with less. For many years, the teachers of Saskatchewan have stood up and embraced the challenge to do more with less. This is a short term solution, but is not sustainable. Teachers have been asked to do more with less so often, it has become an expectation. An expectation that has led to teacher burn-out and, in turn, put education at risk. Now, we further risk education in an attempt to save money. Centralizing governance and structure will not reduce the work required to achieve those goals outlined in the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth or the ESSP. It will, however, reduce the decision-making power of those who truly understand what their school needs to be successful in undertaking those goals. Saskatchewan is a large province with great diversity. Whether geography or demography, the needs of students in Saskatchewan are best attended by those who know and understand because they live in the community. A great task indeed is it for a centralized government to rely on second party information about a particular community in its attempt to serve it. So once again, education in Saskatchewan will be asked to do more with less. When I look at the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth and the ESSP, I see outcomes that are attainable through our current structure because those school divisions understand and respond to their individual needs. A centralized structure cannot have the same success as it will struggle to truly know the needs of its members. The same argument applies to why we have so many municipalities in Saskatchewan. We are diverse and we know our own situation best. The current financial situation should not necessitate changes to our educational system of governance. Centralizing education to save money will not see those educational outcomes met. Allow our teachers, school boards and divisions, who know their students best, the autonomy to create the environment that will see those outcomes met.

There has been no meaningful public consultation, and a change of this scale has the potential for many errors, why is the government rushing this?

As an educator/administrator of a small rural elementary school I am very concerned and alarmed at the sudden urgency of actions related to Dan Perrins' report. Normally, more time for consultation could and should be expected for a potentially drastic change. I am aware that 'transformational change' has been in the works as it had been announced previously, but without any information. Why the rush to make a decision so quickly now? As an educator, I'm no stranger to change nor am I opposed to change that improves student learning. Change is inevitable. I do not see how this will improve student learning; in fact, I feel it may be detrimental. How will services that are already sparse be equitable and accessible to ALL Saskatchewan students, especially those learners distanced from bigger centres? If the number of teachers becomes based solely on enrollment because of extreme budget restraints, our school will become a 'little country school house' again. For example, one teacher may educate/supervise K-3 students (might only be 25 students, but will include 4 sets curricula x 7 subject areas). Unreasonable expectation for both learner and educator! Completely regressive! As an administrator, I know that teacher stress and heavy workload is ongoing, but somewhat normal part of the job; however, when additional huge uncertainties are presented mid-year, that seems so disrespectful and unfair! What about an appointed/elected combination board configuration? You'd get the knowledge base/skill set advantage of the appointed ones PLUS the contextual and community perspective of the elected ones. Adult advocacy is critical for individual learners AND for communities of learners (i.e. schools and their respective communities).

Dear Sir or Madame, I respectfully, submit that education should not be seen as a business but as a vocation that requires all involved individuals to make decisions that encourages the betterment of society. It is a mission where there must be a deep sense of responsibility and relationship with our communities, families and individual children. By having locally elected boards and two different school divisions, we assure parents the opportunity to choose what they believe is best for their child. In a democratic society, freedom which causes no harm to a person, is the fundamental cornerstone. I realize we are in difficult economic times, but considering the immense pool of post secondary education that exists in the current government, surely there are better solutions. The current government must think outside the proverbial box and remember that we must protect the most vulnerable of society: the children. Be assured of my continued prayers. Respectfully,

I worry that the small town schools will be getting closed next. Our school is a huge part of our community, with a great deal of young children.

In my opinion, Option 3A: Restructuring Public School Divisions appears to be the most logical model to move to in the upcoming educational governance restructure. While I do believe that there needs to be some increased school division accountability, particularly spending accountability, I believe the highly experimental move to a provincial model would cause upheaval and be extremely detrimental to the students who are the ones who will undoubtedly be most affected by the impeded functionality of the education system during an extended transition phase. Option 3A offers (hopefully) minimal disruption to the student while still achieving important restructuring objectives including standardization of policies, procedures and improving transparency. However, I caution that school division spending accountability should somehow be monitored during and after implementation, particularly when school divisions are amalgamated. There is the potential for unequitable distribution of monies within school divisions based on the "historical" school division borders dependent on where "headquarters" for the new school division lands. The spending policies and accountability of the new school divisions should be closely monitored. I agree that the local voice needs to be retained and more consistency among school divisions regarding the purpose and usefulness of school community councils is required. There are things that are observed at the local level that could assist school boards in cost-savings, etc. if school community councils were actually consulted. Caution should also be taken when placing high reliance on using certain 'outcomes' as a measurement tool - remember to consider quality versus quantity. In other words, if the quality of the grade 12 education is low, the quantity of grade 12 graduates is not an accurate measure of the state of your education system.

Please keep our collective agreement.

Although I'm in favour of looking for efficiencies where they make sense, I am strongly opposed to any scenario that includes appointed rather than elected, local, school board members. Having an elected member in my area gives me, as a community member and parent, a voice. It also recognizes that my area, and the schools and students within it, have differences from those in other areas of the province. I am concerned that a giant school board governing the province, while possibly saving money, will lose the perspective needed to effectively manage programs at the local level. Equal isn't always fair, and without representation and actual management at a local, operational level, we risk losing the ability to target funds, programs and other attention where they may be most needed.

There are no more efficiencies to be gained by a further elimination of School Divisions. Local autonomy is important to have decisions made as near as possible to the folks affected by the decisions. Remember around 50% of education costs are paid by local taxation. Elected boards are more democratic and less open to political partisanship. Making transformational change simply as a cost cutting vehicle is wrong and saying it improves education is dishonest. Locally elected boards with local autonomy are the essence of democracy.

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report, I agree with the feedback offered by the School Community Council: 1. We support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). 2. It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! We do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. 3. We do not support any of the three models presented in the report. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support that change to governance or further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. 4. We have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold we are legislated by. 5. We need a permanent high school plan, including transportation, to accommodate the best interests of our students, their families, and our community. 6. Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in. Regards, _____, Resident and concerned citizen

I am a recently retired school board trustee _____ so I am familiar with the discussion surrounding the Perrins report on school division governance and restructuring. As a former trustee I do not have a vested interest in maintaining status quo for school boards, but I also have some insight into the value of locally elected representation on school boards. I think Mr. Perrins makes some important and valid recommendations regarding "shifts" in governance (pg 20) of the report. I think provincial standards in governance training and certification would improve the functioning of elected trustees. Standard compensation rates should also be established. (However the Board I was a member of did not give themselves a raise in the 7 years I was a member). It may be that the size of school boards could be reduced by one or two trustees per board and still provide adequate and authentic representation. I also believe that a provincial entity such as described by Mr. Perrins could provide provincial quality control to all operations of the school division, including governance. I think there may be rational for tweaking the school division boundaries and encouraging cross-division co-operation. But - and this is an important "but" - the ESSP brought together school division in an unprecedented way and has paved the way to inter-divisional cooperation that has retained the unique ability for each division to act within their own individual strengths, opportunities, needs and challenges, while maximizing from the strengths and findings of other divisions. There is a tremendous amount of sharing of resources, ideas and several initiations underway to produce efficiencies by sharing efforts. This can be improved but it has been happening and is a continued focus by many if not all school divisions. All of this being said, please let me add my voice to those asking the government not to proceed with further major amalgamations and to retain our current system of locally elected trustee governing boards. Past amalgamations did not save money. In fact, they cost money. They did improve our education system. However, I believe they have reached the maximum size, beyond which we will see lost efficiencies and effectiveness. Further amalgamations will surely interrupt and harm the goals of the ESSP and will certainly not put our students first. Health and education are very different. When parents send their children off to school it is with some anxiety and with great trust. The school becomes an extension of their home, the place where their children grow in body, in mind and in character. Trustees provide oversight and accountability to the process. Despite their best intentions, government as funder and educators as professionals have other interests (financial, reputation, ideological, pedagogical) than might not always serve the best interest of the children and their families. Locally elected trustees are in a position to be ambassadors and auditors to watch over the needs of both the system and the communities they serve, without self-interest. This crucial role would be negated if school boards members were no longer connected to the community or if they were appointed by government. Dan Perrins report indicates that his consultations with school divisions and with the public indicated that major changes to the structure and governance of school divisions are not wanted or warranted. They will not result in significant savings to the public coffers and it could harm the progress being achieved through the ESSP. I have attended community meetings in this region and read reports from similar meetings throughout the problem indicating there is overwhelming public support to retain school divisions as they are and to support strong locally elected representation on their governing boards. Please hear our voices. Our children are our greatest trust and safeguards must be in place to retain the voices of their parents and caregivers, and to protect them from unintended consequences of centralized institutions. Thank you, _____

On behalf of _____ Economic Development, we wish for School Boards to remain local and elected. We believe this is the most effective way to deliver superior primary and secondary education. Thank you for your attention.

To whom it may concern: I am on the _____ School Community Council. I am quite concerned about the impact of amalgamation on our rural school. Why such a short time frame for changes of this magnitude? There is little or NO reference to students or students learning in the report, is this not supposed to be about bettering our students? Our students should be seen as an investment in the future of Saskatchewan, NOT A WAY TO SAVE MONEY! Amalgamating school divisions does not benefit our students. I strongly oppose the amalgamation of our school divisions.
Sincerely _____

After reading the Educational Governance Review Report I feel strongly that our government should change our current system so that we have more school districts in our province. The land mass per school division needs to be decreased so that it is closer in line with similar provinces such as Alberta and Manitoba. These school divisions need to be divided so that communities that have similar size, needs and cultural similarities are together working toward a common goal. For example the Prairie Spirit School Division is a prime example of what to avoid. The division has 2 of the fastest growing cities in our province, Warman and Martinsville, which both have a population of approximately 11,000. While the remainder of the schools in the district are located in towns or villages with an average population of approximately 800. These small communities are vastly different from a fast growing community. This type of situation only harms the smaller communities and leaves them without sufficient funds, staffing and resources to meet the needs of the students and community. The students in our province are our "future". If we want the "future" of our province to succeed and remain in our province we need to give them a better chance to do so. Even though our numbers are increasing, our government has been cutting back on funding for Education repeatedly for years. The education system that is the core of our future is failing our province by not providing the funding for such things as resources, maintenance, ever changing technology, fixing and maintaining buildings, literature, health and wellbeing of students and staff, and most importantly staffing . These are the major reasons that our rural communities are dying out. The large school divisions are struggling to meet the specific needs of each community with the limited budget they have been provided. Therefore, in order to ensure that our children get the proper care and resources that they need their families feel they are forced to move out of the rural communities they are in, in hopes of finding a better solution for their children's needs. Sometimes this may mean to a large city where there may be a private school, or a public school that has the resources specific to their needs. Often even after doing so, they are left with the same problems or other problems because the Government is not giving Education the proper funding!

I am concerned about this amalgamation affecting our students negatively. Being a rural school we already make do with less than other schools in bigger centres. If our Division is amalgamated into one big one or even just joined in with one of a few, how will we ensure even our basic needs are met? Will we be at risk of losing the few extra curricular like Band for example. Our school works hard to keep this program and we can not afford to lose funding for it. Our school needs infrastructure improvements and an amalgamation will take the spotlight off of important things that need to get done, and instead the focus will be on reorganizing the school districts. After talking to those who went through the 2006 amalgamating, and reading about the last amalgamation, it seems like it was a very time consuming and confusing endeavor, one that I fail to see the need of repeating again right now. I would like to see how this would benefit our kids before this was put into effect.

Dear Advisory Panel: I am the mother of 4 children, two of which are school-aged and two of which are pre-school. I live in small-town Saskatchewan and my children attend in the North East School Division. Regardless of what changes the Sask Party makes to the education system, I feel it is very important that each region and each school be represented with its own voice to represent its own particular issues and challenges. If this means that these voices are represented through elected volunteers, instead of paid board members, I believe this is much better than doing away with the school and community voices altogether. From what I understand, the potential changes (amalgamation) will exclude Separate (minority faith) School Boards. I deeply support this and deeply respect this and I think it is very important. I believe that any changes that must be made should target the "fat" of the system (reducing or eliminating wages for board members, travel expenses, decreasing costs through province-wide purchases of software and supplies, etc.) rather than the "meat" of teaching Saskatchewan's children (Education Assistants, total hours of education required per year, etc.). I believe that the focus and goal of all and any changes should be to serve the students and their education. I strongly believe that this must come first. I believe that the students and their education are best served by ensuring that each region and school has an elected member or elected volunteer to voice their concerns. Thank you for your time and thank you for serving Saskatchewan. Respectfully, _____

I would like to express my opinion that I think there should only be a regional model of four school boards in Saskatchewan. I am also wondering why in _____ where we have only about 250 students, there are two schools. Our high school only has 99 kids in it. I think they need to combine the two schools.

Re: K-12 Education Governance Review Advisory Panel: We have examined the Educational Governance Review Report as a School Community Council with both the PVSD Board and members of our community. We understand the importance of achieving the targets in the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP) as efficiently and effectively as possible, especially given the financial challenges the government is currently facing. However, we do not feel that the options presented in this report will result in significant cost savings without negatively impacting the quality of education for our students, eroding community voice, and affecting the sustainability of our community. We support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for students and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). We do not support the concept of an appointed Board of Education. We believe local voice is an essential part of a successful school-community relationship. We do not support any of the 3 models presented in the report. We feel forced amalgamation puts our school, and many like it, at risk of closure. We want to know what potential changes there will be to the rural school closure thresholds that are currently legislated. We feel this is a critical consideration in evaluating the options. We would like to see a permanent solution for high school transportation and are concerned what impact forced amalgamation will have on bus ride times for our students. We believe that further progress can be made in existing school divisions to find sector-wide efficiencies and cost-savings and recognize that the government may need to be more directive in requiring these sector-wide efficiencies to be realized. We urge you to do further research, most notably on the points raised above, before making a decision that will ultimately affect the quality of education for our children.

I am a Special Education Assstant with _____ been with them 14 years now. I absolutely love my job and what I do, I have always put my students and their needs first! But with all this talk of changes, I think everyone is forgetting that when it comes to students, their needs should always be first and in the cases of the changes it's what's going to benefit the government and not the students, since when did we stop caring about student needs? I am strongly asking that you hear the deep concern in our public voices, local democratically elected school boards are the best choice for my community. Local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities.

We need to keep our school boards locally elected, for the benefit of OUR CHILDREN!!

Dear Advisory Panel: I understand changes are being considered in our education system. As the Advisory Panel who represents our interests as citizens and taxpayers, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community. Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support the Chinook School Division and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature: 1) We need to keep our school boards locally elected; and, 2) We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community. Sincerely,

As a parent I am very concerned with the choices you will make re regarding the educational governance review bigger is not always better. The rural divisions in place are already very large school boards and have trouble with distance of things already. Two I would hate to see it go to an appointed school board members, the electoral procedure allows communities to have a say on who represents them and their school and their communities. Having local board members run for school boards ensures that they keep an interest to what is happening in their school and communities to help deliver the best education for their individual needs. Our government has to take a look at the waste in upper management for sure and to allocated funds more to the schools themselves to help rural schools deliver programs and support staff in a timely and informative manner. Our support staff is over worked trying to fit all the schools they look after now going bigger will not help with this. Many middle of the road students are falling through the cracks when it comes to enough supportive help. We need to think of what is best for our students and find the money to achieve a high level of success in educating our youth. They are our future and if we can step into help in the early years with enough teachers and support staff to fill the needs of our students then we will find less need to spend money on our social system later. Class sizes should be looked at with all the social problems and behavioral problems teachers have to deal with on top of education curriculum. There isn't one set model that works, things need to be looked at in individual cases. I am not a fan of class splitting either by this I mean taking a class and putting 1/2 the kids in an upper grade and 1/2 the class in a lower grade. I think this socially affects students in an unprecedented way. I know that some of these issues were not in your report but I think they are worth your consideration. Geographic size and student enrollment must be considered when choosing the best option. Staying small for easy access to programs and material as well as support staff makes sense at the size we are now for rural schools maybe there is some options that can be taken in the city schools without effecting increasing the size of the rural schools. Thank you for your consideration in these matters.

Our schools are in a time of crisis. I have been in the classroom for 23 years and never before have I seen such need in front of me. Honestly, I don't know what is best as far as school divisions and boards but I do know one thing. The ills of our society are manifesting themselves in schools and unless something changes drastically, this system will implode. The basis for these issues is all the same and it is poverty. Poverty in our society means that students are coming from unstable, unsupported homes. The education system can only build on and reinforce the education that comes from home and today's students are sorely lacking. This manifests itself in deficits in language and numeracy. Before they even start school they are behind. This compounds and by the time they come to me in high school, they are years behind in reading and writing. I have many vulnerable students that have 40 or more absences in a semester. That works out to about 40% of the school year and when they are in Grade 10 their skills reflect this with them achieving around a Grade 6 level of reading and writing. This lack of stability and support at home means that students often bounce from one home to the next, they deal with addictions and often have mental health issues. Frankly, school is the least of their worries. It is incredibly difficult to teach people who are not in front of you and they are at risk of failure. Grade 10 is the first year that they are actually held back if they fail and by then the issues are so deep seeded it is next to impossible to turn this around. So what do we do? It is critical that we intervene at a very early age with these vulnerable families. Until we face the truth of residential schools and racism in this province, it won't change. From an education perspective there are some things that we can do. We need to recognize how complex and exhausting teaching is today. -Teachers must have adequate prep time in order to meet the needs of their students. All teachers need one prep period every day. Excellent classroom teaching does not just happen by chance. It takes hours of preparation and collaboration. - Actual class sizes must be examined. By including admin, student services, teacher librarians in the formula it is artificially low. Kids fall through the cracks due to the sheer volume in the classroom. -Teachers need more educational assistants in the room; especially in the primary grades. More adults to support increasingly diverse classrooms is a must. -We need to develop interventions earlier. Math 9 Plus is too late. We need to do everything in our power to get kids at grade level earlier and stop social promotions. -Get extracurricular duties off the plate for teachers. These "voluntold" expectations are undermining our teaching. New teachers especially need the most time to prep for teaching yet they are expected to earn their way to a permanent contract by doing hundreds of hours of extra cur. Frankly some teachers are hired for their coaching despite their teaching and this is unacceptable. We need the best and the brightest in front of our kids. There are community teams run by community members and that is great. We need to focus on our craft of teaching but that is hard to do when an administrator asks you what you are doing for extra cur this year or you are made to feel like you are not a team player because you devote your time to assessment and not coaching. We keep adding things to the plate for teachers but we don't take anything off. If we really want to demand more and do better, this an easy one to take off. Let the communities run the teams; we will teach. Yes, this will take extra investment in education. I believe though not to do this is morally wrong. Whatever cost saving measures that can be found need to be invested right back into kids. We have an obligation to serve the students and families to the absolute best of our abilities. During times of trouble, we do not abandon our most vulnerable. We need to do better. In the end, we will all benefit or suffer based on the decisions that we make today.

Dear Saskatchewan Government and Education Committee for Mr. Perrins Report: Thank you for giving us, the people of Saskatchewan, a way to voice ourselves following the release of your report on education in our province. As a parent with children in the public school _____ I appreciate this! I would like to share my opinion and concern that the student and teacher ratio not be changed for the worse. Already this year my two children in public school saw they're grades become split classes of 1-2 and 2-3 because of smaller class numbers. As a parent in a small community where there is great school and community spirit we make the best of our situations but to rely on that for our children's education is not fair. Please do not lower our children's education quality while you look at different options for it! Thank you,

I consider myself lucky to get to work with such dedicated people on a day to day basis with the Saskatoon Public School division. Every day, I get to see first-hand the amount of hard work it takes to offer a quality education to our students. It is my opinion that our school division is an efficient operation that produces ambitious students who will be of great benefit to our province going forward. I believe that any attempt to amalgamate other school divisions with our own will only result in a deficit to our staff, students and families, while offering our government only modest savings. I also maintain that it is a cornerstone of our democracy to have publically elected school board members. These people have a vested interest in the quality of education that a school division offers, and as a result, work very hard to ensure that said quality is upheld. I hope that our government takes the time to make the best decision for our students, and does not make radical changes which may negatively influence our students' educational experience, for short term savings.

In the Dan Perrin Report – the discussion around means of selecting board members (elected or appointed) states that shifts in governance will require amendments to legislation. (Pg. 21). Questions/Concerns: 1) If the electoral process continues for school division board membership, will there be changes to the Education Act so that Saskatchewan people (First Nations & Non-First Nation) that live on reserve or federal land will have ability to both vote for and are eligible to become board trustees? Currently the Education Act, specifically section 173 (1) and (2) - and how 'resident' is currently applied and used by some school divisions - excludes both First Nations citizen participation and non-First Nations citizens participation in both governance and access educational services. This part of the Education act reflects a Saskatchewan context when only First Nations people resided on these reserve land areas. Times have changed. With the current context of Saskatchewan, and the First Nation's Treaty Land Entitlement and economic progress, we now have a context where you have both First Nations and non-First Nations people residing within First Nations land boundaries. These families are not allowed to have voice or be eligible to be that voice in the current governance framework. This effect ripples in that these families face obstacles and are sometimes excluded in accessing educational services as well. 2) If the appointed board membership is the route of choice, how will First Nations board representation be determined? Will the skills matrix be equally applicable to those representatives as well?

I fully agree with the need to revisit current practices and examine them for efficacy and relevance and therefore I support the review of current school board structures. Having said that, I must state that the extremely compressed timelines do not give me much confidence that the review will either be thorough or helpful. It does very much have the appearance of window dressing on a foregone conclusion. Having said that, I will still lend my voice and thoughts to the process. Mr. Perrin's report is based on the question of how to best achieve the goals outlined in the ESSP and in the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth but through the lens of governance and organizational structure. While on the one hand the ESSP addresses learning, on the other the SPG appears to address economic goals. A big question I have is which is the dominant priority driving the review and possible changes? As a long time educator I can easily get behind a discussion regarding the ESSP however when I look at the SPG my experience tells me that whatever comes out of the consultation will not likely result in an enhancement of public education but rather a net loss of resources. That will in turn impact our ability to achieve the goals of the ESSP. Whatever decisions are made need to support the goals of public education, not "cure" some panicked economic imperative. In his report, Mr. Perrins made mention of Education Quality Councils but did not really expand on them. I will be blunt. In other jurisdictions, and I will focus on the UK, such bodies have not proven to be particularly effective in leading learning improvement. OFSTED has really been used to promote particular political agendas and in general led to a sense of crisis in the UK educational system. A little Google research will support this assertion. While the education sector in Saskatchewan has room for improvement, it is by no means in crisis and it would not be helpful for either the students or taxpayers to believe there is one. An increasingly distanced governance and evaluation structure cannot possibly respond to local conditions, challenges and opportunities in an effective manner and will quickly devolve into a contextually poor decision making body. A few years ago I decided to attend every board meeting for one year to gain an understanding of how boards worked. It was my observation that the local board was extremely responsive in its decision making around local issues. Although I did not always personally agree with choices and decisions, it was obvious that the trustees had a clear understanding of the challenges and dynamics of their local context and were deeply invested in doing the right thing for the community they were responsible for. Over the last number of years I have observed an increasing centralization of decision making and power in the education sector. The ability for teachers, school staff, and now elected local boards themselves to make the decisions necessary for student success are becoming increasingly difficult. The ESSP is an excellent framework for moving the sector forward but the continued erosion of the tools (local decision making, funding, priority identification) to meet the ESSP goals will thwart efforts to achieve them. Ultimately I am deeply worried that the centralization of decision making and control will become too easily influenced by politically motivated policy decisions and not what is best for Saskatchewan students. A couple of years ago I had the opportunity to discuss the success of the Finnish education system with Pasi Sahlberg. Among other things he cited the fact that over a period of 30 years multiple governments of different stripes committed to a common vision of what teaching and learning should look like. This provided the stable environment needed to embed excellent practice. He also pointed out that there is a deeply decentralized model of program delivery that is reflective of our board structure (at least prior to the elimination of local revenue generation). This provided the environment necessary to respond positively to local needs. I would strongly advocate for changes that have shown positive results on student learning, not political expediency. Thank you.

We need to keep our school boards locally elected. I do not support any of the recommendations in the Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report.

I am a Special Education Assistant with _____ an employee for the last couple years _____. I am very thankful for my union and our collective agreement. I am very concerned about the recommendations/options that have been put together and such a rushed fashion. I don't see how these options and I quote..." Will focus on student success while ensuring accountability and efficient operational structures within the education system". The government gave Dan Perrins three weeks to study the amalgamations/restructuring and write his report. Why did Mr. Perrins recommend reduced school divisions and appointed trustees? There has been no meaningful public consultation, and a change of this scale has the potential for many errors. Why is the government rushing this? There's no evidence or report that states amalgamated/re-structured school boards and government appointed trustees and CEO, will save money. It will only guarantee that the parents, workers and communities have no voice. Please stop this! The public feedback supports our existing school division boundaries and keeping our democratic process of elected school boards. Why would the government want to change this? Why was this not brought up during the elections? I love my job working with students and they are my priority every day when I go to work. Why did the report not reference how this change will impact the students and their learning? Students are not a priority in this report! This is a business model, with government appointed school boards, communication and feedback to and from parents/communities will be negatively impacted. I love my democratic right to elect a school board trustee who will be accountable and represent my community. Elected school board trustees have a vested interest in my community, not the government's mandate. How fast can major decisions, such as school safety issues, be made if there's no local contact or voice? I am asking that you hear the deep concern in our public voices... Local democratically elected school boards are the best choice for my community. Local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities. Sincerely,

This system being proposed is a long-term decision without the benefit of knowing what the future holds. The rural communities are already largely dependent on the schools in the area. Not only are they a hub for the children and teachers but a place for a plethora of events ranging from fund raisers to art appreciation. The demographic of the province has changed dramatically over the last 10 years. What used to be small rural farming communities are now, more of commuter communities with several medium to large farms in the area. As agribusiness grows the farm size will as well. This change will probably continue with more people commuting (or working from home) and not wanting to (or not able to afford to) live in the cities. How many of these people have picked their homes, livelihoods and futures based on where their children can receive an education? How many work at or with the local schools / boards? A great many, to be certain. With the rising costs of living and transportation why do we need to make changes to the schools that are already here? If it is a fiscal issue couldn't we set up a board in between the government and the school board to keep everyone on track and to add a layer of transparency? If it is, as suggested, all for the benefit of the students and better graduation rates perhaps we should spend less time, effort, and money trying to plan a new system and instead build in incentives to achieve these goals? I imagine that if cost reduction for post-secondary were available based on grades of students some may be more inclined to study, or maybe additional money for the schools dependent on grades and graduation rates? I would hate to see restructuring force even more people out of the rural community due to longer bus rides to schools farther away only to revisit these same issues in another ten years. Let's not fix what isn't broken lets instead find the problem. I am certain the grades and graduation rates are not the result of school boards and the layout of school divisions.

I am very grateful that my four children have access to Catholic Education and in specific _____. I value the curriculum and instruction it offers as an alternative to public education. It plays a vital role in the community for people such as myself and my wife who desire faith based education for our children. The community of teachers and educators are second to none and I am very grateful that we can send our children to school knowing they are in good hands.

Dear Minister Morgan: We are writing to you in regards to the report the Saskatchewan Government recently released on the provincial education system. My wife and I are very concerned with the loss of local area representation on the school boards that will come with the amalgamation of the school boards. As a rural community member, we are also very worried about loss of representation for rural communities. We think that having locally elected members to our school board helps with the support of rural schools. We also have a question as to why such a short time frame for the changes of this magnitude to our school system ... the way we understand it is there was only three weeks study followed by a report out just before Christmas and three weeks consultation. We do not understand why there is such a short timeframe for such an important decision. As long-time supporters of the Saskatchewan Party, this is an alarming development as we have always felt that the Saskatchewan Party was rural Saskatchewan's biggest champion. Please reconsider this report and these ideas.

To whom it may concern: I am quite concerned with the proposed amalgamation of the public schools of Saskatchewan. Not only will this hinder all student services but this is discriminatory to all public schools. The fact that Catholic and private schools are exempt is appalling. This becomes even more of a hindrance in areas like Lloydminster where currently there is a public and a catholic school board. If the public division becomes one division for the province, it becomes very easy for a parent to choose which division is best for their child's education. This would be the case for all centers that have private divisions close by. Another alarming proposal is the appointed boards opposed to elected boards. We want to have a board that lobbies for our needs. Not a board that is a bunch of 'yes-men and yes-women'. Furthermore, an elected board in Regina is far less effective than an elected board in Lloydminster. Please consider these points when making a decision.

I am very much in favour of locally elected boards to serve the needs of our school. Please do not eliminate elected boards which can and do serve the needs unique to each school population. Thank you for hearing my voice . I believe it is important to have locally elected school boards to ensure that communities have a say in their student's education. Please do not eliminate these boards! Thank you.

Locally elected boards are most necessary to accurately reflect the voice , the values and the needs of our children and youth. Who better understands what is best for them than the locally elected community and parents, who are familiar with their local educational environment. I am a retired teacher and have worked in 2 provinces and in both the rural and urban schools. Please DO NOT dissolve the locally elected boards in favor of government appointed ones. PLEASE PROTECT THE FREEDOM AND SPECIFIC NEEDS OF OUR CHILDREN by staying LOCAL !

I appreciate that you've invited all education stake-holders ~ parents, teachers, and communities ~ to be a part of the transformational change conversation that impacts each of us. It is difficult, as Mr. Perrins conveyed, to identify scenarios that would better-support student success and I admit that I am skeptical whether the motivation stems from a true desire to improve the education system or simply from fiscal restraints. My concerns regarding amalgamation involve varied education aspects and what is really best for students, whether that be direct student programming or much-needed supports for teachers to best meet the diverse needs of students. First of all, I am apprehensive that students will not be provided with timely access to much-needed supports, such as EAL support, Educational Psychologists, Speech and Language Pathologists, Aboriginal Liaisons, Nutrition Workers, etc. if these individuals are expected to support expanded regions in proportion to new geographical division boundaries. If round-trips are hours long, it doesn't seem feasible to expect prompt service. Even shared bussing routes, while seemingly more efficient with more students, may cause substantially longer bus-rides for young students, where for some, bus-ride times are already extensive. "Sharing" these services may be a cost savings, but is not necessarily in the best interests of the students. Furthermore, I am concerned that teachers will not have the same access to education leaders and specialists in order to best meet the diverse and changing needs of students. Will teachers be able to effectively manage curriculum outcomes without these supports? Furthermore, if these services are shared, I imagine that the transportation costs required to cover a vast geographic area would negate job redundancy. If not, where are these cuts made? I predict that amalgamations would further cut teacher support and professional development in a variety of areas including assessment and reporting, Student Services, supports for students with diverse learning needs, and EAL supports. Secondly, LINC negotiations are an enormous component of amalgamation. I am concerned that in blending these local agreements, school and cultural needs will no longer be met and teacher workload will intensify even further. This change in local agreements would be seemingly in opposition to the current "Task Force on Teacher Time" report, which has yet to be implemented with strategies to alleviate the current pressures on teachers. The sheer time and legalities of such a venture to re-write or abolish LINC agreements do not seem to establish a means of cost-reduction, nor a benefit to teachers or students, particularly when it comes to class size & composition and staffing formulas. Additionally, through amalgamation, decision-making would become too centralized and decision-makers would be too far removed from those they serve. Board members would be unable to connect with the communities as the viability of visiting schools often to provide support and identify needs would decline greatly. The voices that advocate on behalf of students, parents, and communities, would no longer be cognizant of the school and community needs. My biggest concern is that forced amalgamation will create equality at the expense of equity. Culture climates will be overlooked entirely due to geographical expanse and communities will have no autonomy to make the best decisions for their students. Many important elements of education that put students at the centre would be disregarded. I am in complete support of anything that will benefit students, but I do not support cost-savings at the expense of student success. I appreciate the opportunity to share my views on transformational change in education and sincerely hope that any decision that is made takes into account what is best for the students within our province.

To whom it may concern: I am deeply concerned about the possible amalgamation of the Lloydminster Public School Division. I work for Lloydminster Public School Division, but I am first and foremost a parent who has always taken my children's schooling extremely seriously. In my eyes, Lloydminster Public School Division has always strived to meet and work very closely with teachers and parents alike, to ensure that our children are provided with the highest possible standard of services and education. Communication has always been paramount between the school division and parents. And, should the amalgamation go ahead I feel that this will drastically disrupt the quality of these services. LPSD has always been a school division that reacts quickly to any given situation, and effectively strives to continually meet the needs of all its students. It is not an easy task to meet the large spectrum of needs across two provinces, but LPSD has successfully achieved this. LPSD equally provides services such as Pre-Kindergarten and transportation across both provinces regardless of which school or province the children reside in. I believe it is essential that we keep a local School Division based in Lloydminster due to the uniqueness of Lloydminster being in two provinces. Lloydminster Public School Division regularly strives to meet the large spectrum of needs of the students across the two provinces and I truly believe that it will be severely detrimental to our children's education should the amalgamation go ahead. I am also deeply concerned that, both as a parent who lives in Alberta and a tax payer, if we changed to an appointed School Board, I would no longer be able to voice my opinion or concerns. I feel that Lloydminster is unique due to its geographical position and so therefore should be exempt. Please consider our concerns as we truly believe that amalgamation is not the way forward for our children.

I support local involvement in education of our children. Further centralization of educational governance will reduce the involvement of parents and create a greater gap between parents and the educational communities which serves their children. I believe that a reduction in the number of school boards or a move to one governing board for the province would not improve our children's education. I am pleased that the minister is committed to continue the constitutional right of religious minorities in education. Prince Albert and area has a large number of First Nation and Metis students. The graduation rates are improving. We must continue in that direction. Centralization in my view would be harmful to their continued success.

I have worked in the Chinook School Division for the past 5 years and have seen how the community and school interact with each other working hard to keep the lines of communication open and working together for the benefit our students. We have challenges that are unique to rural areas that can only be appreciated at a local level. Combining the school boards into one will not benefit students in rural areas and could even make things more challenging in the long run.

I strongly feel the current education system is adequate with locally elected boards of education that are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. Local elected boards are the community voice and also important advocates for ensuring excellence in learning that serve the needs of all students which are unique to each school division. There are many principles imbedded in the first two options of the Perrins report that may have serious implications to education and the cost of funding education in our province. I support the governance structure of today with minor amalgamations and or realignment of boundaries that can make sense if and only if done with purpose and principles in educating students in Saskatchewan.

I have major concerns in regards to the merger of all Saskatchewan school divisions into one government governed body. I feel that considering the large area and diversity that our province has that each area needs to be represented by it's own who understand their unique needs and local values. Please remember that these changes affect our future as our children are the holders of our future. I feel education is one area that the budget should be "pinched" on. Our current school division represents our children and our families needs - please don't leave that in the hands of the whims of whoever may be in government at the time.

I do not agree with the options that are being considered by the province in regards to the governance review. Being part of a rural community with a rural school I know that we have to have a voice in our education system. By creating a single provincial public school division, regional division or more amalgamations we as a rural community have less voice. By amalgamating divisions the focus will be less on our individual communities and more on the city centers where there is greater populations which will be harmful to our children's education and school funding. I want our voices heard within our communities which I believe can only happen by remaining at the ideal size of a school division that we currently have.

Being from a rural area, we are very concerned about the proposed changes to the Saskatchewan school boards. While we understand there may need to be some cost-cutting measures, it would appear that the review is focused mainly on saving money, rather than investing in the best possible education for our children. There is very little in the review that concerns the direct needs of our children, and little consideration for the various learning styles that exist. We understand that the urban areas compose a high percentage of the student numbers, but our concern with the proposed changes is that it would especially be detrimental to the rural student body, as we would lose much of our potential voice and input into the system. The number of rural Saskatchewan students may be declining somewhat, but this should not mean that their quality of education should be diminished, nor their options limited. All students should be provided with an equal opportunity to develop and reach their potential. In regards to the decision-making body being in one central location, we feel we would lose access and input, and that our educational support, especially in the rural northern part of the province, would be negatively impacted. Although we would prefer the boards remain as they are, of the options given, we find Option 3b (Division model - realigning boundaries) preferable. We feel the restructured boundaries would likely still give our school councils, our teachers, students and communities a better opportunity to be heard and valued. Thank you for your consideration of our opinion. We trust the decisions made will be in the best interests of the ENTIRE province, and the provincial student body.

I would ask that you maintain the status quo regarding education governance in Saskatchewan. It is working well and has the best interest of the students in mind.

I am a CUPE 3766 member working for the Regina Public School Board and I am very concerned about the recommendations/options that have been put together and such a rushed fashion. I don't see how these options and I quote..." Will focus on student success while ensuring accountability and efficient operational structures within the education system". The government gave Dan Perrins three weeks to study the amalgamations/restructuring and write his report. Why did Mr. Perrins recommend reduced school divisions and appointed trustees? There has been no meaningful public consultation, and a change of this scale has the potential for many errors. Why is the government rushing this? There's no evidence or report that states amalgamated/re-structured school boards and government appointed trustees and CEO, will save money. It will only guarantee that the parents, workers and communities have no voice. The public feedback supports our existing school division boundaries and keeping our democratic process of elected school boards. Why would the government want to change this? Why was this not brought up during the elections? I love my job working with students and they are my priority every day when I go to work. Why did the report not reference how this change will impact the students and their learning? Students are not a priority in this report! This is a business model, with government appointed school boards. Communication and feedback to and from parents/communities will be negatively impacted. I love my democratic right to elect a school board trustee who will be accountable and represent my community. Elected school board trustees have a vested interest in my community, not the government's mandate. How fast can major decisions, such as school safety issues, be made if there's no local contact or voice? I am asking that you hear the deep concern in our public voices... Local democratically elected school boards are the best choice for my community. Local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities. I hope that someone pays attention to these emails as this is of extreme importance for the future of our children and our province!

It has been proven that the best interests of the students are met when there are local boards representing them. Please maintain the status quo regarding education governance in Saskatchewan.

We believe parents have the right to a say as to who governs the education of their children; the present school governance allows parents to exercise this right in community by means of electing school boards to represent them and that is their right. we would ask the provincial government to recognize the primary right of parents to educate their children by continuing the school governance policy of electing school boards rather than appointing government boards with all of the restructuring involved. Thank you for hearing our concerns.

I belong to the seperate system because I feel we've lost our voice in the public system. I'm not Catholic but appreciate and understand the need for religion in our school system. I don't like the fact that parts or religion aren't in the public system because it offends others. 1) Loss of effective and accountable public voice 2) Unintended consequences of amalgamations and appointed boards 3) Less say, control and input in your child's education 4) Loss of relationships with parents, parishes and community partners

PLEASE KEEP OUR SCHOOL Division boundaries the same and ensure that we are able to elect our School Board Trustees. I VALUE OUR COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT AND I BELIEVE IT'S IMPORTANT TO KEEP WHAT WE HAVE. I DO NOT WANT TO BE FORCED INTO A DIFFERENT COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT.

The changes suggested by Dan Perrins in his report on the provincial review of educational governance in the public sector are concerning. Further amalgamation of our school divisions without further study of what the cost savings would actually look like will only serve as a disservice to our students, families and communities as a whole. All of the proposed changes the Perrins Report suggests seem suggestive of negatively impacting the students in all four scenarios. This isn't just about saving money. This is also about ensuring our students continue to get what they need to succeed in education. Local boards of education are such an important and integral piece of an efficiently functioning school division. Locally elected boards give voices to the communities that we serve – to the families and to the students themselves. Our local board members are acting in the best interest of those students and families and that will, without question, be lost by moving to an appointed board. Students in each area of this province have unique needs and the locally elected boards are in touch with, and responsive, to those needs to ensure that our students succeed. Locally elected boards remain accountable to the families and communities that elected them and the administration of the division is then accountable to the board. Our locally elected boards have ties to the communities, they have relationships with the families and they are making decisions in the best interest of the children who live in those communities to ensure they are receiving quality education. By having an appointed board, you stand to lose that connection with the communities and families which would not be in the best interests of the students. Our division has realized such tremendous growth and change in recent years and student achievement has been consistently improving. Further amalgamating school divisions, without a thorough study of the cost savings and benefits to students realized by doing so, would be a step backwards for the students in this province. Student achievement has to remain at the forefront of any proposed change and the Perrins report does not seem to adequately address this. That is concerning. Prior amalgamations have proven that the amalgamation process is not always in the best interest of those affected and is not cost effective and introduces considerable distraction. The Perrins report also only speaks to public school divisions and doesn't speak to separate school divisions. If the education sector is being reviewed, it should be reviewed as a whole and not just focused in on either the public or the separate divisions – it has to include both. If change is to be looked at, it should be done thoughtfully, with adequate time being given to ensure the decisions being made will achieve desired results.

I am a firm believer in rural, small town education with governance at the grass roots level. I was a school board member for over ten years and had children in school for 20 years and I know that my children were better served by having local teachers and local governance. The farther away the governance gets the less attention for each child and the more homogenization of everything. There are some things that would benefit from a provincial system, perhaps the purchase of supplies, the maintenance of certain systems, that type of thing. The school does not exist on its own in a community. A good school has interactions with the community and has community members that care about the school and the students. WE don't need more remote-ness than we already have in this province. It is too easy for small schools, small communities to slip through the cracks. We don't need to drive all the citizens to live in cities because of the opportunities for their children. My children had a good solid educational basis to build their careers on. Two of my children have master's degrees. The attention and help they received in their small town schools helped build them into good citizens and good students. I firmly believe that living in a rural area helped make them into the good people they are today. Please don't spread out our schools and our services and governance any further than it already is. Thank you.

The school divisions are big enough as it is. The system works. It's not broken. Going to a single entity is untenable, a bureaucratic nightmare which won't save money and smacks of Trump-ism /Nazi-ism. It's just plain stupid to change it as it is working fine the way it is. The whole national-socialist structure of one person controlling everything and using underlings is ridiculous. Management will just get more top heavy, not saving money and taking money away from the students it needs to support.

As a parent and a teacher, I believe that a locally elected school boards can provide more for our children and schools. I teach in and my children attend a catholic school. This is a part of who we are. A school division that does not value Catholic education cannot make decisions with regards to Catholic education. Regina Catholic Schools is one of the highest achieving divisions in the Province of Saskatchewan. Amalgamating Catholic boards will distract our attention from our priorities. School division amalgamations are disruptive and time-consuming. The Regina Catholic School Division has been fiscally and financially efficient. Changing governance or amalgamating school divisions is not the answer to the financial challenges that the government is facing. We need to keep our focus on reading, math, writing, graduation and attendance – things that matter to students and families. Amalgamating school divisions is not the answer. Thank you for your consideration.

I don't think this is a good idea, our division does a great job. The government is making education and health look like they are the problem to the deficit when the governments foolish decisions are the real problem

Good afternoon: I am with Regina Public Schools, an employee for the last years here in Regina and very thankful for my union and our collective agreement. I am very concerned about the recommendations/options that have been put together in such a rushed fashion. I don't see how these options and I quote..." Will focus on student success while ensuring accountability and efficient operational structures within the education system". The government gave Dan Perrins three weeks to study the amalgamations and restructuring and write his report. Why did Mr. Perrins recommend reduced school divisions and appointed trustees? There has been no meaningful public consultation, and a change of this scale has the potential for many errors. Why is the government rushing this? There's no evidence or report that states amalgamated/re-structured school boards and government appointed trustee's and CEO, will save money. It will only guarantee that the parents, workers and communities have no voice. Please stop this! The public feedback supports our existing school division boundaries and keeping our democratic process of elected school boards. Why would the government want to change this? Why was this not brought up during the elections? I love my job working with students and they are my priority every day when I go to work. Why did the report not reference how this change will impact the students and their learning? Students are not a priority in this report! This is a business model, with government appointed school boards. Communication and feedback to and from parents/communities will be negatively impacted. I love my democratic right to elect a school board trustee who will be accountable and represent my community. Elected school board trustees have a vested interest in my community, not the government's mandate. How fast can major decisions, such as school safety issues, be made if there's no local contact or voice? I also value our collective agreement and think it's important to keep what we have and not be forced into a different collective agreement if all school districts are amalgamated. That is an unfair bargaining practice! I am asking that you hear the deep concern in our public voices... Local democratically elected school boards are the best choice for my community. Local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities.

I was saddened to hear that there may be pending changes in the way Education is overseen within Saskatchewan. Education in our Province has realized many "significant changes" over its timespan, the most recent major change that occurred ten years ago. When I hear that everything is "on the table" but then listen to Cabinet members indicate and see articles in our press that report that there "is NO indication of amalgamating our many Rural Municipalities causes one to wonder if indeed All is being considered. Transformational change means that it has seen or been transformed into change. May I say "that is what education is, continually learning new things in new ways and the Education Sector of our province has done well and continues to do well adapting to Change". Please note below a few of the changes that has transformed within the Education Sector community of our Province over the last number of years. 1. The downsizing 10 years ago to fewer and larger school divisions. Many who are now just catching up to the numerous disruptions to those involved in this process during what created a stressful time for our students, parents, administrators, teachers and trustees. 2. LEAN: Boards of Education along with all school board staff worked hard at looking for and finding efficiencies that could help in making sure that monies and resources were going back into the classrooms for our children. It is to be noted that there was over 3 times the amount in efficiencies found than what was asked to be found. Indeed, this was a good exercise to have taken. 3. ESSP: (The Education Sector Strategic Plan). This On Going work continues to finally for the first time, see all education sector partners working together to achieve long and short term goals. We are just now seeing the results in reading, graduation results and learning out comes for First Nations and Metis learning. With any major transformational changes this will disrupt the great work that has been initiated and progressed to now or remain on the self as other initiatives have in the past. 4. With the removal and the ability for a School Division to set their own mill rates and collect its own taxes has made it that no longer school boards can envision and work toward a "Vision for the future." Instead they are now trying to see those allotted funds going into budgets, (often reduced yearly) to just remain status quo. Parents and students are now seeing programs which once enhanced a student's academic progress now reduced or illuminated because of funding. I would suggest that: School divisions get No larger. There most likely is a need to realign boundaries of school divisions to fit traffic patterns that communities associate with. That there will continue to be representation by locally elected trustees who reside within their communities and will have personal contact with their ratepayers, parents, students and stakeholders and vice versa. If government is identifying that Governance expenses are too ample it may have come to where the Ministry needs to set the (expenditures) per diems, travel rates and Professional development requirements of Trustees and rewrite what actually is the duties, "expectations" and role of trustees on Boards of Education. Thank you for the opportunity to voice some of these concerns.

I think kindergarten gives children a good start at school and I am totally in favour of local boards that know what is necessary to a particular area

It is important to remember the people you are considering cutting are most likely the very best of your education and health communities. I have family members that work in this sector and it is so easy to just dismiss people in higher positions because our culture dislikes anyone who makes more than they do, but these are the same people that have sacrificed time and energy to become the best in their profession. So where is the reward? If you invest in your learning and work long hours and are promoted through the ranks, the message is you must be cut? If mistakes were made by a leadership we elected then we all share in the responsibility of paying for those mistakes (consider a tax increase), I would rather pay to keep our province than to diminish it in this way. It is deeply troubling that our leaders in government are so old-school (see "mafia") that they need to create a target out of health and education to cover up their mistakes. Think about this tactic; it is diabolical. I had so much trust for you Mr. Wall, you certainly have the camera fooled, but your methods reveal you to be anything but trustworthy. I do not care which stripe of government we next elect, as long as it is open and honest and does not seek to denounce its own citizens to cover deficit. Let's actually think about making Saskatchewan prosperous by saving a large portion of our revenues the next time a boom hits. Thank-you

The government gave Dan Perrins 3 weeks to study the amalgamations/restructuring and write his report. Mr. Perrins admits there is "unanimous support to keep the status quo and elected school board trustees". Why did Mr. Perrins recommend reduce school divisions and appoint trustees? There has been no meaningful public consultation, and a change of this scale has the potential for many errors, why is the government rushing this? There has been a lot of public feedback supporting our existing school division boundaries and keeping our democratic process of elected school boards, why would the government want to change it? Why was this not brought up during the elections? Divisions have found their own efficiencies - three times more than the governments' mandate, why is this being done? Why did the report not reference the how this change will impact the students and their learning? Students are not a priority in this report! Are students first in this report? No, this is a business model. As a tax paying citizen I have the democratic right to elect a school board trustee who will be accountable and represent my community, I pay education taxes! This is a business model, that will ensure small communities will have school closures, this is wrong! How fast can major decisions, such as school safety issues, be made if there is no local contact?

Further amalgamation of school divisions or boundary changes would only lead too school closures. The closure of schools in my opinion would be detrimental not beneficial to the education of our children. Studies have proven that fatigue inhibits children's ability to learn. School closures would only lead to longer bus rides resulting in tired children thus lowering the quality of education not improving it. Our rural communities have been the back bone that has built our province, and helped it become the great place it is. Keeping our schools ensures viability for our communities and our kids futures.

I think it's an embarrassment that our provincial government feels it is best to take away from the education and healthcare systems to cover for their mistakes and lack of accountability. Taking away the ability to provide proper resources to better the population because we never saved for when the economy wasn't going our way is terrible way to govern. MPs & MLAs should be taking a pay freeze, the corporations should be taxed more and that money used to provide for everybody that needs it. Corporate and private control has plagued politics for far too long. You make society better by providing the best education you can. You make society better by having the best healthcare system. The way things are going it seems more like corporate interests are more important than anything. The people need proper representation far removed from the cronyism of current politics which looks only to boost the interest of shareholders and business interests.

Thank you for the insightful report. I appreciate the research, thoughtfulness and neutrality that is woven throughout. I have been an educator for 25 years, both a teacher and in-school administrator. I have taught in the north for rural and Saskatoon Public for the past 15 years. This has allowed me to gain a perspective of education in our province that many others may not possess. Having said that, I do not profess knowing everything there is to know about governance. I learned many things as I read your report. The following are a few points that are important to me as we move forward: the first consideration in any changes to governance, efficiencies or alterations to school divisions must be how it will affect students. Other people may read your report through the lens of how these changes will affect them personally / their current assignment. The correct lens is how these changes impact student learning, engagement and graduation rates/future contributions to society. The engagement and authentic participation of parents and SCCs in their child's education is critical. We cannot remove them from the setting of priorities and monitoring of progress. They are our best untapped resource and will become even more valuable to us in times of fiscal restraint. Regardless of which model is selected we must pay special attention to enhancing the voice of these very important stakeholders. I believe in democracy and therefore feel very strongly that local boards should be elected. I recognize that the cost to hold elections is over one million dollars yet I still believe that we have a right to

choose who will be our representative and if we are not pleased with their work we have a mechanism to remove them through the act of voting. I think your suggestion of providing a matrix and some external training to improve the capacity and skills of trustees is excellent. We must strike a balance between being financially prudent and the risk of taking steps backwards in education. Option one (provincial model) may be a very drastic change that is not capable of impacting the change that is required. Amalgamating some school divisions based on the recommendations you provide (respecting geographical barriers, existing partnerships, etc.) could be beneficial due to increased efficiencies in administration and our ability to share best practice in teaching with our colleagues. School divisions are not very good about gathering teachers together from neighboring divisions to learn and share what is working to increase student achievement. If we really want to impact learning as outlined in the ESSP we need to reexamine our existing curriculum, the PD we offer teachers to ensure they are proficient in the content and pedagogy and the way we collect data to ensure student learning. I can honestly say that I am very nervous as our province moves forward. Finding cost-savings for the province is important but student learning is critical. The academic success of our students will be what sustains our province well into the future. I hope that the government is willing to consider the feedback provided. Thank you.

Dear Members of the Panel: Fair does not mean equal. Being a teacher, these words were spoken to me years ago by a past director when helping to make a key decision with regards to the child we were discussing. It seems as though those same words are key in this present discussion. **DO NOT FORCE FURTHER AMALGAMATIONS ON SCHOOL DIVISIONS!** With Dan Perrins' report pushing for further amalgamation of school divisions, it seems as if that thought has been lost. How can students be put first when their decisions are being made at provincial level with no regard for local influences, and with the thought that education across the province needs to be equalized? Fair does not mean equal! Students cannot be given "equal" opportunity when you are discussing a student that attends a small rural school versus a large city school. The very nature of the two different opportunities that each child is afforded allows them a fair chance to succeed and do well, but not necessarily a monetary or material equality. **STUDENTS IN RURAL SCHOOLS WILL LOSE** if further amalgamations occur. Teachers will be lost as Teacher/Pupil Ratios are pushed toward "equality". Fair does not mean equal! Just the same as their parents face different advantages or disadvantages based on where they live, so do those students. Certain things may be advantageous in rural settings and others in urban. Why would amalgamating the decision-making centre give those students any greater opportunity? The more we centralize, the more the bureaucracy becomes larger, more distant and less accommodating. This is evident in any large organization and surely this is not what we want for our children. Chinook School Division is already the size of Nova Scotia! Do we really need to increase its boundaries and move the decision makers further away from those they are making decisions for? Costs: Premier Wall is very adamant that any carbon tax put forth by Prime Minister Trudeau has not been calculated and no figures can show its impact. Cannot that same question be asked of Mister Perrins' report? Where are the figures to support any savings that are purported to occur? 28 directors, deputy directors, administrators, and various other administrative personnel will have to be paid very lucrative severances. Vendors that divisions have entered into contracts with will have to be paid out as contracts will be broken - not to mention all the costs with further moving/amalgamating services. Most positions will still be needed, they'll just be re-named, moved, re-"officed" and taxpayers will foot that very expensive bill. Where are the savings to occur? The educational cost from re-structuring will be evident and will hurt students! When directors and administrators must focus on policy and board governance, and not focus on students first, education suffers. Clearly. Ask any of the directors from the last amalgamation process. Students suffer when bureaucrats spend time on bureaucracy! Budget shortfalls should not fall on the backs of our innocent children. A very small tax increase on property taxes would help offset any education shortfall in the budget. Amalgamating school divisions is not in support of better education and rural Saskatchewan will be hardest hit and very hurt by any further amalgamations. Please take into account the needs of rural students when deciding if "equality" in school divisions is what you're looking for! And please consider the destruction of rural Saskatchewan when looking to move administrative centres further and further away from those served. Does it really benefit and will it really save any money or make decisions any easier? Please do not force amalgamation on our students. Further to our initial points, we would also like to add boards must be elected in order to be accountable to those that they serve. Appointed boards will NOT do better for students and education. An appointed board member will by the very nature of being appointed, seek to serve those who put him/her in that position. Can we really rely on people who must first serve themselves in order to maintain their status to make good decisions for children? Elected representation has been at the heart of good education in this province since the very first schools began and elected representatives do well to put students' needs first. They have students' needs at heart and if they do not, their electors make sure they are not re-elected. Can the same be said of an appointed board member? Please consider this when making decisions that will affect our children!

While I agree that financial and operational efficiency is a goal of every household, organization and government, I believe that this report does not effectively explore the impact on human resources (teachers, educational support), nor does it fully account for the effect it will have on our students. Centralization is simply not the answer. It is easier, from a government perspective, to maintain, but it does not allow regions to implement what is best for their students or staff. What works in Saskatoon may not be feasible or pertinent in Chinook. Centralization or standardization in education is not an effective model. No Child Left Behind was a model that simply over-promised and under-delivered in the United States. Closer to home, standardized contracts such as busing have produced higher costs instead of promised efficiencies. Centralizing human resources has failed in institutions such as the University of Saskatchewan. Standardizing or centralizing governance with regards to education (school boards, divisions) will not, in my opinion, allow the community or electorate to be heard and involved. Cost efficiencies can be achieved, but with careful and strategic planning. While this report is well-researched and presented by a highly-respected mind in public policy, it would hold even more weight with me if people involved directly in PreK-12 education were formally and meaningfully involved. I look forward to the opportunity to discuss this report and other topics with the Honourable Minister at the next Saskatoon SCC Assembly. I hope this government will show leadership by placing the best needs of the student and teacher first, and not use cost efficiencies or the deficit as an excuse to cut programs, wages and services. Respectfully submitted,

I feel the education system that is in place now has been working well for students and communities and should remain.

It is time for change. One Division or four divisions provided the ultimate, actual and financial goal is about and for the children. To "Maintain and improve the quality of instruction for all students", to "supports young people in the classroom". It is time to get back to the basics, educate our youth, placing staff and support directly in the schools, working directly with the students. The following is not acceptable, status quo is not working. PISA 2015: Science - Saskatchewan ranked last among the provinces. Reading: Saskatchewan ranked last among the provinces. Math: Saskatchewan ranked last among the provinces. PCAP 2013: Saskatchewan ranked 7th among the provinces in Science and 8th among the provinces in Reading.

To Those Deciding the Future of my Child's Education: While we continue to endure economic challenges with in our province, I'm reminded of our focus on Students First. Our students are our future and one of the most fiscally responsible decisions we can make is to ensure continuing quality of education for our students. We know that early investment in education and healthcare changes the course of our student's lives with long term savings in health care and justice. I want to ensure a education system that puts the needs and learning of all of our children first. I value the diversity of Saskatchewan and respect the local school boards' focus on how to best deliver education in their division. Having lived through 1 amalgamation, our communities are seeing the continuing value of being part of a school division that represents our areas and enables us to respond to the diverse needs of our students. Our taxpayers respect that decisions made by our board consider and reflect the needs of our surrounding communities. We are able to express our thoughts and concerns directly to our school board because they are part of our communities. Having voice in the future matters. It models how our students can make a difference by being active members of our communities. Forcing another change disrupts and potentially removes the community connection. It quiets our voice. It's essential to make decisions in the best interest of our students, not because the numbers say that it's more cost effective. The NDP amalgamation caused disruption for at least 5 years and education spending continues to rise. While we need to be fiscally responsible in tough economic times forced amalgamation removes the community connection. People respect when local representatives make tough decisions because they know they have been heard and that the board members are part of the communities in which they live. We need to model a growth mindset for our children and show how together we can all actively make a difference. Rather than forcing reinvention of the school divisions why not encourage divisions to look within and refine their collaboration with key stakeholders. Why not look to the bright spots and learn from the divisions that are becoming increasingly more efficient and cost effective? Why not ask the employees how they can help collaborate to increase efficiency? As with any parent, I want to know that my daughter's education is a priority and that her needs are met by educators whose focus is her future rather than surviving re-organization. As Malcom Gladwell explains in the Tipping Point, it's the small changes over time that sustains lasting change. Rather than removing the local board's ability to make decisions for their stakeholders, what are the changes that each of us as members of the province of Saskatchewan can make to tip the scales in favor of developing thoughtful, independent and creative learners that will continue to make Saskatchewan a thriving province now and for the generations to come.

Attention: Hon. Don Morgan, Minister of Education; We have read through the Options for Restructuring and do not want to see any changes made to the system. We have children in the North West School Division and are happy the way things are being run at the present.

First let me start by expressing my disbelief in having this 'slipped' through without bringing attention to the matter! If we were not advised by a mail out, likely this would have slipped by and no one would have noticed. We received notification last week and TODAY is the deadline (this is) disrespectful to the people of Saskatchewan. But that seems to be the direction of our government lately. A DIVISION MODEL - B would be my choice but I think there should be more time and consideration given to ensure this is 'Done right the first time'. And I believe the people involved should be the teachers, parents, public - as they are not just about the money. They are about the students. I am extremely disappointed at the behaviors of our leadership lately after being a strong supporter. I realize that times are tough but to cut in the areas of health and education is unacceptable. There are many areas where monies could be saved, starting with the higher paid positions. I believe that some amalgamations is required but to the extent of one school division or health district is ridiculous. And that's coming from a high school diploma person! There are massive differences between urban and rural and there is in no way possible that you can bring consistency to both. There is also the special aspect to consider of our northern communities which are more secluded and again deserve and degree of modification based on their needs. There are many more special needs students where the communities and the school divisions have worked hard to have 'inclusion' for all students in their local schools. Those on local boards are the best to monitor and make recommendations to the needs in these areas. In rural schools there are many subjects that a teacher has to prep for versus a teacher that specializes in one subject. Perhaps a movement of 'specialized' teacher between schools in close proximity would benefit both the students and the teachers. I believe there should be more flexibility to the boundaries as there are some students that are within miles of the boundaries and have other dealings/students in that division and a common sense approach should be taken versus a hard and fast rule. Our university students have lowered their knowledge in the basics and our province is not preparing our students properly for university as disclosed in the statistics that we are 'not giving them good enough'. One large school division is not going to improve that. I am definitely open to hearing of some efficiency in administration but do not believe that a one size fits all for the teacher and students of our province. A DIVISION MODEL - B would be my choice but I think there should be more time and consideration given to ensure this is 'Done right the first time'. Too many times we 'follow' the USA or some other model, so let's make our own. And I believe the people involved should be the teachers, parents, public - as they are not just about the money. They are about the students.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Educational Governance Review Report by Dan Perrins. The Saskatchewan Association of Northern Communities (New North) represents the towns, villages, hamlets and settlements of northern Saskatchewan, the communities that would be impacted by changes to the governance structure of the three northern school divisions. New North supports the position of stakeholders, including the SSBA and the 19 school boards referenced in the report's Letter of Transmittal, that elected boards are the "only effective way to represent the local voice." We come to this position not necessarily as a stakeholder in K-12 education (although many of our members are just that in one way or another), but rather as an organization that has a very clear understanding of the importance of supporting, enhancing and defending, where it is necessary to do so, the value of local governance, to the growth and development of the north as a whole. To our mind, the Perrins Report, in taking a global view of educational governance in the province, has been unable to reflect critically or at any length on how the dismantling of local governance in education might impact some communities and some regions more heavily than others. It is our belief that eroding and weakening the capacity of northerners to respond to their own challenges not only runs counter to government's own position that northerners need to find their own solutions to their own problems, but also weakens the capacity of institutions to respond effectively to crises, such as those we have witnessed in the last year or so. Our further position is that the three school divisions in the north should not be looked at as ripe for amalgamation, but as the basis for an expansion and an enhancement of local school governance even further, based on the success of Ile a la Crosse and the Creighton school divisions in delivering responsive, efficient and effective educational programs in those communities New North is very concerned about the implications of some of the options presented in the Perrins Report. We are particularly concerned about 40 years of progress in the development of northern governance of northern institutions being wound back. Once gone, it is difficult to get back again. We strongly urge government to consider the scope of what they are proposing, and the damage it could do to advancing northern development.

To Whom it may concern, We want and need to preserve Catholic Education in our province as our constitutional right as Catholics and as parents who choose Catholic education for our children. We as parents, are the primary educators of our children and the right to choose belongs to us. There is a need for faith based education, as society benefits from it and is more prosperous because of it. The schools have the enrollment they do because people chose it. Religious persecution is at the heart of this "discussion", not money.

I would like to thank the Ministry of Education for taking the time to do a governance review. Dan Perrins' had the unpopular task of presenting options for change to governance in the education sector. Thank you to him and to the members of the consultation panel, who have taken the time to listen to the concerns of people in the province. The timelines have been short for consultation, but sometimes the short timelines cause people to focus and really share their concerns and opinions. Most importantly, I would like to thank the Ministry and Government for recognizing the importance and value of Catholic Education in Saskatchewan. As a parent, trustee and former teacher, I have a few opinions on education. Education is always changing. It has to change as society changes. 10 years ago, when school divisions amalgamated, there was a lot of unrest in the sector. Making significant changes to school divisions does not come easy, and may cause more harm than good. Today the government faces the daunting task of finding efficiencies in every sector. Unfortunately, when the economy is good, we tend to overlook our shortfalls. As soon as we are hit with a huge deficit, we need to take a hard look at what we are doing and make changes. Education in Saskatchewan has been good, but it could be great. Throwing money at a problem doesn't fix it. Using what we have and rethinking what we do and how we function, will. Change does not have to be negative or scary, when it is done for the right reasons and improvements are made. When the change is disruptive and has negative effects, it is not good for anyone. Forced amalgamations and appointed trustees, is not, in my opinion, a good change. There are changes we can make, that will not have negative impacts, but can trigger improvements in achievement and efficiencies. Why does Alberta do so well on PISA and Saskatchewan does so poorly? Is it because we don't teach the right things? Or is it that we don't do anything to really improve our scores? Alberta has provincial exams, Saskatchewan does not. When used appropriately, these are amazing tools for improving results. They should not be used to judge staff, but to find deficiencies in programming and make changes for improved student learning. The Ministry of Education has the power to make the changes it needs to ensure that improvements occur in student achievement. Divisions have worked together to form the ESSP. This is a huge step forward for the province. We all have the same focus and goals. The problem is that no real measure of accountability exists. The Ministry can develop that. Several years ago, Lloydminster Catholic School Division decided to make changes. We were not getting the results we wanted. Through budgeting and programming, we were able to focus on early childhood learning and develop common assessments in the division. It has taken some time, but we have seen huge advancements in our achievement results and graduation rates for all of our students. Rethinking how we approach learning has given us the opportunity to focus on our goals and not get bogged down with distractions. I believe the Government of Saskatchewan has an opportunity to make valuable changes in the education sector that will take us from good to great without disrupting the good work that is being done around the province. Saskatchewan is diverse. Every part of the province has different needs. I'm not sure that someone making decisions in Regina can really understand the needs of students in northern communities unless they have experienced that culture. I know that people making decisions in Regina and Edmonton do not understand the uniqueness of living in Lloydminster and often forget that one size does not work for us. That has been demonstrated many times by all Ministries in government. Local voice is very important to ensuring the right needs are being met. I look forward to continuing the positive relationship that has developed between the Ministry of Education and Catholic Schools in Saskatchewan. My hope is that we will look towards the future for opportunities to advance our province's success in education without disruption and chaos. Thank you for allowing the public to voice their concerns and opinions of the review.

I strongly feel the current education system is adequate with locally elected boards of education that are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. Local elected boards are the community voice and also important advocates for ensuring excellence in learning that serve the needs of all students which are unique to each school division. There are many principles embedded in the first two options of the Perrins report that may have serious implications to education and the cost of funding education in our province. I support the governance structure of today with minor amalgamations and or realignment of boundaries that can make sense if and only if done with purpose and principles in educating students in Saskatchewan.

I support cost saving systems, strengthening the educational outcomes and standardizing boards, however the wide sweeping changes proposed are unacceptable. Further amalgamation is not in the best interest of RURAL students. I suggest centralization of procurement and payroll to reduce costs. We need locally elected boards, they are our local voice. What happens to communities that lose schools? They die, they cannot attract families. Bus ride times are a concern; kids should not ride buses for extended periods of times. Sign your name and address. THANK YOU MOMS!

I like option 2. I work in Health care and I am interested to see how the one Health authority will work; however in the school system I worry that there will be a lack of representation if we go a similar route. Option 2 reduces the number or divisions but keeps the representation of the rural aboriginal communities. Too many city bureaucrats can make a widely populated, rural province feel unheard and unimportant.

To Whom It May Concern: I am writing today in response to the K-12 Educational Governance Review.

I have a deep concern regarding the future of my children's education if changes happen within our province as they have been proposed by the Educational Governance Review. I am concerned that all four options given for consideration are all completely opposite of what the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, Service Employees International Union, Saskatchewan School Boards Association, SSBA Public and Catholic sections and Saskatchewan Association of School Business officials, as well as a parent group, the opposition education critic and members of the general public unanimously stated. They have given unanimous support for elected boards and for no more amalgamation. These associations are made up of the people that work hands on with our children and I am concerned that their voice has not been heard. I have witnessed the impact on the previous amalgamation, and feel that it opened gaps in services and support for our children. I have also witnessed the impact that the change in funding from locally determined mill rates, to provincially determined mill rates have affected the schools in our area. I am concerned about when these changes would be occurring and how quickly. Planning has already started for the coming school year. When does the government plan on making these changes? What will happen to the plans and resources already in place? Discarding these plans would be a waste of time and money, which could both be put toward our children. If the goal is to create efficiency, how long will it take to make all these changes to a point where tangible efficiency has been created? Change causes disruption which will inevitably slow down progress towards educational goals that teachers are working towards within the classroom. I am also concerned with this government's focus on standardization. I am also very concerned about accountability. There are essentially two levels of accountability with having a locally elected school board; the elected trustee is accountable to the community which placed their support behind them, and then together as a school board, the school board is accountable to the provincial government. If the province changes to a single education system where leadership is appointed by the provincial government, one level of accountability is removed. I am concerned that I might no longer be able to choose who represents my voice in public education. By the removal of publicly elected school boards, you are removing the democratic process from education and my right to vote for who I place my trust in to run my children's school division. Education is public, not a provincial entity. Elected school boards can be specific to our needs and can focus on the area in which they serve. So if the province changes to a single board, or amalgamates to a smaller number of boards, whom will I contact when there is a problem or concern within my school? One of the "benefits" of the Regional Model listed was "retains local accountability". How can a quarter of the province be considered "local"? How can a board represent the best interests of such a large region? There are currently 61 provincial ridings in Saskatchewan to represent the people of our province. What if we were to pare that down to 4 MLA's? How effectively could those 4 represent their constituencies? I'm also concerned that not a lot of consideration and planning has gone into any of these proposed changes. Language such as "Implement an entity to drive sector-wide operational efficiencies" has me wondering what "an entity" might mean. Thank you for your time and consideration in reading my concerns.

Hello Lisa (Lambert): I just don't understand how eliminating elected boards of education, and replacing them with government appointed boards even makes sense; "if it isn't broken, why fix it"? If locally elected boards are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account; why dismantle that? Surely not for the benefit of our Greater Saskatoon Catholic Schools! With all of your knowledge and experience, would you please explain this "transformational change" and how it fits into our democracy?

The Saskatchewan High Schools Athletic Association exists to foster positive opportunities for students through interschool athletics. The SHSAA believes that student participation in school sport contributes to the overall educational experience of students in our province. The framework that delivers educational athletics in Saskatchewan is unique and different than other sporting opportunities in Saskatchewan. The programs of the SHSAA are administrated by educators, delivered by a volunteer base second to none, and supported by the Members (boards of education) within our province. The objectives of the SHSAA are many including the promotion of multi-sport participation, the development of citizenship skills, and the encouragement of healthy lifestyles. Changes in educational governance will impact the SHSAA and the delivery of educational athletics in Saskatchewan. Everything from the constitution and bylaws of the Association, the planning of playoffs leading to provincial championships, and maintaining affordable access to school sport will have to be considered by the SHSAA following any changes to the structure of how education is organized in Saskatchewan. Our hope is that any changes that are made will consider the important role that educational athletics plays in developing and educating the students of Saskatchewan as well as the important role that school sport plays in the culture of schools in the province.

I am with Regina Public Schools, an employee for the last 25 years here in Regina. I am very thankful for my union and our collective agreement. I am very concerned about the recommendations/options that have been put together and such a rushed fashion. I don't see how these options and I quote..." Will focus on student success while ensuring accountability and efficient operational structures within the education system". The government gave Dan Perrins three weeks to study the amalgamations/restructuring and write his report. Why did Mr. Perrins recommend reduced school divisions and appointed trustees? There has been no meaningful public consultation, and a change of this scale has the potential for many errors. Why is the government rushing this? There's no evidence or report that states amalgamated/re-structured school boards and government appointed trustee's and CEO, will save money. It will only guarantee that the parents, workers and communities have no voice. Please stop this! The public feedback supports our existing school division boundaries and keeping our democratic process of elected school boards. Why would the government want to change this? Why was this not brought up during the elections? I love my job working with students and they are my priority every day when I go to work. Why did the report not reference how this change will impact the students and their learning? Students are not a priority in this report! This is a business model, with government appointed school boards, communication and feedback to and from parents/communities will be negatively impacted. I love my democratic right to elect a school board trustee who will be accountable and represent my community. Elected school board trustees have a vested interest in my community, not the government's mandate. How fast can major decisions, such as school safety issues, be made if there's no local contact or voice? I am asking that you hear the deep concern in our public voices. Local democratically elected school boards are the best choice for my community. Local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities.

I believe that a further amalgamation would not be in the best interest of our community; or in the best interest of our students. Legislation protecting the Rural School Threshold should not be removed. Our growing community cannot nor should not lose their school. I do support cost saving but DO NOT support the wide changes that are proposed in the review report. I know I have already submitted some comments regarding this matter but after giving it more thought I am quite upset with a possibility of our school, South Shore Elementary School, closing. Rural communities revolve and grow around their schools. With no school here young families will look elsewhere. When families choose to reside in rural areas it is to be part of a smaller school rather than be in a larger school in the city, in an overcrowded classroom. Our children, families, businesses

the community we live in, will all be greatly impacted. My other concern is that the school nearby, Lumsden Elementary school, is already at their capacity. That means that our children will be bused to Regina? I become concerned then for the safety, distance and the time that the children of our community will spend in buses. I am sure there are other ways cutbacks can be made and money saved other than the closure of our small rural community schools. And it is important that WE continue to have a voice for our school and our community.

I am a mother of two in the Catholic School system. I see the changes affecting public school board will affect the Catholic school system either directly and immediate or indirectly and eventual. I have first hand experience of how beneficial it is to have a school board close the community it affects. My child needed specialized resources and services. I strongly believe the much need support and services was due to locally elected board that ensured my area and therefore my child received help in a timely manner. I feel in the new system my child would have been a small fish in a big pond and resources and help would be inaccessible or delayed. Thank you for reconsidering the decision to remove the decision making power from the local representatives who know their community and area best.

Please keep the Regina School District AS IS. Too much change will be hard on the boards (involved), teachers, and staffs of each and every school. I've been an employee of this board for 40 years and it's continuing support system that is in place right now should not be interrupted. In fact, more help is needed for all the teachers and staff in our schools!! Thank you.

Money would be more wisely spent on teachers and EAs than top heavy administration. Subject leaders would be a huge benefit to collaboration between schools. School boards have little impact and if money would be saved using representatives instead of separate boards maybe that is a source for the already lack of funding.

I'm very concerned that we don't know what to expect from these changes. I'm not against change where needed, but to have no indication of what these changes will mean is unnerving. I would like to see some conversation on centralization first of some services. And if combining some smaller school divisions needs to happen, I'd rather see some rural divisions be combined and kept separate from the urban divisions as our needs greatly differ.

I will be brief in my comments as our board view will cover many of the details that I do not address here. The whole process as it has unfolded is of concern to me as a democratically elected board member, elected to represent my community almost continuously since 1991. I have 'lived' through 2 amalgamations since 1991, the first one was voluntary, the second one was mandated but coincidentally expanded the school division to exactly the same boundaries as we had already explored. The second one would have gone ahead earlier if funding was provided to cover major facility deficiencies in the 'new territory'; funding which was provided at the time of the second amalgamation. Our boards were right at both times and the resulting efficiencies were redirected to benefit students through smaller class sizes, enhanced support services and limited increases to materials budgets. When the government took over setting of the mill rate, it was pretty much no change from where we were at setting it ourselves. The result was that we did not require a lot of transition funding when the FOG was being retooled. What I learned from this whole experience was that the right change at the right time for the right reasons could be beneficial, and that it took 2 rounds of change to get to the right size with a high level of efficiency. We are now experiencing enrolment growth and student achievement which is above the provincial average for all students. We have initiated a number of innovative programs and have more planned. It has been through the local voice of trustees dedicated to the best outcomes for our students that we have been able to put plans in place; developed with administration that we have chosen who understand our student needs, to support local learning. We have been presented with options put forward by one individual contracted by the government to fix an as yet undefined problem, possibly to fix a shortfall in government revenues. I feel it would be more prudent to consider a more complete review of educational outcomes and operational finances prior to making changes which even our MLA's do not seem to understand the necessity of. Please do the research first and let us as boards know what is 'broken' and give us an opportunity to work with all parties to fix any problems. I am very concerned that any changes to governance structure and division operation which directly impact what we do in our schools on a daily basis will do serious harm to the progress and potential success of the ESSP which is the best example of transformational change I have seen in all my years as a trustee. Note as well that I have not suggested that board expense as it currently is should be considered sacred; I have long believed that is one area that should be more closely examined and possibly capped. Not all boards necessarily live within their means, and not all actions reflect commitment to long term beneficial things such as the ESSP. We may be on the verge of throwing the baby out with the bathwater! Our province is growing, in fact we have recently added 3 MLA's, following a reduction in the number of board representatives with the last amalgamation - perhaps it is time for those MLA's to represent us by working with the existing school divisions, public and separate, to fine tune what we have and preserve the good things which have been done over more than 100 years. KEEP THE PUBLIC IN PUBLIC EDUCATION.

I firmly believe that school board trustees should be elected. Elected trustees have the confidence of those who elected them. They govern themselves by what is in the best interests of the students and parents they serve. Appointed board members would necessarily act in the interests of those who appointed them. Education and democracy go hand in hand. Democracy does come at a cost, but the cost of having elected trustees is a minute part of the cost of education in Saskatchewan. School Community Councils (SCC's) are not the solution for obtaining the voice of parents and the community. Their focus is on their school. There are many incredible people serving on SCC's, but they are volunteers and cannot be expected to take on an enhanced role. Many do not want any more responsibility. It should not be surprising that boards agree with most recommendations from management. For boards who follow a policy governance model their most important job is to select a competent Director of Education who is prepared to translate their direction into action. Elected trustees come with diverse backgrounds and different competencies. It is that very diversity which makes them representative of their communities. MP's, MLA's, Mayors, Reeves and councillors are not required to have specific skills and competencies, nor do they have mandatory training. It seems to me that such requirements would be considered elitist. Still, I believe that governance training which is cost effective would be welcomed by trustees. There is always room for improvement in education, but moving from elected trustees to appointed boards is not an improvement. Unfortunately, trustees and boards have been so distracted by the challenge to their existence that they haven't been able to focus on real improvement.

As a Saskatchewan Tax Payer I would like to submit my opinion that it would be a disservice to the children of this province to go to an appointed school board and that it would hurt rural communities to further expand the boundaries of the school boards. I believe the goal of the proposed changes is to eventually privatize our school systems which will only further limit the children of this province. School boards require local representation to have their voices heard and their differing needs met. There is already a lack of appropriate funding going to the schools in this province and taking away their voices is not going to help it will only hurt. Democratically elected board members represent the people, appointed board members represent the wills of a political party.

I am a substitute teacher with the _____ School Division, a former permanent FTE contract teacher with the division and I have 3 children who will be schooled in the division for the next 17 years, so I feel that I have a great deal at stake regarding the so-called transformational changes coming to education. Some of the concerns that I have include: 1. I have not seen what the savings are or how they will be made from any of the options. 2. While I hope that my children do not require educational assistants, SLPs, ed psychs, etc, it is not out of the question and I feel that these supports will be more difficult to come by if the divisions are made to increase in size. 3. On the subject of EAs, extreme budget cuts that are being made are cutting these jobs, and if even my own children don't require these supports, their teachers and other students in their classes likely will in order to provide the best learning environments for ALL students. 4. All students and all families deserve to have a local voice, and I'm afraid this will be lost if the divisions grow significantly. 5. I realize that there are savings to be made in any organization, but what I see is a lot of waste in the "executive branch". There are initiatives being pushed on to school divisions and teachers which cost huge amounts of money with very little evidence of benefit to students in the end. There are definitely other savings that could be found in the division offices, but the people who make the choices as to where the money goes, tend to dislike losing luxuries they've become accustomed to having. And it's fine to talk about trimming the fat, but the fat always floats to the top. 6. I really want this reform to be about what is best for the children, rather than the government's pocketbook. The children are our future and if they don't have a solid education, I'm afraid our province won't like what happens.

To whom it may concern: As a rural area Saskatchewan resident I have had the most amazing educational experiences. I grew up on a farm nine miles from my small town school. At that time it was a K-9 school. We had split grades for the most part and every teacher knew us, personally. They connected with every single one of us as students and took pride in knowing what our needs were and how to help us on an individual basis. They knew our parents and they were part of our community. They came to watch us play ball games, participate in sport's days, curl and play hockey. As they released us to go to a larger High School they begged us to return and stay in touch, and we did! 21 years later I had the privilege of returning to the same Elementary school, now K-8, as a teacher and 3 years ago I came full circle as I became the Administrator of that small town school of which I was nurtured in the 70's and 80's! What an honor to return to where it all started! To teach children that I could understand and come to know so well because I knew so many of their parents from our days in class together! Our little school has seen some ups and downs over the last 40 years but it has been the base of our community. It has held things together when times were tough and it has brought joy and laughter to everyone in the community when things were good. Now as we reflect on the ideas put forth in Mr. Perrin's report, all we can see is the demise of small town schools, including ours, and the death of small towns throughout the province! Our children are as important as private school and the separate system attendees, yet those children have nothing to fear! Our students are as important as large city center students, yet again, these children will not be worrying come the fall about where they will attend school! Our children are bussed from various corners of our attendance area already, what will happen when boundaries are changed or schools amalgamate? An hour on a bus for a Kindergarten child, and expect them to function till 3:30? Teachers, in many rural areas, have made those communities their homes. They are raising families there. Their spouses are working in the area! How can we uproot them without destroying the very fabric of what Saskatchewan is built upon? It was the farmers and the small town folks who put this very government in to power! Will they feel the same urge to vote for the Sask Party when they are forced to become urbanites, or worse will they have a chance to vote if they have been forced to move their families to another part of the country where the grass may appear greener? I pray that the powers that be will look closely and consider carefully what amalgamation will mean to our system. We cannot follow the Health Region leads on this. What our students NEED here in our building, today, is not at all what another student in Prince Albert, or Redvers may need! Our School division motto is - Every Child by Name and by Need! We have that here!! We know our kids! We know their needs, just like my own teachers did in this same building so many years ago! PLEASE do not take this away from us! Invest in education instead of destroying it! Invest in the future of our province! Find other ways to cut your budgets but not at the expense of our future leaders of this haven we are so blessed to be a part of. Saskatchewan needs the strong, yet compassionate voices, of the Sask Party that we elected in to power now more than ever! Follow the advice of all 32 entities that Mr. Perrin had conversations with - DO NOT AMALGAMATE anymore!!! Thank you in advance for considering the submissions you receive from the Saskatchewan residents!

Keep our school boards locally elected. Keep decisions closer to our communities.

Hello, There may be small efficiencies found in amalgamating some divisions. However, I believe that there are significant differences between the "big urban" divisions and the "smaller rural" divisions. A model that compares apples to oranges wouldn't be the best model to address the diverse needs of all Saskatchewan students and their communities.

The thought of having 1-4 school divisions is ridiculous. I understand that some changes are needed but let's not get out of hand. Please reconsider. Each local board/ town needs a voice in education. I have taught in rural and urban settings. Both have their unique characteristics, needs and wants. Taking that away would be a crime. What are we coming to in Saskatchewan? I have a lot of anxiety when I say that question out loud. It is time to ensure that our education system is given what they need ... including appropriate funding so we can do our job. Since when do we not get to have a voice in any of the changes that are happening. Seriously. I almost cry every time I remember that I voted for you Mr. Brad Wall, and your little clan. That will never happen again! As a concerned citizen, I would also love to see a summarized report, similar to the report shared on education, on our provincial government. As I want to know where all of our hard earned money is going? Can you make cuts to your system to save a few dollars? We both know the answer to that. Widen our division boundaries a bit, if that makes you sleep at night. Don't be ridiculous though.

The administration of school divisions is, on my opinion, top heavy in many ways. We have 100k/yr. salaries for transportation managers (as was advertised on Saskjobs several months ago in our division), so I can only imagine what other managerial staff are being paid. This money should be spent on school infrastructure, teachers and staff and programs for students. I agree that reform is needed, but the reform cannot come at the cost of losing local support and local input and most certainly must not come at the cost of the already over-stretched school staff and underserved students. If division managerial salaries were trimmed and redundant managerial positions eliminated, rather than sweeping division restructuring or amalgamation, I feel like that would be a large step in the right direction. As a parent of four school aged children, I do not want to see our school fall into an even larger division as the one we are in already feels too large in many ways. I do want to see more support for the boots on the ground, the teachers and support staff, and the students and I fear that amalgamation will only make things more difficult for these people even though they are the ones that should always be the main concern and focus, but it seems they are always the most overlooked.

Here are a few personal comments regarding your K-12 Review and Consultations. Thank you for the opportunity. 1) Education is the cornerstone of Society. Tinker, don't tank the system. Cut the fat, keep the fit. 2) School Division Boundaries: Maintain the same, or closely resemble, the number of School Divisions in the province. If it ain't broke, don't fix it! Adjust boundaries only where necessary; place more emphasis on the Regional aspect of Boards. Fewer sub-division boundaries, thus fewer members elected; also consider at-large voting or combination of status quo, within subdivision, or entire division. Draw sub-division boundaries according to school attendance areas (school groupings) rather than artificial lines on a map. 3) School Board Members: Compulsory Governance Education for all elected board members, (Certification) before occupying seat. Rationalize (standardize) trustee compensation (financial and otherwise) across the province to ensure equity and fairness. SSBA can do this. Or an independent body. 4) School Community Councils: consider S.C.C.'s as 'advisors only' to schools and regional board. Another level of bureaucratic 'authority' is not needed in the system. Parents presently enjoy tremendous, meaningful influence and power through their children, teachers, principals, administration, S.C.C. and Board. Think of the S.C.C. group as 'Friends of the School'. 5) Teachers: Rationalize (standardize) teacher compensation (financial and otherwise). Increase, the dollars, not decrease. Maintain strong front-line personnel; classrooms are already heavily loaded in most schools...to the detriment of students, teachers and families. Eliminate the teachers' 'locally negotiated contracts' which is the cause of much financial disparity in the province. Find a new way to do business. Maintain and respect teachers' professional integrity, accountability, responsibility and freedom. Do not insult professional teachers by counting 'minutes worked'. Use more carrot, less stick. Rely on professional integrity. 6) Find efficiencies in School Division 'back office' operations, coordinated purchasing efficiencies, IT, etc. 7) The most important measure of a caring, progressive society is how it values, respects, and cares for its children; the elderly, the sick, the disabled, and the poor.

While being a concerned parent of a child in the Prairie Valley School Division, my hope is that the discussion around the Educational Governance Review will not result in a compromised delivery of education and support for all children and youth across Saskatchewan. In looking at the proposed changes presented by the Perrins report the only option of the three mentioned that looks like it would have the most minimal impact on the current delivery of education is option three, a Divisional Model. Continuing with a Division model would give the best voice to rural schools even if the current number of divisions were reduced from 18 to between 8-14. Having a Provincial Model or a Regional Model would severely reduce the number of services that are currently offered through Prairie Valley and other school divisions. I do realize the provincial governments need to cut costs, but the result of reorganizing the education system in this manner could cost the students, staff, and teachers more in the quality of the education given, than it saves the provincial government in their budget.

I am opposed to amalgamation of the school divisions. Please keep our boards local with locally elected representation

As a teacher in Saskatchewan change seems to be the one constant in education. But change needs to have a purpose besides putting a dollar figure on it. Will change improve the teaching / learning environment and relationship? It has taken a lot of time and effort since the last round of amalgamation to establish new important relationships with other schools and teachers which benefit our students. Since the basic premise of the education system is the teaching and learning relationship then everything in the system should exist to support this relationship and the instructional process. Will further amalgamation achieve this? Are any of the proposed changes enhancing the professional status and responsibilities of teachers? Do the proposed changes enhance school centred planning? Will the proposed changes respect and honour all existing contracts both provincially and locally negotiated? I am concerned that many of the answers to these questions are yet to be determined and this is too big of a process(that is moving very fast) to believe that the answers can simply be worked out afterwards! That is not how to create efficiency within a system. Extensive consultation with teachers and I mean many teachers must take place so that our views, knowledge and experience are incorporated into any decisions regarding the educating of the students of Saskatchewan.

As a Speech-Language Pathologist I work at several different schools and I fear that creating bigger school divisions would mean that I would have to travel farther from where I live to get to work. I also worry that a bigger school division would make it less cost effective in terms of sharing resources with other therapists. Right now I share assessment tools, hearing screening devices and therapy resources with other Speech-Language Pathologists and I fear that a bigger school division would mean that sharing these resources would be less realistic. I also worry about the impact on students- knowing that there are so many students who have special needs and need individualized plans to function to the best of their abilities, I worry that sweeping policies in a bigger division would be dangerous and detrimental to students. I also know that there are so many communities with different needs, and knowing the history and families and realities of a community is very important; I worry that bigger school divisions, would make it harder to know the communities and would have a tendency to make sweeping policies that would not be best for all our unique communities in the province.

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report I am offering the following feedback: - I do not support any of the three models presented in the report and we wish to remain a part of the Prairie Valley School Division. - Currently, under the direction of the Prairie Valley School Division, we celebrate some of the highest performance scores in Reading and Math as well as extraordinary High School graduation rates. What guarantee is there that these standards of excellence will be maintained through provincial amalgamations? * Further amalgamation is not in the best interest of our rural students and communities. Instead of amalgamating schools centralization of procurement and payroll would help reduce administration costs. * Locally elected boards matter, they are our local voice if any change is made it should be standardizing the expectations of our Boards * In all of these options educational legislation will be changed and the legislation protecting Rural School Threshold may be removed. This legislation protects small schools from closure. What happens to communities if they loose their school? * If schools are amalgamated who will determine what the appropriate ride times are for our children? We fully support finding cost saving systems, strengthening our educational outcomes and standardizing expectations of our Boards, but we cannot support wide sweeping changes as proposed in the Educational Governance Review Report. - Rural communities thrive, grow and revolve around their schools. Closing schools will 'close' small town Saskatchewan.

Our children are very happy with their school and teachers and are currently doing well in the Saskatchewan primary educational system. The school's integration within the neighbourhood is quite strong and an asset to the community. We welcome the discussion looking at the possible alignment of scheduling and planning within Saskatchewan. This would not only allow for standardization and consistency within the province but provide a chance to instead focus energies on the quality of education. From our families perspective we have been frustrated with some of the local scheduling decisions including the reduction of the lunch "hour" and the further addition of added time to the school day. With some re-alignment, we are optimistic that some of the local challenges related to the high school learning environment, largely imposed due to student distribution problems, may be addressed. Our hope in discussing available options is that we continue to strive to provide our children with a first-rate education.

I am unsure what the real benefits or drawbacks of further amalgamation will be. More information is needed before final decisions are made. A few questions that I feel need to be addressed are: 1. Did the last set of amalgamations save money? If so, how much? And also where were the savings made? 2. What benefit to students and their communities do further amalgamations bring? 3. Student services are already stretched to the limit in our divisions. What kind of impacts will a larger school division have on those workers? I hope that however things progress, students are put first. Thanks

I firmly believe that a further amalgamation wouldn't be in the best interest of our students nor of our community. Also legislation protecting the Rural School Threshold should not be removed either. Our growing community SHOULD NOT lose their school . I have two small children, one who will be starting school in the fall. I grew up here and attended South Shore Elementary school and chose to move back here because of the school. I know of other young families whose parents grew up here and returned with their young children to give them the opportunities of attending a school like South Shore Elementary too. I do support cost saving but DO NOT support the wide changes that are proposed in the review report.

I am very strongly opposed to any proposal that suggests it is necessary to make substantive changes to the governance structures of Saskatchewan school divisions. The last attempt did not create any lasting solutions to the the challenges faced by Sask students and certainly created a period of unnecessary uncertainty as well as a permanent reduction in local input and control. I will do what i can to oppose any changes that lessen the role that local communities play in education and which further remove financial accountability from local hands. Why would this government considering rehashing old NDP solutions to our challenges when the people of Saskatchewan have already rejected them?

have followed the Transformational Change message and the Education Governance Review process and am pleased for the opportunity to provide my personal feedback. Having worked through a voluntary amalgamation in 2003/2004 of the Melfort and Tiger Lily school divisions and then the Government sanctioned amalgamations of 2006 I identify closely with a lot of the challenges outlined in Dan Perrins report (for the Options 1 & 2 in particular). Although the goal is to create a system that has long term financial benefits for the entire education system there is no savings in the short term! And there would definitely be a loss of local input and accountability. In 2006 I believe the review and the goal was likely similar in focus. It would be interesting to see the value of any governance or administration savings that occurred province wide and how long it took to get to that point. There should also be some projected savings outlined for any option that is recommended to the Ministry by the panel. I do agree with the items listed in the North East School Division's response to the report. In particular items: 4) Past experience would indicate the impact on schools and front-line services should not be underestimated when governance and management changes occur; 5) The amalgamation of 2006 provided the North East School Division the opportunity to achieve greater capacity and specialized services to students and school communities. This level of service is sustainable. It took a lot of time to get to the point that all students were receiving the best practices and services of the larger divisions after the 2006 amalgamation and I believe the recent work towards the goals Education Sector Strategic Plan can be achieved with local boards as they currently stand. I also can agree that the Shifts in Governance points made on Page 20 of the Perrins report. Focusing on these items with Board levels as they exist will still enhance effectiveness, efficiency and accountability while maintaining local participation and input. One Government decision that I do not agree with (although it is pretty clear it is for political reasons) is holding back on amalgamations in Municipal Governance. The tax collection process is very inefficient with duplication of work at the Municipal, School Board and Ministry level. And although it is identified on the Heat Map on Page 14 of the report I personally do not believe a fully effective and efficient solution can be implemented until the administration and governance of Villages, Hamlets, RM's etc can be consolidated. One of the reasons that Health and Education sectors went through amalgamations was so that all residents have access to equitable services. That should also apply to municipal services. Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback. Best wishes for positive outcomes for all!

I believe School Boards need to remain local as each school board represents a unique demographic. They know their communities and the needs and strengths that exist there. Strong local school boards are willing to volunteer their time resources and talents to better the schools they represent. Saskatchewan is a diverse place filled with Urban, Rural, First Nations and other demographics. I believe that in order to best serve the people of this province as we educate and develop the children of our future we need to keep school boards where they are. I hope that the children who are our future continue to receive the best education and supports we can offer. We need to maintain strong communities who work together for the betterment of our province. School boards are one way that we engage members of our communities to get involved. As people in this province lets take a stand for our children and for strong communities!

No to amalgamation! Too many issues that are specific to each school and their needs Differences between city schools and rural schools No way is a government appointed official or board member going to know the needs of a certain school. No way to manage properly without everyone being lumped together, which will NEVER work

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposals for amalgamation that was sent out through our School Division Board. I would first like to address the insufficient time frame we were given to reply to these proposals. Two working days is not enough time for a Board of Directors or SCC members to properly disperse information to our communities and give them the tools to make an informed decision on one or none of the proposals outlined. As for the public receiving any additional information from our School Board Representatives, they did not have any other additional information than what the proposals outlined....how do we attempt to make an informed decision when we were not given any details to the proposals I believe that an Education System needs to work as a team, I also believe that communication is essential to all success. We as a school division are currently working well together with schedules that are overwhelming, so to amalgamate even further would add more stress to the involved parties and less communication with the people that matter the most, the people that are hands on in our schools and school programs. This is a crucial, the best education to our children and their learning environment should be our main focus. There are many factors that contribute to a successful education program and your support to continue to move forward, sustain and grow in our education is what we need. Our team approach and open communication with other schools, SCC members, teachers, Division Board members has provided more ideas abroad, solutions to problems, support systems to one another that are proactive and proven viable. In my opinion we have obtained great building blocks in our school division that supports open communication, problem solving , idea sharing, team environments on all levels of the structure system. Bigger and better, follow the leader, keeping up with the jones is not what we need as a province, we need what works best for us, our rural communities as a whole or individually, and/or possibly be leading in the industry. We do not all walk the same, speak the same , think the same, feel the same or look the same, so our strongest link is our individuality that is specific to each area that has local representation, knowing first hand the needs, requirements and priorities to our children's education. Changes are required if we are not doing what is in the best interest of our child's education, but we feel we are and our process is working. These amalgamation proposals indicate to me that there is failure in our system without any explanation. I am an open minded person if there is factual, statistical information that proves that any of the proposed amalgamations would be more effective than what we have right now, but to date I am not convinced nor have I seen any additional information.

SCC Chair

After reviewing the ESSP, I feel that it is my duty as a grandparent, parent & a community citizen that I show that I have a voice in the education of the children/students in our community. Of course we always want to support that maintaining & improving the quality of instruction for all students is in the fore front when thinking of change! We know Saskatchewan is growing, so of course the Plan for Growth is inevitable and the Education Sector of Strategic Plan (ESSP) is needed to start to plan and take a look at the whole picture. But there again, I hope that thinking of the students is the most important aspect of the ESSP, not just the almighty dollar. Having lived in this community for over thirty years, I have worked at Pense School, I have watched many children attend Pense School, go on to attend high schools in Regina & Lumsden, and have turned out to be valued citizens as they have grown into great adults with good values and a sense of community. Many of them had left and have now returned to make their homes here and raise their families where they have been raised. I believe that is a testament of the rural school and community support that they have received growing up. That is the reason so many people move out of the city to rural communities, so that their children have smaller classrooms, more "one on one" help from teachers, and get many chances to play sports, that maybe they wouldn't get in the city because they weren't skilled enough to make it through "try-outs". This teaches them many skills that will last a lifetime. I hope some of these comments will be taken into consideration when moving forward with the ESSP. I do feel that we as a community do need to have a voice for our school & our community. It affects all of us in the schools and in the community where so many things will not be ours if that is taken away with having appointed Board of Education members that do not come from the community. We are also in need of a permanent high school plan, including transportation, looking at the best interests of our students, their families and our community. We know there will have to be change, but please let us, as members of the community, have a say in how some of these changes will affect, not only the students, but the families, local businesses, so many of our volunteer groups that are in our community, the facilities that we take great pride in, as we evolve as a place to grow, and raise great students who enjoy the community that we live in.

I have recently just moved to the community of _____, in which I have two boys in elementary school and one boy that is in high school and is attending _____. The smaller communities work together as a family to support our schools and programs and I would like to see our voices still being heard in keeping our system separate from the regina office or province wide, I would like to recommend we stay how things are for the benefit of our children growing up in the communities that we live in, I feel this is best for there futures.

The purpose of this letter is to support the North East School Division's (NESD) response to the Educational Governance Review Report. Cumberland College has a strong partnership with NESD and we are currently working closely with the Division to develop further pathways to post-secondary for their students. Cumberland College works in partnership with NESD in a number of significant ways. For example, we are currently working with the Melfort High School (MUCC) to put in place a dual-credit Continuing Care Assistant (CCA) program for next September. Such a dual-credit program will allow high school students to both complete their Grade 12 requirements and receive a CCA Certificate (through Sask Polytechnic) to be work-ready to enter the health care field as a Continuing Care Assistant and will serve as a pilot project for dual-credit initiatives in the province. Kelsey Trail Health Region is very excited and supportive of this initiative to connect current high school students with KTHR employment needs. Cumberland College also works in partnership with NESD to provide a four-year B.Ed. program in Nipawin. This program is undertaken in partnership with the University of Regina and is now in its fourth and final year. Students will graduate this April and will have opportunities for employment within NESD (the program was put in place in response to NESD desires to "grow local teachers for local positions"). Cumberland College will start a second cohort of B.Ed. students this September. Cumberland College is offering a Master in Education (M.Ed.) program for local teachers who may wish to move into administrative educational leadership positions. This program will be done through the University of Regina and will offer local teachers access to a graduate program they would not otherwise be able to attend. NESD is supportive of this M.Ed. program and is encouraging their staff to apply. As a result of our strong partnership with NESD, Cumberland College supports the points made by NESD in their response document to the Educational Governance Review Report. We greatly value the partnership we have with NESD and we believe a strong, local voice in school governance is important to continue with this partnership. Without the ability to reach-out at a local level to NESD educational leaders, Cumberland College would not likely be able to undertake the responsive joint programming we have undertaken (and are about to undertake).

We have gone through school board amalgamations before and the children (especially in the remote areas) have not shown any benefits from the monetary savings from less administration. Restructuring will cost money and time. It may be a few years before this restructuring will be complete. It will take the focus away from learning and students will suffer. In fact, our school has ranked lowest in reading and math scores in our division. We already have a shortage in staff to properly educate our students. The resources we require from our school division such as councillors, ed psych specialists, etc do not have enough time to help students on a regular and timely basis. Having only one board to cover the whole province of Sask will not only reduce the contact with individual schools, there will not be enough resources to send out help where and when needed by the province's schools. Our children are our future. We need to give them the best we can so they can lead the country.

I want to keep our elected school board. They are the "salt of the earth ". I feel they best represents me, as a parent of school children in both the elementary and high school systems. I don't want to have a school system where success is measured on a "business like mentality" . It must continue to be an extension of the family . A loving and excepting place of growth and development . A place that will graduate community minded loving citizens . High math ,science, and language scores are great but wane in comparison to the development of a caring and well balanced individual that can creatively problem solve and work well with others. Thank you

Thank you for this opportunity to speak to the proposed changes in Saskatchewan School Boards.

fail to understand the reasoning behind eliminating all elected school boards across the province and replacing them with a board appointed by the provincial government. School boards are meant to be close to the schools they oversee; that would be an impossibility for one board serving the wide expanse of our province and given the different and varying circumstances each school district experiences. Surely any money possibly saved by such centralization will be spent in compensating for the failure of adequate education in areas with specialized needs. Please make our school system as excellent as possible, but not at the cost of eliminating the election of local school boards.

I'm involved with 3 school divisions. Each one is unique and has local support from community, board members, and families. A government appointed school board will fail to recognize individual needs within families and communities to support the education and learning requirements of individual children. Bigger isn't necessarily better.

I am opposed to the amalgamation of the school divisions. Please keep the board local.

To whom it may concern: I'm curious why public sector employees in Saskatchewan are being used as pawns to distract from the true budget issues at hand in Saskatchewan? People are going to be asked to make financial concessions/cuts/roll backs/freezes? Were contracts not negotiated in good faith and with "ear marked" dollars or were negotiations completed with fingers crossed in the hopes that oil and potash would remain profitable and "cover future costs"? Provincially, have we not saved anything for a rainy day? Did we go through the "have years" and not plan for future dips or fluctuations with the resource sector? We had enough money to build a new football stadium but we don't have enough to honor legally binding contracts that were negotiated in good faith? Could our \$1 billion shortfall in 2016 have anything to do with projects that came in exorbitantly over budget? I consider it is a colossal concern when a \$400 million project turns into \$1.8 billion disaster. I would have some explaining to do if a projected educational field trip ended up costing over 4 times what I predicted it would be. I believe that miscalculation would come with some tough questions. Maybe the Sask Party supporters that made millions off GTH dealings would be willing to give their profits to public sector employees?? I like Judy Ferguson's comments about the GTH land deals. "We want to emphasize that the audit did not conclusively state that there was no conflict of interest, fraud or wrongdoing with respect to these land transactions related to GTH," Judy Ferguson. She said she was concerned the use of the words conflict of interest and no wrongdoing have not been well understood and have overshadowed her audit's conclusion. It is difficult for people in education to remain trusting and positive with government when these types of deals go on. If oil and potash were to reach record levels 3 years from now would the government want to revisit "negotiated" contracts to "offer more" becomes times are so good? I think not. Do our government leaders realize the extent to which educational technology, school transportation, school playground equipment, etc. are subsidized by local fundraising? Educational stakeholders have taken on countless projects and endeavors because that is what needed to happen or schools wouldn't have SmartBoards or playground equipment but again we are asked to tighten belts and do more with less? Do government employees and their families have to fundraise for technology in the office, transportation to meetings, or lunch room tables and chairs? I think not. I've spoken to several upset people in my rural community and I hope these educational stakeholders have taken the time to send in their feedback. I feel the government is wanting someone to blame for our deficit instead of owning the budget problems and moving forward with solutions that are reasonable and legal. As Principal of Wadena Elementary, if I were to overspend during an academic school year I would have to own that deficit. I would not blame the staff and ask them to take wage cuts next year? The timing (Christmas break??) and eerily quiet release of Mr. Perrin's report felt very secretive, almost strategically secretive to me. I feel the issue of Transformational Change and Mr. Perrin's report should have been acknowledged and announced provincially on the 6 o'clock news.....not on Dec. 21st when all School Boards had already met in December and educational stakeholders were, in too many cases, in the dark until the return to classes on Jan. 4th. Where is the specific data that supports transformational change as a viable solution in education and health care? Alberta moved to a single health region prior to 2010 and they are still reeling as a result of that decision. What province in Canada has successfully maneuvered and modelled the degree of Transformational Change that Saskatchewan may be embarking on? "Wall's stay in power has been littered with tax goodies and cuts which funneled billions into corporate coffers. And none offered any benefit other than the implausible assurance that trickle-down economic policy would eventually build a more resilient economy. That was always a dubious proposition. But there's no room for any conclusion now other than that Wall's crony capitalism has failed miserably. And given the choice as to who's going to make up for that failure, surely it makes more sense to target the corporate titans who have been living large, rather than people who are already struggling to get by" (Greg Fingas, 2017). I am all for fiscal responsibility and transparency but I don't believe that all options and avenues have been explored regarding our current financial state in Saskatchewan. Mr. Fingas references the deep and padded pockets of corporate titans. In 2016, the bonuses for the top 100 CEO's in Canada ranged from \$3.8 million to \$89.3 million. If that kind of money is accessible for CEO "bonuses" there must be room for additional taxation of these corporate titans or we could lay off 251 custodians and save \$43. Saskatchewan Premier Brad Wall is defending an extra \$37,000 he receives from the Saskatchewan Party which is on top of his \$154,247 taxpayer-funded salary. Wall said Tuesday the additional pay is something the party does to recognize the work leaders do outside of their job in the legislature. Teachers do significant work outside of their job in the school. Interesting facts- it would take a Teacher 41 years or 7380 hours of extracurricular activities to receive the equivalent of \$37,000 (that's \$5.01 per hour if you do the math on that). Isn't minimum wage \$10.72? Over the course of 41 years, Mr. Wall would hypothetically receive \$1,517,000.00, more than \$5.01 per hour if you do the math.

I don't believe that any of the options presented are acceptable. No 1, 2, 3a, or 3b. The status quo should be maintained. School Divisions in rural Saskatchewan encompass large geographical areas, which already lead to huge travel expenses and operational costs, by the very nature of their size. I am 100% in support of locally elected school trustees. I believe locally elected representation is crucial to maintaining local voice in the determination of educational needs and supports for local communities. I am extremely displeased by the way this process has been laid out, start to finish. The timeline for such a monumental change is unfair to those who will be significantly impacted by these decisions. Especially considering that the major method of feedback is through an online form or email - two things that people in the North and rural Saskatchewan are disproportionately unable to access in comparison to their urban counterparts. I also am disappointed in the governments insistence to have each piece of feedback named - how is this fair to teachers, support staff and administration of school divisions - those most likely to be impacted by any changes will are also those who will most likely feel muzzled by this type of requirement.

The consultation process has been short and there have been no problems identified in the report that we are asked to address. There is room for continual improvement in education and all changes must be measured and found to be in the best interest of our children. Under the Education Act the public has the ability to interact with schools and participate in a democratic process. We have the legislative right to participate in education governance by the spirit of the Education Act. This local input and participation is threatened by changing the governance structure to appointed boards or to a centralization of boards. By electing trustees to represent our interests as parents, community members and ratepayers we are electing dedicated people who know our kids, schools, teachers and parents in our communities and that in turn strengthen our education system which is built on relationships and partnerships. It is ineffective to limit the support that locally elected boards of trustees give to schools to enable them to tailor programs, professional development and resources for their unique student populations. The governance recommendations in the Perrins report smack of standardization of student experience which is exactly the wrong direction to go in order to improve student outcomes.

I am a recently retired teacher who is currently involved in our education system as a substitute teacher. I am very fortunate to have had a wonderful career working with many amazing teachers, administrators, students and families. I worked in the very small two school division know as Humboldt Catholic Schools for many years until they amalgamated and became part of Greater Saskatoon Catholic Schools.

Throughout my years as a teacher, I have seen many changes in the way education is delivered....some of them good and others maybe not so good. Your report asks for "input on the governance structure required to maintain and improve the quality of instruction for all students wherever they live" so I will try to focus my input in that area." My personal story and input for the "wherever they live" portion is as follows. As a former student from a somewhat larger high school and a teacher in a fairly large elementary school, I had some concerns about moving to the farm and knowing my then preschool kids would eventually be attending a smaller rural school. My thoughts, at the time, were there was no way that small school could offer what a larger school does. I hoped that the high school would be closed down by the time my children were that age so they could go six miles down the road to the larger high school in Humboldt. Well, my mind certainly changed once my children began attending that smaller, rural school and I would have fought to keep the high school open if there had ever been talk of closing it. In my opinion, the opportunities and family like atmosphere far outweighed the extra class choices they may have had at a larger school. Senior administrators may think like I did and not recognize the many benefits of a small school if they have never had the opportunity to experience it firsthand. I certainly experienced a huge change in governance structure during my career and therefore have some input on that aspect as well. When I began my teaching career, in 1985, I was with the two school Humboldt Catholic Division. There was a principal and vice principal at my K – 8 school and they were in the building basically all the time to support their staff and students. After amalgamation with the Saskatoon Catholic Division our administration was continually out of the building at meetings. It was very frustrating because there were constantly questions and issues arising that we needed them to address. I know it was a similar situation with Humboldt Rural School Division when they amalgamated into Horizon School Division. The principal of my children's school told me, "What I used to be able to handle with a simple, short phone call to the principal down the road now needs a half day off, a sub, travel costs and a meeting." I think it is extremely important for the in school administrators to be "in the building" to support staff and students and deal with the many issues that come up daily in a school. Especially with today's technology (skype, conference calls etc.) there is no need to incur all the travel costs, sub costs and time out of the building for the head person at the school. One morning a week could be set aside for all principals in the division and that is when they can schedule the majority of dialogue that needs to be dealt with as a group....but they will still be "in the building" if something major arises at their own school. As well, included in this governance structure area, would likely be the amount of central office staff. That, too, has changed

tremendously throughout my career. Of course, it is necessary to have a certain amount of staff to handle things such as payroll. In my opinion, though, things have gotten out of hand. What is needed and absolutely necessary to maintain and improve the quality of instruction for all students is front line staff who actually work with the students. Cutting the lowest paid front line staff that actually works with students (educational assistants) to hire more central office specialists (reading consultants, communications people etc.) to work with teachers and the public is taking education in the wrong direction. Teachers need to be recognized for the professionals we are. We have our Education degrees, combined with energy, enthusiasm and a love for our job but simply need front line support to get that job done. We don't need central office specialists teaching us how to teach reading, test students etc. We are professionals. As an example, the newest thing seems to be individual reading "benchmarking" tests for each student three times a year. In order to accomplish this teachers are once again out of the classroom and substitute teachers need to be hired (a huge cost). Again, teacher's need to be recognized as professionals. By the end of September, we know who is reading below grade level, above grade level and at grade level and adjust our teaching accordingly. I would even understand doing one formal individual benchmarking test a year but that would be all that is needed. Teacher's need to be recognized as professionals who will get the job done if given the time and support to do so. Principals need to be "in the building" to support those teachers, see the needs of their individual schools, and then get additional support for students and staff that need it. Individual needs within today's classrooms have changed. The number of students needing additional support for a variety of reasons (speech, autism spectrum disorders, behavioral issues, family issues) has increased tremendously and front line support is absolutely necessary to meet those needs. An example from a school I have worked in this year is a new high school student who came to the school in the fall. Teachers very quickly realized there were severe academic deficiencies as well as family issues and tried to get additional support for that student. Unfortunately, there wasn't a spot available to do the "necessary" testing to be granted that support so the child is left on his own to get further and further behind as our system fails him. How sad. Again, we teachers are professionals who want the best for our students and can recognize when support is needed. Frontline staff along with strong and available in school administration are absolutely necessary. Central office is where the cuts need to be made. "Maintain and improve the quality of instruction" is an area that you have asked for input. Again, I have seen many changes and again, I think one of the most important changes may be that we, as teachers, were seen more as professionals when I started. One personal example of this is with student retention. As a new teacher in the 1980's I had a student that struggled academically in my grade two class. I knew that he had adequate academic ability but the maturity and interest weren't there yet. I felt it was in his best interests to repeat grade 2 and was apprehensive about meeting with his parents to tell them he would be repeating grade 2 in the fall – even though we had open communication throughout the year and they supported him and knew he was struggling. My principal, who was always in the building, said he would join us for our meeting and because of his years of experience, he actually did most of the talking at the meeting. Of course, the student's mom had tears in her eyes and was quite sad when we said her son would be repeating grade 2 in the fall. By the end of September that next year she was in my classroom thanking me and saying how happy her son was and how much he liked coming to school now that he was able to complete activities independently. He simply needed a catch up year and I, as the professional, was able to recognize that. (Side note: He became a teacher) In later teaching years, I was able to handle those situations on my own but was thankful I had a principal in the building who was able to support me when I needed it. It is unfortunate that teachers, as the professionals in the education system, who want the best for their students, no longer can make that decision. In my years of teaching, I have seen many variations of the basics – reading, writing, math, spelling. In my later years of teaching, I found that myself and other teachers were continually having to go to "inservices" about new programming, new testing methods etc. We, too, were now spending more and more time out of the classroom rather than with our students. That is costly to the division...and to the students who deserve to have continuity. At the beginning of my career there was professional development money available to each teacher to choose a conference to attend that would meet an individual need. Later in my career, we had so many mandated things to attend that I rarely chose to go to yet another one of my own choosing. In my opinion, it is a good thing that workshops are offered. They should not, however, be mandatory for all teachers. I have seen excellent teachers, who have taught a specific grade/subject for many years, forced to go to workshops that they could have taught. That doesn't make sense and is costly to the division and the teacher who is out of the classroom and has to spend hours on the road and planning for a substitute. Again, these workshops should be available for teachers new to a certain grade/subject area to attend but not mandatory for all. We are professionals that recognize when we need support and if not, our in school administration would recognize the need for support and encourage the necessary short courses to take. In the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth it states a "commitment to deliver smaller, more effective government as partto ensure programs and services are delivered as efficiently as possible." The chart in your report

shows various costs associated with the different divisions in our province. Administrative costs and governance costs are quite varied. Maybe there needs to be a "cap" on what percentage of a divisions allotted money can be spent on central office staff and administration compared to what percentage must be spent on frontline staff in the schools. That is absolutely the key to maintaining and improving the quality of education. Cut back on all the high cost top level administration, specialists etc. and increase your lower cost front line staff that actually works with students - teachers and assistants. As well, I believe that locally elected boards are very important. Thank you for allowing input from an ordinary teacher who doesn't have a lot of experience with governance structure but loves children and wants the best for all of them.

As a mother and a teacher living and working in Prairie Valley School Division, I see firsthand the importance of having local autonomy in governing one's school division. We need locally elected boards, they are our local voice. I began my teaching career as the first and second round of amalgamations happened in the mid 2000s. In my school, our class sizes have increased and the number of computers has decreased. Further amalgamation is not in the best interest of Saskatchewan students. I support cost saving systems, strengthening the educational outcomes and standardizing boards, however the wide sweeping changes proposed are unacceptable.

I don't feel joining all school divisions is the right thing to do. It is not going to benefit any of the divisions. I think every school should have their own SCC so they can deal with properly with any issues. When you take away our local SCC our kids will just become a number and not an individual. Personally I feel this is just another way to close more schools and make the children ride on the bus even longer then some are already. So before any decision is made I ask you to put yourself in the position of the staff/students/ SCC and parents.

I appreciate the government's willingness to look at change. My concern, though is that while the Perrins Report is very specific about issues within the province - lack of coherence, accountability, consistency, protocols, and assessment/classroom practice from a wide variation of interpretations of expectations, outcomes, and practices, the report makes some sweeping assumptions and is quick to assign blame of these issues to stakeholders outside of government. Saying that elected boards, too many School Divisions or leadership outside of the Ministry are at fault, makes the solution quite simplistic and very narrow minded. If the issues were simply a matter of replacing what we have with something different, then the report makes complete sense. However, if the issues are deeper than that, then the report makes no recommendations that any other "arrangement" or governance model will be any more successful in addressing the issues at hand than the current one. Expecting that different equates to better is short-sighted in my view and is an expensive experiment (both in financial cost but also in the learning of children - which cohort of children get to be lost in the implementation phase while we decide what we should have seen in the first place?) I would prefer to see clarification, accountability, focus on results and coherence in expectations be addressed - without blame but just in the interest of getting better at what we do. Perhaps a new governance model may be necessary also but not without some serious consideration of the issues and how to address them within the model that we now have. Sometimes all you need is to remodel the bathroom, change a few pipes, keep the babies and even a few tubs before you set fire to the entire building because the bathwater isn't doing the job it is supposed to do. I believe that the cost will be very high without seeing any change unless and until the core issues are addressed effectively. Now that someone has actually pointed out the discrepancies, can't we start addressing the real issues and stop finger pointing at those who are trying to work within a broken system? Rearranging the same people (or even different people with the same roles) and hoping that will fix it is not, in my view, the most effective use of resources (people, expertise, leadership and time.)

As a parent who homeschools her children, I ask that: - SHBE (Saskatchewan Home Based Educators) be counted as stakeholder in these discussions. - that any governance model maintain parental freedom to choose to home educate. - the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students. - that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators. Thank you!

Hello: I am extremely concerned with the three options that have been provided to the Education system to streamline boards of education in the province of Saskatchewan. The unique situation in Lloydminster does not fit well with any of these models. The Province of Alberta invests funds into our local Education as well as a municipal levy. These funds ensure programming is fair and equitable for all residents. Please consider Lloydminster's unique situation before any drastic changes are implemented on our Education System. Please ensure our children's needs are the priority. Thank you.

Keep locally elected representatives to ensure our students, teachers, and schools have their needs met in the most effective way, and are represented by people living in the same community.

I am writing in response to the Education Governance Review report. I am a mother of three children,

They are all at a stage where they are relying heavily on the education system to give them the start in life to help them succeed later on in life. I am very concerned about the possible amalgamations to the school divisions and the impact that the changes will have on my children's education. The possible amalgamation of the rural and urban divisions is very poorly thought out and has the potential to negatively impact every rural community (and every student in rural schools) in this province. The needs of rural schools are very different than urban schools needs and as such require different management and governance. Small schools are important to rural life and should be supported and valued, which is not what is proposed in this report. Quite the opposite is proposed in the report, with very little thought given to rural schools. Small numbers does not mean that they don't deserve consideration, these schools educate children from a large area and they deserve to be represented and governed by people that understand them. Appointed boards take away so much from rural schools and I am greatly opposed to having one large board for the whole province. It is very important that we keep our ability to elect boards that represents our community and our way of life. This needs to be about our children and their education and not about dollars. I value having elected board members. Local people that best understand the needs of our schools are who we need to have governing our education system, not appointed boards that are not representative or knowledgeable of the systems that they represent. The dollars that are saved by these amalgamations will not be enough to justify the sacrifices that are made to accommodate them, especially in rural Saskatchewan. I am opposed to all four of the options that are proposed in the report. I suggest more time be spent to comprehensively assess the situation and come to a solution that does not jeopardize the education of our students and the health of our rural communities. My children's education is of utmost importance to me and I feel that these changes are going to have a negative impact on their learning and education, and ultimately their future. I urge you to take the time and make the right changes, not rush into something without considering the impact that they will have. If it truly is about saving money you need to look at more than governance. Taking away local school boards is not going to accomplish the savings that you are talking about, it is only going to hurt rural Saskatchewan and our children. I value my local school board and the value that it provides to my children's education. Changes are inevitable, I urge you to take the time and due diligence that is needed to do it right.

Keep our school boards locally elected. Keep decisions closer to our communities.

Dear Panel, I am very concerned about the Educational Governance Review and the potential impacts this may have upon our school and school division. I am supportive of a whole of review of education within the province, including the work of finding efficiencies that is already underway. I am not supportive of "one-off" reviews that are only going to affect the public school divisions. My family settled in this territory in 1882, and my relatives were some of the first teachers in their rural area. For the past 135 years, access to local education and the responsibility of local citizens to provide input into that education have been a part of our family's philosophy. Please do not remove the opportunity for local and parental input into education by instituting appointed boards. My children were just entering the school system when the amalgamations occurred 10 years ago. At the time, I was unaware of how disruptive the amalgamation process was, but as I have become familiar with the services offered through the school setting, I do understand the disruption and loss of education focus that process had upon our students. Please do not disrupt learning environments again by amalgamating school boards. My children experience physical and developmental challenges that require special services be available to them. I am concerned about how these services will be provided to other children if rural schools are closed. The Perrins report mentions a closer alignment with health services in a delivery area and I can see that may be an avenue for further exploration. Please don't divest the responsibility to maintain services to rural schools. I do support the work being done provincially on the Education Sector Strategic Plan and the focus on student achievement. These are steps in the right direction. I also support a review of education that examined how services are delivered, scales of magnitude, appropriate credit numbers and choices, curriculum review, pre-K programs, school nutrition programs and incorporating physical activity back into schools. Please do not consider that a review of Educational Governance is enough of a transformational change. I expect better!

Having governance of northern schools in southern Sask. will likely be a detriment to northern schools. People from southern Sask. do not know the issues of northern communities and vice versa. There are many issues which exist in northern Sask. that do not exist in the south such as a high number of youth suicides, high rate of school drop out, high unemployment, etc. If the northern youth wish to pursue post secondary education or training in the trades, etc, they have to leave their communities to access further education. Board members generally advocate for their own communities. Northern governance needs to be done by northern people who understand the needs of their communities.

Cutbacks and restructuring deplete teacher and school staff moral that is already low. Overworked and burned out teachers, support staff and rundown buildings cannot fulfill the mandate of "focusing on student success". Student success comes with a staff that feels supported. Stating that we will not be given our increment or the news earlier in 2016 that the Conservative gov't would only honour 50% of our contract is simply not honouring our contract. That is illegal! Adding more assessments on to a student or a teacher doesn't prove student success. Student success varies with the individual; not one "reading assessment" has consulted with a student to find out what makes them feel successful. Here are some other things that don't make teachers or students feel successful: increasing class size, or adding to the amount of time students spend on the bus. And, cutting support staff budgets so that students with designated disabilities, behavior issues, impoverished homes, are all in overcrowded classrooms with broken down "heating" systems and one teacher in the room, don't feel supported. I don't feel supported and sometimes I wonder if I am successful when I am overwhelmed and under acknowledged. Some students are struggling to succeed and they just need an adult to acknowledge their contributions and presence. Cut out the "reading assessments". Reduce sub time required to cover that teacher that is doing the assessment would reduce some costs. But what about the public's perception of teachers and education? Sometimes showing support doesn't cost a whole lot of money. What about LOTS of positive "teacher" stories in the media? Or the bus drivers who went that extra mile- literally- or figuratively? What about leaders who come into our buildings to see what students and their teachers do that they are proud of? These positive messages could come out weekly. It's not just about the money. Acknowledging the VALUE of what students do to succeed and especially the teachers that facilitate their success is almost as important as the money. In fact it might be even more important. But.... contracts must be honoured by all who have signed them. That is an important lesson.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide some feedback. While I appreciate the increasing cost to deliver education within our province, I am not sure going to appointed boards and one central agency reporting to the Minister of Education would best suit the needs of our students and province. Strategic planning and goal setting is crucial to moving forward and improvements in service delivery is of the utmost importance; however, appointed schools boards do not appear to be more effective. Elected boards support a democratic process, and, if the community does not have a say in the appointment as the individual is vetted, the community has lost their voice at the table. Not accounted for in some of the documents provided in the report are the diverse needs to students and the challenges we face to meet5 their learning needs. For example, in the past five years, there has been an significant increase in the number of immigrant children in our educational system and the corresponding supports that required to effectively help them grow as learners and future Canadian citizens. As well no mention is made of the emotional, psychological and mental health challenges that are students are facing and supports (counselling, educational assessments, etc.) that are required to enhance their learning. Overall, if there needs to be a change or restructuring to support a stronger voice for education, I would support the Division Model or Option 3 with a realignment of boundaries. That said, I am concerned of what would happen with our local LINC agreements, and, if that would mean no local say in our contract in each of our school divisions. Would that also mean for example, a loss of preparation time for SPS teachers or a loss of say by SPS teachers in professional development and local contract issues? That I am not in support of. Nor do I want the Ministry of Education with little or no say from educators or the STF to make changes as was done when a longer school day was implemented. There appeared to be no apparent thought to the support staff (educational assistants) working with students whose work day was not increased in a corresponding manner. In addition, when our school year was changed for students to return to school after the long week-end In September, it was announced by the premiere during the election of 2012. Would a centralized provincial model mean that more decisions like this would be made and simply announced and enforced? In closing, educators need to be valued and appreciated as professionals and not as individuals working in a big business. Their professional autonomy needs to be honoured so that the standards and expectations of the Ministry of Education for our students is efficiently and effectively met as we are preparing tomorrow's leaders and citizens for a global economy. Change is never easy but it is an opportunity for growth and dialogue is crucial. Thus, thank you once again for this opportunity.

As a parent of a student in North West School Division #203, with more entering kindergarten in the fall, I am very concerned with the proposed amalgamation. I do not have access to enough information to feel comfortable, or be able to make an informed decision about what would be best for my children. This proposal raises a lot of questions, which at this time, do not appear to have answers that are being openly shared with us. What is the reason for this proposal? How is following through with it meant to improve the education of my children? As a parent and tax payer living in rural Saskatchewan, I am in support of having true local representation for our schools and do not believe that the possible changes are in support of that. I hope that my concerns will be considered. Thank you.

To whom it may concern, I believe the school divisions should be left as they are currently, or at the very most, rectified into a slightly smaller number than there currently are. Despite claims that it isn't about nickles and dimes, that is all this amalgamation is about. While it may seem to make sense in the short term, we will lose teachers. Or, the teachers and support staff will care less. They'll work just hard enough to keep their jobs. Which, in a line of work dedicated to educating children, will result in a definite drop in education and well being for the children. Trimming the fat makes sense. However, education is not a business and should not be run as if it is one. The government may benefit, albeit it to a very minor degree. The education and development of our children will suffer. As the saying goes, children are our most precious resource. It makes sense then, to do what we can to ensure they have the best education possible. Not try to save money.

As a former teacher in the Greater Saskatoon Catholic Schools, I am concerned about the future of our schools and the quality of education that our students receive. The education of our children, and the resources needed for this purpose should be of highest concern and priority to the government and people of our province. I feel that the loss of locally elected school boards would seriously affect the education system. Locally elected school boards represent the community and provide an assurance that the needs and interests of the school division are addressed. The most effective advocates for our local school communities are locally elected representatives who understand the needs, concerns and position of the community. I am also concerned that amalgamation of school boards may lead to the loss of the unique characteristics of each community, especially related to the Catholic school systems. While there may be a need to look for cost-efficiency solutions in government spending, it should not come at the expense of the diversity, dignity and uniqueness of the education system and the school boards. I hope that whatever recommendations or proposals are made will ensure the quality of education, and promote student success and respect for the educators and school boards who provide the service of education to our children. Thank you for the opportunity to express my concerns regarding education in our province.

I recognize the government is facing significant challenges in attempting to balance the budget. I support the government's efforts to achieve a balanced budget in the short term. I urge the government not to centralize any further the decision making process in publicly funded education when it is addressing its financial challenges. The financial savings that could be achieved by further board amalgamation are minimal and they would be offset by the inevitable increase of hiring (both at the local and provincial level) to make up for the loss of input from the local level. The further consolidation of education governance into an even greater monopoly than exists already cannot achieve the goal of cost savings. The purpose of publicly funded education is to help parents, who are the first and foremost educators of their children. For that reason we have local, elected school boards. They should be supported rather than reduced. Education is not a mere government program to be delivered as cheaply as possible. Having said that, I also do not believe that the challenges facing society can be solved by mindlessly pouring additional money into publicly funded education. In short, I believe the transformational change being sought by the government would involve a greater role for school boards and a lesser role for the Ministry. While the government may continue to control the overall budget, it should devolve delivery of education from the Ministry to boards and their provincial organization. I believe student success can be maintained and enhanced in this model, and accountability and efficiency will be improved.

I am opposed to these changes happening so quickly. More time and information is needed.

Keep our school boards locally elected and keep decisions close to our community.

The fact that this review is taking place during a time of an economic downfall, it is clear that any and all decisions being made are based on finding financial savings, and have little, or nothing to do with student success or achieving curricular outcomes. From the benefits/challenges section of the report, it is obvious big changes are planned, with the the challenges seeming to be listed as after thoughts that will be dealt with at a later date. There are far too many questions and concerns that need to be addressed before moving forward.

Our children go to Ituna School in the Horizon school division. When our kids started kindergarten we were in the Deer Park SD. We saw changes and were moved with Foam Lake (I can't remember if there was a name change) and the most recent version of our school division is Horizon as we know it now. Each change that was made in the past I was in full support of. However, to expand or amalgamate our school division again is sheer lunacy. We are the "southern school" with Waka as the "northern most school" we've traveled some incredibly crummy roads for sports in our own division. Don't make kids travel farther! Jim Hack is a great representative for us as is Kevin Garinger. Making a larger school division might (it's doubtful) save money at face value but the services provided to our schools will undoubtedly be less.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the four options developed by Mr. Perrins. My number one concern is option 1. The idea of taking away an opportunity to have elected representation for public prekindergarten to grade 12 education in Saskatchewan is an idea that should have more opportunity for scrutiny by citizens of this province. We are only a few months removed from an open and successful democratic exercise that elected or acclaimed school board trustees and municipal officers to represent us in places of assembly throughout this province. For a thriving democracy, this is a good example of one way candidates and voters can choose to make their mark on how their communities are being shaped through local representation for items like education and municipal affairs. Progressive and well planned educational opportunities are a major part of what makes a successful society successful. Local representation to public school boards has been in effect in this province for over 100 years. I am proud to be an elected public school board trustee for the past 4 years and have on many occasions forwarded on and acted on items provided to me by persons living in the Division. The notion that the provincial government of the day can commission in 5 weeks an opinion from an individual on the future governance model for public prekindergarten to Grade 12 education in the province and then over the following month hold a limited amount of special interest meetings and garner random email feedback in order that the government can make a change in the model seems to be quite hasty. I suggest that once the 6 person panel presents their summation of these meetings that listens to persons and organizations on the content of the Perrins report that the government of Saskatchewan further has a promotional campaign directly to its citizens on what they would like to see as the governance model for public prekindergarten to grade 12 education. If elected trustees are possibly being eliminated then a province wide referendum should be held on a new proposed governance model of public pre-kindergarten to grade 12 education. Why not have the public participate directly on the future governance of public pre-kindergarten to grade 12 education? It has been the public at large that created and has nurtured the model to this day. This further consultative effort by the government would be to highlight the possibility to eliminate elected representation on public school should be held so persons may realize a piece of the democratic process in our communities is being ripped away. As well, for other options in the Perrins Report, further merging of school divisions should be carefully weighed and again a well thought out and consultative approach with communities should be led by the government so that all communities get a chance to formulate options on what this would actually look like before a decision is taken. In sum, as a citizen, parent and a trustee I am really disappointed at pace of this exercise and the fact that more consultation needs to be taken to in order that we carefully and thoughtfully debate taking away our democratic right to participate directly in public prekindergarten to grade 12 education. If the government of the day wants to erode our level of democratic participation then have a referendum or make it part of your next election campaign. You didn't get a mandate in the last one to make this change to our democracy.

I am very concerned about the cuts to education, large classroom sizes and the student teacher ration. There are several studies completed demonstrating that behaviour deviates when too many people are in one building and yet are most valuable asset (our children) are daily subjected to this type of environment. I am also very concerned that teacher aids have been cut in so many school division

My family had to relocate because there was insufficient assistance for my nephew who was in our school system but had to be pulled out because of government cuts – my family moved to bc where my nephews are now thriving in school in an education system that values all children. It is bad enough that every day I worry about loosing my job because of the current economy debacle and constantly worry about how I am going to keep my home, which angers me to no end when I pay taxes to a very top heavy government full of many ministers, dm's, adms, executive directors, directors and managers who only solution to this insane deficient is to resort to cutting the jobs or wages of front end staff to save their own; but now I need to worry about my child going off to school everyday to potentially address real life dangers of an over-crowded, under-funded educational system. One solution to reduce Saskatchewan's deficit may be to consider reducing the number of ministers, dm's, adms, executive directors, directors and managers. Any government willing to reduce so many services, including our children really should be willing to reduce their own upper levels of this inefficient hierarchy. Really more cuts to education? If we want the public to give up more maybe we need to look at out-of-scope government workers and start eliminating these positions. Or have we voted in a government who is not willing to walk their talk, and are willing to take from children, the elderly and front line workers when they were the ones responsible for our economy in the first place. It seems a little unjust to punish those who did not commit any crimes and let those responsible for Saskatchewan's current situation get off the hook and retain their positions and large salaries.

School age: You should be the age of 5 when school starts. If school starts Sept 1 and you have not yet turned 5, you should have to wait until the next school year.

To whom it may concern, I strongly feel that amalgamations (if any) should be minimal. The main stated reason for amalgamating school divisions is to save money, yet past amalgamations here and in other provinces have shown that that cost savings are minimal. Upper level administration would be faced with heavier workloads, requiring higher salaries, while administration would lose touch with the teachers and staff in the schools. If any cost savings are to be achieved, I fear it would come at the price of hundreds of layoffs. Many of which would affect good young teachers and educational assistants. As having previously been employed in a larger school division, I can attest to the fact that smaller school divisions are better for teachers and students alike. In a small school division administrators know the teachers; they know their strengths and their passions, and can ensure that the teachers are being used effectively. Teachers feel comfortable approaching upper administration with requests, complaints or feedback about division policy. In my experiences in a larger school division, sometimes policies are put into place that make little to no sense in the schools and classrooms, but because the administration has little connection with the teachers, things stay the same for far too long. I have seen tech policies that block content to the point of students not being able to research breast cancer for a health presentation, how does this benefit our learners? Amalgamation would result in large poorly functioning divisions where policies like this can thrive. Of greater concern is the risk to rural schools. Even in my small school division the voice of the rural student can sometimes get lost. Large, centralized school divisions would focus primarily on Urban students who have wholly different needs. And if, as the government suggests, we lose our local school boards, we would not only enter into a state of taxation without representation, but what little voice our rural schools have would be silenced. How are we to improve graduation rates among First Nations students in rural Saskatchewan if all decisions being made are being made for students in our cities? Furthermore, making decisions that affect the whole province solely on the basis of budget is irresponsible. If we are to have a strong future in Saskatchewan, we need to invest in our future by investing in Education. Put money towards areas that research has shown have a strong impact on learning and achievement (such as RTI with adequately funded support personnel) and not towards "fundamental change" that will change the structure of things but do nothing to increase learning. We do need transformational change, but not through amalgamations. We need teachers to be trusted and respected, not just by students and parents, but by administration and government. We dedicate our lives to our students, trying to make their learning experience memorable, joyous and valuable. Please don't make our jobs even harder by taking away our voices.

It is important for the school board trustees to be kept locally elected to truly understand and address both the challenges and the strengths of individual school divisions. This promotes support for students as well as staff at a local level. School divisions as they are now should be responsible for the hiring and management of staff. There are other options besides centralization. If funding needs to be redirected, I believe the government should work with the existing school divisions to make that happen with as little disruption to student learning as possible. Keep school divisions local to best serve the students and staff.

I totally support this initiative, providing that no front end positions are lost. We have way way to many management positions, and boards in place, consuming big dollars that could and must be trimmed, thus ensuring our tax dollars are being more wisely spent, where needed, and with the end result being that our present high level of education continues.

As a parent of a child in the Catholic system, I expect to see the Saskatchewan government uphold the rights of Catholic school boards to exist according to the Education Act. My family used to live in the southwest area of the province, a rural area. Those school divisions have already been amalgamated and therefore no other opportunities to share services - they barely have services as it is. Consultants, educational psychologists, speech language pathologists have to travel far distances and work with many students across a large area. Students in rural areas have less access to those specialized services mentioned than students in urban areas. In my urban school division we have the same issue: few specialists dealing with or responsible for thousands of students. If there were more amalgamation, the students would suffer. There are old school facilities in many areas of the province, urban and rural. Fewer school divisions do not mean there is more money to fix aging facilities. School boards are already at the financial breaking point because the Sask. Party government chose to ignore the collective agreement of teachers and forced school boards to pay 50% of teacher salaries. This forced school boards to cut Educational Assistants and Teachers. How does this meet student needs? Students need help to achieve their academic and personal potential. Cutting personnel like teachers, EAs, consultants, specialists do not put student needs ahead of government mistakes. Saskatchewan students are not taxpayers and cannot fix the deficit. Adults have to realize that only school boards, their trustees, and teachers and support staff have the best point of view to help the education system in Saskatchewan. Ask them for their solutions instead of deciding on reducing school boards to satisfy a budget necessity. School boards should not be reduced any more as it will NOT meet any Saskatchewan student needs.

I feel the status quo should remain in place with elected boards.

I believe that local school boards are elected to represent their community/municipality. Over the years, Saskatchewan has become an even more diverse province. Our immigrant population continues to grow and the needs of our First Nations children must not be overlooked. Many people, who come from other parts of Canada, now call Saskatchewan home. The students' needs vary not only between school divisions, but within each school in some cases. There is not just one template that can be used to govern all of our schools. We have seen a loss of services as the size of the school divisions increase. Services shared between more schools means longer wait times. Who is to govern which students are at the top of a priority list? Will larger areas receive services before smaller communities? What about the other costs incurred by travel, accommodations, etc? I believe that locally elected boards are the fairest and most efficient way to serve the students in our province.

As an educator, I work as part of a culture that is always striving for the best possible outcomes in student learning. Part of improving our practice means evaluating what should stay in place because it works and what could use improvement. As the provincial government considers "transformational change" in the area of public education, the concept of an elected - rather than appointed - school board is definitely something that should stay in place. I have to believe that we all wish to provide the students in this province with the best possible education. A school board needs to have the freedom to put students' needs first; an appointed board offers limited opportunity for thoughtful discussion or public debate when decisions are made at the provincial level that will impact students. Locally elected boards allow for local input; an appointed board places barriers between citizens and the board members who determine the conditions under which our schools will operate. The province has stated that the goals of this review were to increase efficiency and accountability. An appointed school board is no more efficient than an elected board. It also is no more accountable than an elected board. An appointed board is, however, less transparent and more able to institute change without a mandate from the public. It is for these reasons that maintaining elected school boards is essential.

To whom it may concern: Please keep the school boards as they are. We want people of our community on the school board who have an invested interest in our children and grandchildren. Thank you for your time.

This is a very well written report that delivers great information and analysis. No matter what changes are to be implemented, the focus needs to be on the quality of education being delivered and equity for all. Out of all of the options presented in the report, option 3B: Realigning Boundaries, in my opinion is the best of all presented. As a SCC member from a rural area, I feel that having an elected board is the only option for providing a local voice.

Education needs to have the proper funding in order to fully invest in the provinces most important resource, our children. This is not where efficiencies should be made. High quality publicly funded education needs to be a priority and it takes people and money in order to so. Though I do feel divisions and boards need to make sure they are being fiscally responsible our children's needs and safety need to be given the utmost importance, especially in our local communities. Our local boards are important in order to meet the diverse needs that we have in each part of the province. Please consider making the right decision when it comes to fully funded high quality public education and what it takes to provide it. Providing the local school divisions with the money that was originally agreed upon as well as the additional funding that is needed to put the people in place to provide the services required. Please feel free to contact me to discuss this further. Thank you for your attention.

I have concerns about the Review Report: 1) First Nation Consultation: In his Letter of Transmittal, Mr. Perrins notes the stakeholders that he met with during the process. I am dismayed that he did not meet with the leadership of the FSIN. It is alarming since the first of "two key targets" is "...reducing the difference in graduation rates between Aboriginal and Non-Aboriginal students" (p.3). Has there been sufficient discussion with First Nations to really get their perspective? 2) I take objection to the statement that "A plan will be needed for First Nations representation", since it is considered a "challenge" (p. 23)! It sounds like this is a new idea but it is not! Horizon School Division has 14 trustees. Four of these trustees represent four First Nations within the School Division's boundaries. The First Nation representation on our Board has been in place for over 20 years! Horizon prides itself in the positive collaboration and partnerships that it has with its First Nations' leadership, community organizations, families and children. Also, within our boundaries, George Gordon First Nation was the first First Nation that signed an agreement with a provincial school system that gives the provincial School Division responsibility for curriculum, staffing, professional development, and budget for its on-reserve school, George Gordon Education Centre. The teachers all belong to the STF. This unique agreement has been in place since 1995. I am sure there are other school divisions that have welcomed and developed partnerships with the First Nation communities within their boundaries. Having First Nation representation on any Board should be seen as a benefit and not a challenge. Representation suggestion: If it not possible to carry on the present First Nation

representation on Boards, there should be an agreement that Agencies within the new Division boundaries be allocated trustee seats on their respective Boards. Therefore, another area that should be considered when creating new Divisions is the present boundaries that establish the First Nation Agency territories. 3) SCCs: I am very concerned that there will be more duties and responsibilities assigned to SCCs. I am fine with "Continued accountability" as long as it does not include more meetings dedicated to gathering and perusing data, sector plan, strategy planning, decentralized budgets, staffing issues, and training. Many of our SCCs are made of grandparents, community members and parents who just want to help out their schools be it by fundraising, assisting with student activities or hosting community events. If we start to asking them to take on greater roles in terms of finances, policies and academic programming, I believe it will be harder to get these valuable volunteers to sign on than it is right now. The statement "centrality of school community councils" sounds nice but I have no idea what it entails. I find it difficult to believe that there will be "more direct link of school community councils to decision makers". These are benefits (questionable) of Option 1 which I truly hope does not even get considered. 4) Ongoing Initiatives: It is noted in the Report that there are two projects in the works and their reports haven't been reviewed by the Government to date. The funding model shifts "have still not been fully implemented" and the "review is nearly complete and will provide a number of recommendations" (p. 10/11). Also, "The ATTENDANCE (and not absence) management project is in the development stages" (p.15). Why are we looking at this governance report when two other fairly major projects have not run their course? Whatever option is chosen, there are bound to be disruptions throughout all the levels of governance? Will these projects/models be lost in the shuffle? Having gone through one amalgamation, I know the worries about "disruption" "tension", "compromise the focus on student outcomes", "more time to facilitate cooperation" and "diminished voice" that will probably happen throughout the process of creating new school divisions. I wish all of our Saskatchewan school Administrators, teachers, support staff and especially our students patience, strength, acceptance, adaptability, and wisdom to carry on because here we go again!

I have had wonderful experiences with our locally elected board. It would be a shame to lose these people who are looking out for the best interests of their own communities.

To Premier Wall and the Members of the Legislature: I strongly oppose replacing the elected boards of education with a government appointed board. I've taught in elementary schools and know that it is important for teachers and parents to have access to someone local to express their concerns face to face. Eliminating local boards will make this impossible for most people. Local and elected boards will be more responsive to the needs of students. How can a few appointed board members understand the needs of all schools/students and provide timely responses? I've also done volunteer work in prisons and know that poor educational experiences can lead to addictions, unemployment and crime which are very costly to the tax- payer. Saving money by eliminating elected boards will cost society more in the future. We need to retain all of the elected boards we have now for kindergarten to grade 12 education!

Publically funded Education is an essential part of building and maintaining a healthy and prosperous community. The goal of our government should be to ensure the high quality of our educational system by supporting effective programs and dedicated teachers and staff. Schools are most effectively run and student needs best served when decisions involving them are made at the local level. Removing this ability from school divisions and putting the decision making process into the hands of people who are far removed from a school's community would not be an effective way of providing for the unique needs of a school division and their students. Locally elected boards are accountable to their school community and work to ensure that the provincial government is accountable as well. Replacing a locally elected school board with one that is appointed by the government would stifle the ability of school divisions to meet the needs of their students. Our current government should not presume to know what is best for our children. The education of our children is too important to be jeopardized by a government cost saving plan that would remove the local influence we have of our school systems.

I am writing to you in regards to the Educational Governance Review. As a Home Educator I would like to see the following requests considered: As a home educating parent and member of the Saskatchewan Home Based Educators (SHBE), I would like to see parents such as myself be included in stakeholder groups. I request SHBE represent home schooling parents as part of these groups. I request that the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students. I would also ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators. Home schooled students such as my four children are the future, a vital part of a strong Saskatchewan. I thank you for considering my requests.

To whom it may concern: I am writing on behalf of my 80 year old mom. She wants to give her input and asks that the school boards remain as they are, with parents, students and concerned citizens of the community who are locally elected. Thank you for listening and giving us a chance to voice our concerns.

Hi: I am opposed to the removal of local school boards and the divisions that we currently have in the province. The reasons why I am opposed to these changes are the vast differences in differing regions. One example of this would be Pilot Butte VS. Sandy Bay. If the school board is collapsed down into one for the entire province priorities will be set that do not fully match the needs of the community. The other downside is that school boards will no longer be elected. Therefore whatever government is in power will set the educational priorities for the entire province undiffused by any local governing. This will lead to government having too much unelected authority where change is needed / desired. Or causing change where there should not be any.

As a teacher and parent I would like any changes to focus on improving the student experience. Names of divisions, numbers of divisions and boards does not matter. What matters is the quality of instruction provided by the teachers and staff to provide an improved student experience. The curriculum, resources at the schools, facilities, class sizes, technology, quality of teachers and administration are all important in providing quality education. Please take a student first approach to whatever decision is going to be made.

With regards to the Educational Governance Review, as a Home Educator I would like to see the following requests considered: As a home educating parent and member of the Saskatchewan Home Based Educators (SHBE), I would like to see parents such as myself be included in stakeholder groups. I request SHBE represent home schooling parents as part of these groups. I request that the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students. I would also ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators. Home schooled students such as my four children are the future, a vital part of a strong Saskatchewan. I thank you for considering my requests.

I am opposed to amalgamation, opposed to appointed boards, and do not want any changes made to the number of trustees on the Board. Please put the CHILDREN of this province first. The Wall Government has made so many good choices - please don't let this decision that so many people are opposed to be your legacy.

I am _____ with Regina Public Schools, _____. I currently work with kids _____ at _____ school. Kids here need the help and work I do with them each day and told how helpful I am in the classrooms by staff, and parents. I am extremely concerned about the recommendations/options that have been put together and in such a rushed fashion. I don't see how these options and I quote..." Will focus on student success while ensuring accountability and efficient operational structures within the education system". The government gave Dan Perrins three weeks to study the amalgamations/restructuring and write his report. Why did Mr. Perrins recommend reduced school divisions and appointed trustees? There has been no meaningful public consultation, and a change of this scale has the potential for many errors. Why is the government rushing this? There's no evidence or report that states amalgamated/re-structured school boards and government appointed trustee's and CEO, will save money. It will only guarantee that the parents, workers and communities have no voice. Please stop this !!! The public feedback supports our existing school division boundaries and keeping our democratic process of elected school boards. Why would the government want to change this? Cant help but to wonder as to why was this not brought up during the elections? I truly love my job working with students and they are my priority every day when I go to work. Why did the report not reference how this change will impact the students and their learning? Students are not a priority in this report! This is a business model, with government appointed school boards , Communication and feedback to and from parents/communities will be negatively impacted. I love my democratic right to elect a school board trustee who will be accountable and represent my community. Elected school board trustees have a vested interest in my community, not the governments mandate. How fast can major decisions, such as school safety issues, be made if there's no local contact or voice? I am asking that you hear the deep concern in our public voices... Local democratically elected school boards are the best choice for my community. Local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities. Sincerely,

As a graduate of Centennial Collegiate in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan it would have been nice to have an economics class or life lesson class. It would have lessons such has filing taxes, importance of health, knowing your rights as a worker, and things that you will in counter once you become a member of society. I know many people say these things should be taught by your parents or you have to experience yourself but if introduced earlier it would help many people out I believe. I know some of these are taught in different class such as in (gym) health class and math class but from my personal experience they were more less brushed over or out right skipped due to time.

As a parent and community member, I am concerned about the community voice in education being lost in our province, if any of the educational governance options as outlined in the Perrin report are pursued. Our board members understand the dynamic of their local communities and the learning needs within. They advocate for students, families, and teachers in schools, and understand the site-specific supports which are needed. This will be lost if we move to further amalgamation of our school divisions. As a teacher, I am concerned due to the workload of the past number of years, and the possibility of it increasing with further amalgamation. We learned new systems for behavior and academic tracking, as well as systems to file our absences, complete accounting tasks, and new ways to assess to gather divisional data for reporting to the province. We did all of this learning while working with renewed curricula - extensively. All of this learning and work came with a price. We gave up a great deal of time away from our classrooms and our students to engage in training to do all of this professional learning. Will we need to do it all again? Where will the training take place? Will I need to drive to a larger center, Regina or Saskatoon, every time there is new centralized professional development to complete? We also dedicated a great deal of time outside of the classroom to all the systems we were required to learn as well as our curricula. This was time that we dedicate as professionals to our careers and our livelihood, but it also impacts our family life and our personal work-life balance. A great deal of stress and pressure has been placed on educators in the past decade, as a result of increased accountability measures and documentation expectations. This would increase further, if new systems are introduced, and if large-scale changes are made by the government to our education system as a whole. As a principal, I am concerned regarding the overwhelming amount of work that will be created by yet another round of amalgamation, if the decision is made to pursue this. The last amalgamation was certainly a great deal of work, to create and learn organizational systems to manage education in our division. We are now at a place in Saskatchewan education, where the sector outcomes are very clear to our teachers and administration. They are also clear to our SCC's and our students. The ship has been built. The resources are in place. Let us sail. Let us work toward realizing learning improvement for our students. Don't rebuild the ship. The costs to the students, families, and educators in this province will be great. If we do not know what costs can be saved, if any, from the options outlined in the Perrin report and they may not be appropriate to pursue at this time. Directors have been charged with saving \$\$'s by finding efficiencies. I expect this is ongoing, and their goal was met last year. Our children and youth in our province are our future. The supports that have been developed and secured for their learning are appropriate for each community in Saskatchewan. Community-specific supports are in danger of being lost, as is the trust of the students, families, communities, and educational staff in Saskatchewan. If the Saskatchewan government wants to see future success for generations of families, continue to dedicate resources to education so there is hope for a growing, qualified workforce in this great province.

Hi, Thanks for you work in reviewing educational governance in Saskatchewan. I think it is important to always be striving to make things better. As a principal I am always thinking, reviewing, and questioning the way we do things for student and adult learning. I believe Prairie Spirit School Division (PSSD) has also stressed this to improve learning for all. However, sometimes the way we are doing things is working. I think the current model is working for our school division and would support keeping it. Effective amalgamation takes time and needs to have the processes thoroughly thought out and in place for change. The current review does seem rushed and I am not confident that all the information has been presented in the event that there is a change in school division boundaries. I do question why separate school divisions are not part of this conversation. I am also concerned with appointed board members. This would be another way that the local voice of communities would be lost. In closing, I do support our current model and would like to see PSSD stay as is. I hope that the review takes all the feedback seriously and will make a decision that is best for the students within Saskatchewan.

Would like to see French taught starting in Grade 1.

My entire Education from elementary school/high school/ University/ Teaching-Administration Career in Education has been in Saskatchewan. We can be proud of our Education System and its governance. For decades our Catholic/Separate School system has worked along side our public system. Please do all you can to ensure that we preserve the good systems we have. School boards must be accountable to the parents of the children we educate. Locally elected boards ensure accountability. Tax payers have a fundamental right and duty to elect those accountable for their children's education. Please ensure that our locally elected boards continue to ensure excellence in our schools and hold the government to account in the education of our children.

I would be disappointed of the division of school divisions transformed into a provincial or regional model. I feel the students receive optimum resources and more focused attention as a result of being in 18 divisional models. Please leave the divisional model as is as we would hate to risk such a good thing.

I see two primary concerns to address: the local nature of education and the costs and benefits of an amalgamation. The local nature of education Education is a local process. Parents and teachers care deeply for the education children receive. If current school boards are eliminated, the connection parents have with a larger school boards will be weakened and damaged. Local board members communicate with community members frequently and those conversations drive their board-level discussions and decisions. School Community Councils currently communicate with school boards and that relationship is useful, strong, and beneficial in Chinook School Division. That relationship would also be damaged if school boards were amalgamated. A larger school board simply could not communicate effectively with large numbers of School Community Councils. These School Community Councils were designed to meet the need for input and connection that was created when school boards were amalgamated 10 years ago. That need still exists.

Costs and benefits of amalgamation The amalgamation 10 years ago was a time consuming and expensive process. Amalgamation required significant energy and focus and it took around 5 years for our culture - including processes, policies, and relationships - to mature. A primary purpose for the last round of amalgamations was to create stable school boards capable of providing full services to all students. This goal was largely achieved. There were also some efficiencies created in larger school divisions due to economies of scale. However, further amalgamation will create little savings because most current school divisions are already large enough to achieve economies of scale. Travel costs required for meetings, professional development, and committee work will likely eliminate any potential savings from any new efficiencies. In Chinook School Division, some schools are separated by over 300 km. In a larger school division the choice between personal contact and cost would demand less personal contact. Over time, schools would become more isolated and independent and this would directly impact learning goals. Let's assume for a moment that significant savings can be achieved through further amalgamation and that the decision will be made to sacrifice personal interaction and culture in order to save money. Even if these decisions are made, the amalgamation process would be extremely costly. New personnel have to be put in place, a new board has to be chosen, new policies and procedures have to be developed, new agreements have to be negotiated, new departments have to be created, and thousands of other decisions have to be made. Add the costs, both financial and human, required to develop a new culture and identity and the overall loss of productivity is enormous. Given the current fiscal realities in Saskatchewan, school boards cannot afford a restructuring.

Thank you in advance for asking for comments regarding this potential significant change to education! I have been a chairperson on the SCC at _____ for 3 years. I have had the pleasure to work with our locally elected school board members who have provided strong support for our school. I am concerned about losing that local voice and what that will mean for decisions regarding our school. I am so proud of Chinook and its initiatives with regards to reading and math! I am concerned that these initiatives may be put on hold with a potential amalgamation to get the whole province on the same page. When you are a leader that can actually cause some frustrations to have to wait for others to catch up! Thank you again for hearing my concerns!

I am _____ with Regina Public Schools, an employee for the last _____ years here in Regina. I am also a member of my local 3766 and very thankful for my union and our collective agreement. I am very concerned about the recommendations/options that have been put together and such a rushed fashion. I don't see how these options and I quote..." Will focus on student success while ensuring accountability and efficient operational structures within the education system". The government gave Dan Perrins three weeks to study the amalgamations/restructuring and write his report. Why did Mr. Perrins recommend reduced school divisions and appointed trustees? There has been no meaningful public consultation, and a change of this scale has the potential for many errors. Why is the government rushing this? There's no evidence or report that states amalgamated/re-structured school boards and government appointed trustee's and CEO, will save money. It will only guarantee that the parents, workers and communities have no voice. Please stop this.

My request is that there be as little centralization as possible. Students benefit most from having decisions regarding their education made at the local level by locally elected school boards. I understand the need to examine the present system and would whole-heartedly support the lessening of administration at the top end thus freeing up funding to be used in the schools, on the front lines so to speak, to provide up-to-date programs for students. In the same vein I would be so in favour of having less pre-testing and more actual teaching, so that students master the required skills. Please keep in mind that all students do not learn at the same time, in the same way and therefore, need to have programming and accommodations that best suit them. As a retired teacher it troubles me that there was such a limited time frame for this process and very little time allowed for input from communities/stake-holders. Thank you for reading my concerns.

I've searched for information on how your proposed changes would affect our school division but found vague possibilities. Will someone please explain how the Perrin report will affect prairie spirit!

#1 After reviewing the three options outlined in the report, I cannot see how any of them will benefit education for students in the unique and complex bi-provincial nature of Lloydminster. As a citizen of Lloydminster and Alberta resident, I have grave concerns that my tax dollars supporting education, will not be used exclusively to support the children in the city of Lloydminster and the Lloydminster Public School Division. Under the current structure of locally elected boards, our trustees are able to provide the necessary resources to "determine program and service levels to respond to community needs and interests" for the students of Lloydminster. #2 The Lloydminster Charter clearly establishes a finding structure that has served the educational sector very well for the past 84 years. Within this formal structure, students are funded based on their province of residency and each Board of Education then harmonizes that funding to provide seamless service to students of Lloydminster Public and Catholic school divisions. The restrictions within the charter that ensure Alberta funding remains within the City of Lloydminster would make it difficult, if not impossible to provide equitable service across an expanded division that would not be bound by a seamless delivery philosophy. #3 Equity for all Lloydminster students is a challenge that arises from differential funding by the two provinces. The equity principle has always been important to the residents of Lloydminster, indeed, so important that the City established a municipal levy (imbedded in the Lloydminster Charter) to ensure equity of opportunity and seamless delivery of services to students across the City. This allows the school division to ensure services such as Per-Kindergarten, Drivers Education, and Transportation are delivered equitably regardless of province of residence or school attended within the City of Lloydminster. #4 It is my belief that the five challenges identified in pages 20 and 21 of the Educational Governance Review Report can all be met effectively through amendments to legislation, regulations and policy. It would be considerably less disruptive to continue with elected boards working under new mandates, regulations and expectations. Thank You!

Having listened to the news reports on this issue as well as a preliminary review of the website these are my comments. I am opposed to consolidating the school boards and appointing board members to oversee the education curriculum in the province. The appointing of board members will remove objectivity in the decision making process and instead it will become a partisan process. Generally speaking, locally elected officials tend to be more collaborative in their processes. Also, parents take full advantage of access to their superintendents to deal with issues that are often of a local nature. Having a top down bureaucratic structure does eliminate the ability for individuals to voice real concerns. I think that the Saskatchewan Government should focus their concerns on student needs. To deal with increased enrolment, new students to our country, and to address systemic barriers to indigenous children they need to ensure there is adequate support in terms of teaching staff, counsellors, speech pathologists and educational assistants. This is the true challenge we face in the coming year. To me, the best way to reduce crime and improve economic prosperity is to invest heavily in our youth. Not only is this a moral imperative but it provides many spinoff effects for years to come.

I taught school for some 30 years in both elementary and high school levels and was principal for a number of those years. These years were spent in both public and Catholic schools and most of them were in rural communities. Over the many years, especially as principal, the local trustees I worked with were very dedicated to their school. On occasion some of them helped save money by doing maintenance work to help beautiful the yard or even in the school, without pay. There was always great concern for the safety and well being of the students, staff, and the school bus needs. They also saw problems developing and were able to deal with them locally. How can administrators know the needs of schools hundreds of miles away? And probably these administrators would receive phenomenal salaries whereas the local trustees are paid a mere stipend for their meetings and dedicated services. I fear we are moving away from the people's rights and moving to "top heavy" style of government. Let's get back to the Saskatchewan spirit of our ancestors who built the schools and cared for them locally. May the people who ultimately make these decisions involve people from the rural areas. Thank you. Sincerely,

Grade 5-8 should have more exams on Math and English class during the school year as high school students do.

Keep our school boards local and show that students and education matters

<http://www.smithsonianmag.com/innovation/why-are-finlands-schools-successful-49859555/> Investing in our education will pay off. Cutting funding is demonstrating pure ignorance. Amalgamation is not the answer. We have diverse needs in our province and having divisions that are able to serve their population the best they can is what is important.

I am a support worker and a part of the cupe If there is a possibility that we may be forced to join another Division, therefore, adopt their collective agreement, I would not be for this change. Our union has worked very hard to get us the benefits and pension that we have, and I don't want to give that up. Please consider this when making your decision.

I've reviewed the Perkins report and feel that boards comprised of local people provide important feedback and direction required for the education system. My Dad is a current board member and although the election appointment is good, the bad is that some people elected are just there for a free ride and no one is able to fire them since they are elected. I believe Some sort of hybrid system would be best as to ensure accountability and provide local voice and input. Connection to your customer is important in business and this local voice is similar in this way.

My family with four children attending school in the rural area of Prairie Valley School Division oppose the proposal of a provincial school model and the regional model. We do not understand how a process that involved and time consuming would be a way to save the province financially. We believe that the current Division boundaries are the best way to meet the needs of the students in all areas, especially rural. We need a local board that understands rural needs and limitations and can represent us properly so that our children's education doesn't suffer at the hands of a board who doesn't understand rural education. Bigger is not better. The students needs should be the top priority in this situation. For that reason, the current division boundaries and model is the one that should remain in place. Focus on the children and their education and make sure it isn't disrupted by amalgamations again.

My husband and I feel that the way the school divisions and boards are set up now is an appropriate system that puts the education of our children in the hands of local people. No one likes to be a "number" or "statistic". We all crave the personal touch as far as service of any kind, whether in our day to day adult lives or as a student in our schools. Our children's needs are better met by local school boards/divisions and council members have a vested interest in the well being of the local people/students they serve.

I am with Regina Public Schools, an employee for the last years here in Regina. I am very concerned about the recommendations/options that have been put together and such a rushed fashion. I don't see how these options and I quote..." will focus on students success while ensuring accountability and efficient operational structures within the education system". The government gave Dan Perrins three weeks to study the amalgamations/restructuring and write his report. Why did Mr. Perrins recommend reduced school divisions and appointed trustees? There has been no meaningful public consultation, and a change of this scale has the potential for many errors. Why is the government rushing this? There's no evidence or report that states amalgamated/restructured school boards and government appointed trustees and CEO, will save money. It will only guarantee that the parents, workers and communities have no voice. Please stop this! The public feedback supports our existing school division boundaries and keeping our democratic process of elected school boards. Why would the government want to change this? Why was this not brought up during the elections? I love my job working with students and they are my priority every day when I go to work. Why did the report not reference how this change will impact the students and their learning? Students are not a priority in this report! This is a business model, with government appointed school boards, Communication and feedback to and from parents/communities will be negatively impacted. I love my democratic right to elect a school board trustees who will be accountable and represent my community. Elected school board trustees have a vested interest in my community, not the governments mandate. How fast can major decisions, such as school safety issues, be made if there's no local contact or voice? I am asking that you hear the deep concern in our public voices...Local democratically elected school boards are the best choice for my community. Local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities. Sincere,

Why are there only four options provided? The Saskatchewan government has not been transparent with their spending. They have falsified their "balanced budget" during the election year. With poor spending by the government, I feel we have lost focus on what is the most important and beneficial to our children and students. We are hurting Saskatchewan's future when we are forced to increase class sizes, decrease the support system for students, and make budget cuts, therefore cutting funding on programs in schools. These are the future doctors, nurses, teachers, lawyers, construction workers, etc. of our province. It is not fair to our students to have them face the consequences of questionable choices made at the provincial government level. The demographic of students are very different between schools, let alone divisions. Schools are not business and should not be treated as so. The First Nations students and other minorities will be paying the price for the amalgamated divisions. Both minor and serious issues will be unable to be dealt with individually and on a local level. With removing our student's support systems within schools our provincial grad rates will decline. Above all, you have yet to demonstrate what the direct financial benefits will be by implementing one of your four options. The people of Saskatchewan deserve to be given more information before we are asked to make a decision of this magnitude.

You need to value children. They are our counties greatest resource. Teachers play a key role in them. Start to respect and value their time and profession. KEEP IT SIMPLE!

As a parent it worries me that the focus in this document is on how efficiently money is being spent, and on how accountable the education minister is. Efficiency in public funding is a means to an end, and education outcomes are surely the most critical factor here. I don't see any assurances in this report that the money saved will be passed to the schools, where it belongs. The Education Quality Council sounds like a data gathering exercise. There are 35 children in my son's class and the education system is failing him. His teacher faces an impossible task teaching these children effectively already, without being burdened with still more data gathering. Why isn't there a cap on class sizes in the Saskatchewan system, as there is in every other province aside from PEI? I speak to my children's teachers regularly and hear that they are the last to be consulted about management exercises in the education system. This is a considerable shortcoming that should be a requirement in your governance system. Things look very different at the sharp end. If things must be changed, then I prefer option 2, regional school systems, but with the caveat that school districts are given the support they need during this transition so that they don't take their eye off the ball during the restructure. Saskatchewan is already way behind the curve when it comes to elementary and secondary education, funding is too low, and the province cannot afford distractions. Slash school board staff numbers, find an accountable middle management that is measured on its performance, and ensure that those savings are passed onto schools, where they can be spent on appropriate measures such as reducing class size and investing in infrastructure. It would be nice to have computers that turned on properly, and a computer coding element to our provincial curriculum so that my children are better prepared for their future. Yes, drive efficiency into the school board system, but then increase the education budget. Get the money to the schools where it is needed.

Catholic Education is important to us.

As a parent of an elementary school student I am concerned regarding the consultation process. The first I've heard of anything was 15 minutes ago via a Facebook post. How can the public be part of a process when they are unaware? Shame on the SK government - huge lack of transparency and lack of consultation with those that are affected. Leads one to believe the decisions have already been made.

As parents of four children in school ranging from kindergarten to Grade 9, we have a vested interest in this governance review. We thank Mr. Perrins for his time and energy in preparing the report. Because the first question that comes to mind is, "Why is the provincial government conducting a governance review?" comments will focus on the six points in the purpose section of the report that outlines requirements of governance structure. Before we do that, it is worth pointing out that the government has not laid out a clear vision on what they want out of "transformational change" in education. Do they want higher graduation rates? Do they want increased proficiency in reading, writing or math? Do they want higher PISA scores? Is this an elaborate cost cutting measure? Or is this a political or ideological move? It is rather concerning that the government has undertaken something they themselves call transformational, yet they have not articulated into what the education system is to transform. The report outlines its purpose, but the purpose of commissioning the report in the first place is unclear. If we underwent major restructuring and amalgamations just 10 years ago, what did that not accomplish that any new structural changes will? And what assurance do we have that this round will accomplish what the previous didn't when no vision has been laid in front of the electorate—especially parents? We shall now proceed to comment on the six attributes defined as requirements for K-12 education governance structure: 1) Achieve improved student outcomes in keeping with Saskatchewan's Plan for Growth and the ESSP: An overriding philosophy underlying our thoughts on this, and many parts of the report, is subsidiarity—that which can be handled at the local level, closest to the people affected by decisions, should be addressed at the local level. Parents and the teachers their children see every day have the most direct impact on student outcomes. When outcomes are below expected levels, parents have local redress under our current structure. We have locally-elected representatives to be our advocates. Removing that would slow progress and reduce agility and responsiveness inherent in the current decentralized structure. With the ESSP being only a few years old, and progress across the province being realized, creating major disruption in the system will only stall that momentum and be very detrimental to our children. Harm to learning and progress in the ESSP would far outweigh any perceived gains through restructuring. 2) Maintain and improve the quality of instruction for all students, wherever they live: This is linked to the first point in many ways. The provincial curriculum already establishes a provincial standard of instruction. If there is a perceived flaw in the quality of instruction, perhaps the foundation of curriculum needs to be reviewed more than governance structures. To obtain quality instruction requires hiring quality teachers (and other educational staff), professional growth and job satisfaction. All of these can be achieved within the current structure. Perhaps more standardization can be achieved, but there are many ways to accomplish this in a more practical and less disruptive way. We have significant concerns about job satisfaction of educators, and therefore the quality of instruction, should the government decide to centralize governance. Trends in organizational structure lean toward empowering employees (again, the notion of subsidiarity).

Empowering employees leads to more engaged staff members, which leads to higher job satisfaction, which leads to higher quality work. Higher quality work in the education sector leads to improved quality of instruction and higher learning outcomes. Centralizing governance and decision making would have the opposite effect. 3) Achieve cost-containment by maximizing the use of resources: The report states that boards across the province achieved almost double the cost-savings and efficiencies that was requested. There have been various news reports about divisions sharing bus services and forming a conglomerate to purchase equipment (beyond the divisions involved in the 18 new P3 schools). It appears divisions and boards get the message that things can be done differently to save money—without forming one mega-division or larger regional divisions. Economies of scale also have limits. The curve of marginal cost eventually flattens out, and at some point, other costs start outstripping the savings. From what we have read, amalgamations and forming centralized governing bodies do not save money. Costs can be maintained and resources maximized with minor adjustments to procedures or practice within the existing governance structure. Perhaps it is time we start using the word investment when referring to our education system. It is an investment that bears much fruit both individually and collectively. Getting value (which includes both cost and quality) requires some degree of investment. 4) Ensure consistent, effective and efficient business processes: As with many aspects of this report, there appears to be an assumption that there is an inherent lack of something in the existing governance structure that will be rectified if we just change a governance model. This seems to be the case here for effective and efficient business processes. There may be a case for consistency, but again, we like to think that having a provincial curriculum automatically installs a high degree of consistency in education. If consistency does need to be improved across the province, there are ways to address this other than wholesale structural changes. Also, from whose perspective do we determine effectiveness and efficiency? From the government's? From teachers'? From students'? From parents'? Once again, the principal of subsidiarity must be considered. Locally-elected representatives are able to effectively and efficiently respond to needs within a division better than a distant entity. If the report refers to effectiveness and efficiency of local boards, our perspective is that our local board is effective and efficient. Perhaps that's not the case across the province, but those skills can be taught to board members and maintain local representation. And democracy has a cost—a cost we are happy to bear. There are governance structures throughout the world that have very little monetary cost. But they are repressive, leaving the marginalized behind. The human cost makes those systems very expensive, and our own democratic principles priceless. 5) Improve accountability and transparency through clear lines of authority and responsibility: Lines of accountability and authority seem to be already clear. A desire for increased government control does not automatically make it more so. In fact, recent reports about the government being rebuked by the privacy commissioner three times over a lack of transparency with the GTH land deals casts a very long, dark shadow over the claim a structure giving it more control would increase transparency. Reporting processes and procedures (if needed) could easily be put into place in our existing governance structure. 6) Preserve and strengthen parent and community voice: It seems counterintuitive that removing locally-elected boards and/or moving decisions further away from parents will somehow strengthen our voice. Parental and community engagement is high because we feel our voices are heard, that our concerns matter, that local representatives are responsive to our needs. There is real danger of drowning out the local voice with some of the proposed structural changes. If that were to happen, parents would become disengaged, and that would have a negative effect on learning. In a recent op-ed titled "Local school boards needed more than local health governance" columnist Murray Mandryk clearly stated a view that we share: "Public education delivery involves a specific population sector, intensely needing the system every day for a specific 13-year period, when our kids attend K-12 school. That automatically differentiates the public representation we need." Education is a unique sector, offering a unique and vital service to society. This requires a unique structure that embraces the local voice of parents and the officials we elect to represent us and our children. An irreversible decision detrimental to education in Saskatchewan should not be made because of cyclical financial fluctuations. Our economy will rebound. Keep education strong, and don't subject it to the roller coaster ride of expansion in good times and contraction in bad times—we deserve better than that. Keep locally-elected boards. Stop further amalgamations.

Board members should be elected, not appointed. While I agree appointments could make it possible to guarantee greater range of diversity on the boards, I do not like the proposition of someone who is appointed since they may feel responsible to those who appointed them. At which point they are not looking out for the best interests of the division they serve. I do not particularly like any of the options. 3B seems like something that may have to happen from time to time, that is review division lines, but at a time when the Government is trying to find ways to address the deficit that it finds itself in, I do not think any of these options make sense. The Minister of Education can use the money that it would take to implement any these options and spend the money to help the divisions.

I have read over the report on governance options and can see some of the benefits of moving toward Option 1 but I think that those benefits are outweighed by the many concerns that I have if the province would move towards that model. Whether anyone wants to admit facts or not, many times the rural voice gets lost and I am afraid that our schools, and my children's education, may suffer. I like the fact that there is some local control over my children's educational needs. Division administration can come into a school before making any decisions to see for themselves what may be best for the student(s). When there is a problem of any kind (necessary small repairs, technological, etc.) someone can be there very quickly. I question whether that would happen in Option 1 just because of all of the bureaucracy that may be there. Also, teaching in the different areas of the province has many diverse requirements in many different ways and trying to make things equitable for everyone would be very challenging. Teaching in these different areas also has different needs and negotiating equity among all teachers may be next to impossible. I would be concerned that the voices of urban teachers would be considered more simply because of their numbers. I feel that some of the province's goals could be achieved while sticking with Option 3. We already have some requirements handed down from the Ministry concerning Learning Improvement Plans and such. This could be expanded into other areas of concern for the province. When looking at the comparison charts for the different provinces, we are fairly similar to Manitoba, who is comparable in size and make-up. It is stated in the report that nothing similar to Option 1 has been tried in any other province and I am not comfortable with Saskatchewan being the first of its kind - too much is at stake in the event of a total failure.

I believe the best option for our students and community is to keep the school divisions the same. Schools need locally run school boards who personally know the challenges each individual school might face. There are many different communities in our province and lumping them together is not the best option for anyone. As a teacher, I am worried about the changes and negative consequences an amalgamation could cause.

To The Ministry of Education: I feel very privileged to be a part of the Lloydminster Public School Division. It is a unique division as Lloydminster is a border city and, therefore, our schools represent students from both the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. Thus, we have taxpayers from both provinces funding the needs of this division. We feel that it is important for both Alberta and Saskatchewan residents to have a local voice so that their concerns can be represented and heard. In the past, Lloydminster has endeavored to work hard to ensure that this happens and we feel that in order to continue doing this in the future, the division needs to remain a separate and public entity. We ask that you would consider our unique situation so that the needs of our students and families can be met in the best way possible. I'm sure you would agree with me that we all have our students' best interests in mind.

I support the existing structure - the Division model with Elected members

I don't think there is evidence proving a cost savings to any of the proposed "Transformational Changes". The best options are Realigning existing boundaries and the Division model (8-14 school boards). Realigning the existing boundaries is good because it allows communities a local board and a local choice. Alternatively, it may be beneficial for my community to learn alternative ways of doing business/delivering education. As well, local/regional politics would be less of a challenge when making decisions that make good business sense - as they're less likely to be biased. Which is why I think a Division model makes sense. With any of the other models the resources and services will be eaten up by the larger/urban centres, putting rural communities at a greater disadvantage.

I am concerned about several aspects of this report: 1. The timeline for the report, and the feedback window leaves little time for education stakeholders to meet and discuss the impact of each of the suggested changes in the report. 2. In a democracy, the voice of the people through elected officials is highly important. Without boards of education, the voice of parents and students is lost. Democracy is lost if the government holds all the power to mandate educational practices. 3. The government, removed from the front line of education, should not have the power to mandate and control educational decisions. So far, the government has not proven to be trustworthy to have such power. The decisions that have come down from government concerning student achievement and welfare have not been according to best research and practice. Boards of trustees however, have to be accountable to the people: parents, students, teachers and division employees. Therefore, I believe that the Boards of Education need to be a part of our educational system.

I think that amalgamation would not benefit our learners as needs vary across the province. By staying as individual school divisions we can better support our learners and needs in smaller areas. Each school division is run completely different based on the needs in each area of the province, therefore merging as one would be complete chaos.

To Whom It May Concern: I am a teacher-administrator from Lloydminster Saskatchewan/Alberta. I would like for you to strongly consider the implications of amalgamating Lloydminster Public School Division with any other Saskatchewan school division. Every community is unique and every school division is unique, however Lloydminster is the only school division that is a bi-provincial school division and, unless you have lived and worked in Lloydminster, you probably have no idea what that really means, and therefore have not considered how complex it would be to blend our city's schools with any other division. Let me share some examples of things that will be a major inconvenience due to our bi-provincial status: 1) Special Education Delivery: the funding models in the two provinces are completely different, the coding for services are different, the delivery of services are different and the medical specialist locations are different, either Edmonton or Saskatoon, depending on the side of the border you live on. For some Pre K students in Saskatchewan with special needs there is PreK programming and in Alberta preK students have special PUF funding. These two models are very different and could look very different if they were not managed and organized properly. LPSD has a system in place for serving children with special needs on both sides of the border, and at the same time ensuring that the guidelines of both provinces are followed. This would be a major inconvenience for another division to take on managing, and honestly, even begin to understand. In LPSD this is not an issue. We have been dealing with this for decades. For us, it is seamless. 2) Student funding: about 60% of the students in LPSD live in Alberta. The fund allocations from Saskatchewan and Alberta are different. At this time LPSD is able to ensure a fair and equal delivery model for all Lloydminster students, regardless of address. If LPSD becomes part of a larger Saskatchewan division I would wonder what that would look like since Lloydminster, Alberta taxpayers would not want their money to go to a school in Meadow Lake, for example. So I wonder if, for schools located on the Alberta side of Lloydminster within a large division, would there be a 2 tier system where those schools have access to resources that the other schools do not receive? Again, that is not a problem in LPSD, it has been figured out and runs smoothly with no inequalities, however I hope you have considered what this might look like if changes were to happen. 3) Driver's Education: Something simple, but in LPSD all students have access to free driver's education, as is the case for all Saskatchewan students. Would the students that live in Alberta not have access to this? Would we have a 2-tier system within a school? Who knew that something as simple as driver's education needed to be considered so that we did not have a system of "haves" and "have nots"? LPSD has known this and figured it out for all students. 4) Time: Lloydminster is in a different time-zone than the rest of the province. This may seem like it is not a big deal, but I do hope that you have considered that the schools in Lloydminster would also require access to any division office personnel that would be needed to support us in case of an emergency. As an experienced administrator I know that it is often the calls that come in at 4:00 that require the most attention and support. Even for the purpose basic management, it is often after 4:30 when I would have time in my day to communicate with a superintendent. I do hope that wherever a new division office is located, it will remain open until 6:00PM Saskatchewan time so the schools in Lloydminster have equal access to supports as other schools in the larger division would. On the topic of appointed or elected boards, I do wonder if there would be an inequality of the rights and freedoms of non-Catholic citizens should public school boards be appointed and our Catholic neighbors within the same get the right to vote for their school board representation. Amalgamation of school divisions, in general, has shown that it does not save money and is not necessarily effective, therefor I do not see the purpose of Saskatchewan going through this again, and certainly with such little planning, consultation and preparation (<http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/saskatchewan/school-board-amalgamations-john-weins-1.3855670>). If the focus of transformational change is to spend less money, then I think that there are other options that would be less drastic and at the same time more effective. I do think there are areas within administration and spending that could be tightened up within our Saskatchewan school divisions. Perhaps the threat of amalgamation will inspire divisions to tighten their belts a bit more. Perhaps guidelines on spending in certain areas can be adopted and implemented, rather than creating enormous divisions where schools are just one of many, teachers become islands without support and students are just a number. Thanks for your time.

I think it is crazy that you are basing this on a 3 week study! SLOW DOWN! I feel you are making rash decisions to save money now. Please think that taking away from our children's education now will end up costing you more money in the future. Our schools are already understaffed!! Children who need help do not always have the resources available to them. You make these insane cuts you will only end up spending more to help pay for all of the uneducated, children in the future as they will not be employable. Please look at the bigger picture education is so important, it is not a place to make cuts. Our Children are our future they are important and worth it!!

We need to keep the power of school boards within our community by having elected school boards. This is about transparency and support for our children.

Good evening: I would like to express my deepest disappointment in the leadership that I helped to elect. The thought of 1 to 4 divisions in our province is ridiculous. Yes, we need to make changes in some areas, but let's not go overboard. What is Saskatchewan coming to? We are made up of many rural and urban settings all of which have unique needs, characteristics, challenges and wants. We need all of these to be heard through a local voice /school board. Education seems to be taking a hit with funding as of late and we need to change that. Schools need money to run quality programming for their students so they can meet the needs of all of their students and be able to do so in a realistic class size. Widen the division boundaries, if that is what makes you sleep at night. But please refrain from making unreasonable changes as some of your options suggest you may. My husband and I have two children in the education system and I am worried for them. You need to take the public's concerns into consideration. Don't ruin Saskatchewan's education system more than it has already been. Thank you for your time.

I am _____ with Regina Public Schools, an employee for the last _____ years here in Regina. I am very thankful for my union and our collective agreement. I am very concerned about the recommendations/options that have been put together and such a rushed fashion. I don't see how these options and I quote..." Will focus on student success while ensuring accountability and efficient operational structures within the education system". The government gave Dan Perrins three weeks to study the amalgamations/restructuring and write his report. Why did Mr. Perrins recommend reduced school divisions and appointed trustees? There has been no meaningful public consultation, and a change of this scale has the potential for many errors. Why is the government rushing this? There's no evidence or report that states amalgamated/re-structured school boards and government appointed trustee's and CEO, will save money. It will only guarantee that the parents, workers and communities have no voice. Please stop this ! The public feedback supports our existing school division boundaries and keeping our democratic process of elected school boards. Why would the government want to change this? Why was this not brought up during the elections? I love my job working with students and they are my priority every day when I go to work. Why did the report not reference how this change will impact the students and their learning? Students are not a priority in this report! This is a business model, with government appointed school boards , Communication and feedback to and from parents/communities will be negatively impacted. I love my democratic right to elect a school board trustee who will be accountable and represent my community. Elected school board trustees have a vested interest in my community, not the governments mandate. How fast can major decisions, such as school safety issues, be made if there's no local contact or voice? I am asking that you hear the deep concern in our public voices... Local democratically elected school boards are the best choice for my community. Local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities. Sincerely,

I am not in favour of losing our ability to elect a local school board. I feel that the centralization of our school system will have a detrimental effect on our children and staff. There is no better way to know the particular issues of any one school than by having people that are there and that have a vested interest in the success of the school. I understand the need for cost saving measures, but I don't believe centralization saves a significant amount of dollars to warrant the detriment to our schools.

It is ludicrous that 18 divisions can be eliminated into 1 division!! There are many sectors that have to be taken into consideration! There are many rural school (some that have smaller enrolments), urban (that have large enrolments) and aboriginal schools. Because the urban schools have more children, more funding and more programs there is less money for rural schools. Yes, we need to cut costs! We do not need all of the hierarchy of divisions which can cost huge amount to the division! Some of these individuals rarely attend meetings! What is needed is Education for our Children!! This is the key to the future, through our Children!! Keep politics out of it!!!!

I agree with the reduction of the number of public school boards in the province, although I think reducing that number to one is too extreme. I'm much more supportive of creating five or six regional, elected school boards throughout the province. I also think that it's worth looking at separate school boards as part of the amalgamation process. Although the separate boards are guaranteed in the Education Act, this government has already demonstrated its willingness to revisit that Act when necessary. Geographically, it makes sense to evaluate the effectiveness of public and separate boards. It also makes sense in light of the recent announcement regarding wage freezes in the public sector.

I feel the current education system is adequate with locally elected boards of education that are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. Local elected boards are the community voice and also important advocates for ensuring excellence in learning that serve the needs of all students which are unique to each school division.. Therefore I support the governance structure of today in educating students in Saskatchewan and strongly believe the status quo should be retained.

I am _____ with Regina Public Schools, an employee for the last _____ years here in Regina. I am very concerned about the recommendations/options that have been put together and such a rushed fashion. I don't see how these options and I quote..." Will focus on student success while ensuring accountability and efficient operational structures within the education system". The government gave Dan Perrins three weeks to study the amalgamations/restructuring and write his report. Why did Mr. Perrins recommend reduced school divisions and appointed trustees? There has been no meaningful public consultation, and a change of this scale has the potential for many errors. Why is the government rushing this? There's no evidence or report that states amalgamated/re-structured school boards and government appointed trustee's and CEO, will save money. It will only guarantee that the parents, workers and communities have no voice. Please stop this ! The public feedback supports our existing school division boundaries and keeping our democratic process of elected school boards. Why would the government want to change this? Why was this not brought up during the elections? I love my job working with students and they are my priority every day when I go to work. Why did the report not reference how this change will impact the students and their learning? Students are not a priority in this report! This is a business model, with government appointed school boards , Communication and feedback to and from parents/communities will be negatively impacted. I love my democratic right to elect a school board trustee who will be accountable and represent my community. Elected school board trustees have a vested interest in my community, not the governments mandate. How fast can major decisions, such as school safety issues, be made if there's no local contact or voice? I am asking that you hear the deep concern in our public voices... Local democratically elected school boards are the best choice for my community. Local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities. Sincerely,

I am urging the government of Saskatchewan to seriously consider the impact of the proposed 'Transformational Change'. Once again, it is the rural sector that will take the hit. Chinook School Division is already the largest in the Province with 42,000 square kilometres and 61 schools. The Perrins report recommended that areas larger than 43,000 square kilometres would be difficult to properly manage. Not to mention that each geographical location has its own culture, so to speak, producing different educational needs and supports. This makes even a regional board or a larger divisional board ineffective. Right now, Waldeck school continues to have a voice through the Chinook School Division. Who will be concerned about small schools like Waldeck, Wymark, Stewart Valley, Success, etc. if there's one Provincial board? We think we'll cut administration costs? I think we'll pile it higher and deeper with sub committee after sub committee once it's realized that all these needs cannot all be looked after by one board. You say it won't close schools? It will. History proves it. You say it comes down to dollars and cents? Tell that to a family whose child already rides the bus 2 hours a day with the threat of an even longer bus ride if their local school is closed. How about the family whose child is thriving at a smaller school because they are no longer just a number. Another problem with this Governance Review is that Catholic and Francophone schools are not included. And they weren't in 2006 either. Our tax dollars go equally to those systems, as well as Public. And yet their boards are once again unaffected. Doesn't make sense, does it? Are there areas where costs could be cut? Most likely. Are there some school boards that still could use some trimming and tightening up? I would say yes. Is it a good idea to have one single provincial education board? I cringe at the thought for all rural schools. Education belongs to the community, not some appointed provincial board that is looking strictly at numbers. These are our kids. This is our future. The future of Saskatchewan. Please, consider the huge impact this decision could have on the rural sector.

I am writing in response to the K-12 Governance Review. I am fortunate to have had a variety of experiences with Saskatchewan schools and school divisions.

_____ fully support the goal of strengthening early literacy skills and and graduation rates for Saskatchewan students. I also appreciate the information included in Mr. Perrin's report. However, I do not understand how any of the options outlined benefit Saskatchewan students, their families and their communities. As a former rural Saskatchewan teacher, interactions with my former students' families suggest to me that the options outlined in the report will strengthen the feelings of alienation already experienced by many after the 2007 amalgamation of school divisions. As a mother of children who attend a francophone school division and a Catholic school division, my experience with other families attending those schools suggests that they feel their unique voice and experiences are in danger of being ignored. In my role as an employee of the school division with Saskatchewan's highest enrolment I have yet to hear anyone speak to the advantages of any of the options listed. I would respectfully suggest that government seek further input from Saskatchewan parents and the voting public before undertaking such a dramatic restructuring. Sincerely,

As a parent and educator who attended the information meeting held by our school division and board I am concerned about the proposed changes. I feel there is not enough information about what these changes will be and I am even more concerned with the impact that these changes will have on the learning and well being of our children. Our focus needs to be on the well being, growth and success of our children. When I hear about these changes it seems the focus is on cost saving and efficiency rather than learning and student needs. Please help us ensure that our focus remains where it needs to be, on the children.

Hello, I have been a teacher with the Regina Catholic School Division for 20 years, and I find this situation quite disconcerting. Why is the current structure not considered as a choice? The report states in its Benefits/Challenges that during the transition period, a focus on restructuring may compromise the focus on student outcomes in the Plan for Growth and ESSP. If we are already behind in so many educational statistics, we should not be doing anything that will negatively impact on our students' growth. What proof is there that this possible regression will only be temporary? My local board is able to address concerns in my community. Each of the communities in our province is different, with varying needs and challenges. How fair is it to the members of these communities to make decisions on their behalf without having the experience to knowledgeable fund or support these needs? I am astounded at the mention of hiring a CEO, and continued use of LEAN. My years of teaching have shown me that educating our youth to become leaders of tomorrow is NOT a business. LEAN was created to improve efficiency in factories. How have we come to the point where our government considers our children to be nothing short of factory generated statistics??? The goals written in the report, (for example, "By June 30, 2020, 80 per cent of students will be at grade level or above in reading, writing and math.") do not take into account the current socioeconomic state of the families in our province, or the limitations in our classrooms. How many Instructional Assistants and support staff will we lose? Have you figured out what will happen to our already overcrowded classrooms? There is also huge concern for our locally bargained agreements, especially in terms of prep time, and specialists. In order for our students to get the best education, it is imperative that we have teachers who are knowledgeable about their subject matter. Even the most well-rounded teacher cannot be an expert in everything, and specialist prep teachers need to factor in to this equation. Science teachers, Teacher Librarians to support classroom teachers with resources and resource based learning, Phys Ed teachers...they all play a huge role, and they are integral to building our strongest generations to come. There has not been enough time to properly weigh all of the possible ideas, and the report has left out the most valuable solution; to continue with the status quo, and make changes (if needed) within this structure. Our students...our future is worth more than a cursory glance and slash.

Family and friends please take 2 minutes to copy and paste and sign this letter! Email it to:

K12govconsultations@gov.sk.ca January 18, 2017 K-12 Education Governance Review Advisory Panel, After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report we would offer the following feedback: - We do not support any of the three models presented in the report and ultimately we wish to remain a part of Prairie Valley School Division - We do support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). - Currently under the direction of the Prairie Valley School Division we celebrate some of the highest performance scores in Reading and Math as well as extraordinary High School graduation rates. What guarantee is there that these standards of excellence will be maintained through provincial amalgamations? - It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! We do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. - Our current Prairie Valley School Division board member is very visible in our schools and community. Provincially appointed board members will not be as accessible, nor will they know their communities' needs. - We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support the change to governance or how further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. - We have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold. Rural communities thrive, grow, and revolve around their schools. Closing schools will "close" small town Saskatchewan. - Nearby schools are at maximum capacity and there are great concerns for distance, safety, and time spent on buses for rural children. - We need a permanent high school plan to accommodate the best interests of our students, their families, and our community, as well as a permanent high school transportation plan. - We would rather our students be part of a smaller school, than being in overcrowded classrooms in larger centers. This is one of the reasons people choose to reside in rural areas. - Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in. - In Mr. Perrin's report the opening letter to Minister Morgan states that ALL stakeholders who approached Mr. Perrin for conversation UNANIMOUSLY support elected boards and NO more amalgamations! WHY would we continue with pursuing drastic changes?

I am a parent of five kids and with the proposed changes coming down the line - it will greatly effect what goes on for our rural school and for my kids that attend this said rural school. As a rural resident my whole life, first in ab, and now in sk, amalgamation most often results in the rural communities losing services while paying more. Why? Because centralization always gravitates towards cities. This causes us to lose jobs, increase bus rides and reduces our say, as proportionally our population is low, even though our land mass is high. How many reps on the current advisory board are rural?? How many will be in amalgamated boards?? We represent the largest land mass, and lowest population. This is why we don't do well. Our needs are so different from urban areas, and we are never ever well represented by urban centric boards. If there are divisions that are not efficient, and not doing a good job, fix those divisions. Don't break what is working in other divisions. Reduce the number of administration, both in the provincial system as well as the school divisions themselves. Monitor closely the "training" dollars spent...locations and durations. Monitor the cost of adding new curriculum, and stop focusing on dumping technology in schools, which I think is a waste of money, really my kids do not need to experience smart boards, have access to laptops, and watch educational TV in schools. Rural divisions do not do well in amalgamation. Please do not lump us in with "unlike divisions", where we lose our funding, lose our voice, and in the long run, lose our children. Here are my concerns - what is the amalgamation timeline – Why the rush? - What benefit or harm will this have on our students? - How can such an important decision be made in such a short time frame? - Why are only the public school divisions being forced to amalgamate and not the separate school divisions? - How will our rural community be represented in these new models? Will we simply become a number? - How much money will be saved with each model? - How will they know the needs of each region? Please Please! take the time to review these things VERY carefully!!!

I am a civil engineer, a former long term public servant whose career was in a large decentralized department. I was also an educator for three years very early in my working life, teaching middle and high school students and was a town councillor for eight years. I attended rural schools for my entire public school education; my children were educated in the public school system in Regina. It with this background that I provide the following comments. Parents and the community at large consider their elected board member an extremely important component of the education system. Whether it's parents wanting a contact person to address education issues outside the bounds of the community itself or community leaders wanting a forum to discuss common infrastructure needs or other similar issues, having an individual who understands their individual or community who is accountable because they're elected is extremely valuable. Increasing the size of the zones or moving to an appointed board would both be seen as regressive for our public education system. There are a number of changes that should be addressed including improving efficiencies and managing administrative costs. However, this can all be accomplished without destroying the current governance structure and introducing the less measurable but very real costs of disruption associated with another round of amalgamations. Finally, I am very concerned with the continually reduction in the quality of our education system as measuref by the Pisa results over the last decade or so. The priority for government is to develop a strategy to reverse this unsatisfactory downward trend and demand that the Ministry develop a strategy and plan to return the province as a leader in education - not the province now rated at lower than every other province in Canada. Wasting resources on what, in my opinion, is a relatively insignificant issue while the results of our education have regressed to where our system is now at or near the worst in the country is a bit like Nehru playing the fiddle while Rome was burning. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to make my views known.

RCSD has been efficient, effective and stakeholder centered. This report fails to acknowledge what the issue is - to improve student achievement or to save money? Locally elected school boards provide the best opportunity for students to succeed. Addressing needs from parents, staff, students and community has been the foundation for improving the relationships amongst stakeholders and the success is seen in our above provincial level outcomes in almost all areas. Elected boards provide the local voice and incumbents who are acclaimed are also the 'local voice' - not appointed. Appointed boards provide no accountability to the community - only to government. Amalgamation will take all efforts away from the improved ESSP rates and is NOT student or local community centred. Shared services, not amalgamation is a better solution for finding efficiencies. We have the fewest boards in Canada. The 1% of governance costs provides a huge shield to inquiries and is a broker for both parents and government in resolving issues of concern. Non of the options are the right choice - status quo on school boards with improved shared services may achieve whatever the government is seeking to fix, however, the system is working and doesn't need fixing. If there are individual boards causing concern, government should address those issues directly and not completely overhaul the entire system for a few irresponsible boards. Keep our education system local and let the whole village raise the children we need for tomorrow to be intelligent, active in the community and proudly represent our Saskatchewan fabric.

School boards need to be accountable to the public they serve (ie elected), not appointed by the provincial government whose hypothetical employees would be influenced and beholden to the government, not students and their families. Amalgamating school divisions would disregard regional needs. Urban and rural divisions are significantly different, and cannot effectively be lumped into one. Saving money at the expense of education isn't acceptable.

I don't believe that much is to be gained in terms of student achievement or engagement by making further amalgamations. It doesn't seem that this has been approached through the lens of learning, achievement or engagement - saving money seems to be the only focus. There are certainly some efficiencies that can be found but I don't believe that wide scale amalgamation is the correct solution. Cuts to education in the name of saving money end up costing more in the long run as costs for health care, social support, and justice increase when students don't graduate with a strong education.

I do have a concern with how this will affect The Key First Nation's (Key Band) current Tuition Agreement with the GSSD. The Governance Structure consists of a board member from The Key First Nation. How will our Tuition Agreement be affected? Will we lose our representation?

I think the Northern board should be left alone ! We need representatives that understand the needs of our children.

We need locally elected board members to uphold the Catholic teaching in our schools. If the government abolishes that, it will definitely be infringing on religious freedom!

I believe locally elected boards are important for local school success. Community needs are so diverse in this province, local representatives have a better view of their community's specific needs than a more generic and/or centralized governance system. As well, local elections provide a necessary check and balance in our democracy for our most important investment: our future. As teachers, we are expected to cater to the diverse needs in our classrooms, and in something as crucial to the future of our province as education, I expect the same from our government. I believe diverse needs across our province are best addressed by locally-elected representatives.

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report we would offer the following feedback: We do not feel that the options presented in this report will result in significant cost savings without negatively impacting the quality of education for our students, eroding community voice, and affecting the sustainability of our community. We support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for students and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). We do not support the concept of an appointed Board of Education. We believe local voice is an essential part of a successful school-community relationship. We do not support any of the 3 models presented in the report. We feel forced amalgamation puts our school, and many like it, at risk of closure. We want to know what potential changes there will be to the rural school closure thresholds that are currently legislated. We feel this is a critical consideration in evaluating the options. We would like to see a permanent solution for high school transportation and are concerned what impact forced amalgamation will have on bus ride times for our students. We believe that further progress can be made in existing school divisions to find sector-wide efficiencies and cost-savings and recognize that the government may need to be more directive in requiring these sector-wide efficiencies to be realized.

To whom it may concern: I believe the school boards should remain as they are, with parents, students and concerned citizens of the community who are locally elected. Thank you for giving us a chance to voice our concerns.

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report we would offer the following feedback: We do not feel that the options presented in this report will result in significant cost savings without negatively impacting the quality of education for our students, eroding community voice, and affecting the sustainability of our community. We support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for students and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). We do not support the concept of an appointed Board of Education. We believe local voice is an essential part of a successful school-community relationship. We do not support any of the 3 models presented in the report. We feel forced amalgamation puts our school, and many like it, at risk of closure. We want to know what potential changes there will be to the rural school closure thresholds that are currently legislated. We feel this is a critical consideration in evaluating the options. We would like to see a permanent solution for high school transportation and are concerned what impact forced amalgamation will have on bus ride times for our students. We believe that further progress can be made in existing school divisions to find sector-wide efficiencies and cost-savings and recognize that the government may need to be more directive in requiring these sector-wide efficiencies to be realized. Sincerely,

Bigger is not always better. There is a saying " where the money is, there is the power" One large division, what happens to the little guys? The educational assistants? The special ed students? The children with disabilities? The small rural schools? The new Canadians? The children who need speech language consultants? Or social workers? And the teachers who multi task daily to keep up with all of the above.

This seems pretty much summed up into following the healthcare footprints. I am saddened to see it go this way. Our children are our future, and education should never be compromised. I feel the decision has already been put into motion, even though 4 options are out there. For the children who need extra assistance in the classroom, will all the Educational Assistant positions be cut. Do these children need to struggle even more? Will there be quicker and shorter wait time for children to get the assistance they need? Example, meeting with speech pathologist? Mental health etc? So many children already slip through the cracks due to funding. I find it hard to believe merging school divisions will have a positive feedback for children who already need extra guidance.

Good Evening I am _____ with Regina Public Schools, an employee for the last _____ years here in Regina. Over the past few weeks I have become very concerned about the recommendations/options that have been put together in such a rushed fashion. I don't see how these options and I quote..." Will focus on student success while ensuring accountability and efficient operational structures within the education system". The government gave Dan Perrins three weeks to study the amalgamations/restructuring and write his report. Why did Mr. Perrins recommend reduced school divisions and appointed trustees? There has been no meaningful public consultation, and a change of this scale has the potential for many errors. Why is the government rushing this? There's no evidence or report that states amalgamated/re-structured school boards and government appointed trustee's and CEO, will save money. It will only guarantee that the parents, workers and communities have no voice. Please stop this ! The public feedback supports our existing school division boundaries and keeping our democratic process of elected school boards. Why would the government want to change this? Why was this not brought up during the elections? I love my job working with all the students in our school . I take my job very seriously and do it to the very best of my ability each and every day. I specifically work with students that have special needs and I keep wondering why the report did not reference how this change will impact students and their learning? Students are not a priority in this report and they need to be.! This is a business model, with government appointed school boards , Communication and feedback to and from parents/communities will be negatively impacted. I love my democratic right to elect a school board trustee who will be accountable and represent my community. Elected school board trustees have a vested interest in my community, not the governments mandate. How fast can major decisions, such as school safety issues, be made if there's no local contact or voice? I am asking that you hear the deep concern in our public voices... Local democratically elected school boards are the best choice for my community. Local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities

I am NOT in favor of school divisions amalgamating within the province of Saskatchewan. We need to continue to work with other school divisions across the province, however, we do not need to amalgamate to do this. I feel that if we amalgamate, voices will be lost within our own communities and the education of the children will suffer. I strongly feel there will be job losses at the school level and that is not in the best interest for our children. Amalgamations have already happened in the past and many jobs were lost due to the amalgamation and cutbacks, the students were still enrolled and the levels of needs changed according to a formula, not because of the needs of the children. Our students with needs were still enrolled in our schools, yet job losses still occurred during the last amalgamation at school level and that is not for the better education of our children. I urge the government to take a closer look at the needs of the children across the province and provide the resources needed to support them in their learning wherever they may live within the province. There is need in every school division and I would like the government to take the time and money and look at the needs within every school within our province as the education is not the same within the whole province, different resources are needed depending on where you live within the province. Spend the money on the programs and resources needed for the better education of our children. Thank You

I am very disappointed with all four options offered in this report. I grew up in rural SK attending a small k-12 school and am aware of the challenges rural schools face regularly. Over the years, I have had alot of experience with schools booking events and teaching workshops - so I have worked closely with rural, urban, northern and first nations schools throughout the province. And I have a daughter who attends an elementary school in the Saskatoon Public School system. All this to say- I feel I am very aware of the challenges Saskatchewan schools have throughout the province at all different levels and sizes. ALL FOUR options that are being offered will be a LOSS of community for all of these schools. Schools will lose their voice regarding their own unique circumstances and needs. This is NOT what SK schools need- in fact, they need MORE support and resources. Having spent time working in Ontario Schools as well, I have seen firsthand how our education system is lacking in these areas. I am also very confused why the SK government would be proposing such a massive costly undertaking that will create job loss. Put the money where it is needed- support and resources for our students and staff. I hope the decision will be to leave the school divisions as they are right now.

To Premier Brad Wall and to the Honourable Don Morgan, Minister of Education:

I have been

a resident in Regina for the last twelve years. I was born in a small town in Saskatchewan and have lived in Saskatchewan for most of my life,

I have felt a general disregard on behalf of our government as it concerns teachers. It is my personal belief that the development of education in our province, that is the culture of the acceptance of the teacher in the community, has created an expectation of teachers that is no longer reasonable. In the beginning of our province, the teacher was expected to be paid little to nothing, to take part in all community ventures and to be a volunteer exceptionally. As I was studying to become a teacher, this same expectation was presented to us on campus. We started out teaching knowing that our vocation called us to do much more than the average individual. Happily, today our teachers are prepared for the profession with guidelines on avoiding burnout and exhaustion, simply to avoid unpleasant stress leaves which are costly to our students, our schools and our own personal self-esteem. We still do more. As long as we continue to do so, the public in general will continue to expect more, and to disrespect more just what we do and how hard we work. We are parenting and loving the children as well as parenting many of the parents. I wonder why it is that so many countries in the world hold educators in the highest regard while many Canadian parents and students choose disrespect toward us. I am very disappointed with the Saskatchewan government's low opinion of its educators. With this same voice, I choose to admit that I have voted for this government every election because I want to see our people come back to this province. Now I would like to say that if this government implements further amalgamations of our school divisions, I will never vote for this government again. It is time for a new government to stop this ridiculous implementation for regionalization in the name of saving money. We have just recovered from the last regionalization. Surely that was enough! We lived through this in Alberta in 2000 and on. Divisions were joined but we saw no improvement in services and certainly there were no great savings. Shared services were sometimes a benefit, but this in no way was because money was being saved. There was no money being saved, just moved around. A Provincial Model where the government appoints board members is a frightening idea, as is the Model of 4 Regions. I have not seen any reports which prove that the former amalgamations saved any money. Changing boundaries will cost us more money and we will never recoup what was spent in the first place, because it doesn't save any money as far as I can understand. There is no going back from this model once it has been started. And how can we ever consider abandoning the model of electing our local school board representatives. That would be a serious error for all of us; students, communities, stakeholders at every level. What a shame that would be! If anything at all needs to be done, it should be the shifts in governance as described by Mr. Perrin on page 20 of his report to the Minister. I am in favour of standardizing governance costs of board meetings, etc. as described under Consistency- Standardization. Certainly, school community councils need to be reinforced and representation of First Nations must be enabled. These opinions, Honourable Morgan, I humbly submit.

I am from a small town in the Chinook School Division and I believe that the most effective form of governance is what we currently have. I would strongly suggest option 3. Thank you for your time.

Good Evening, Please see my comments below in regards to the upcoming Proposed Changes to the Saskatchewan Education System as recommended by Dan Perrins K-12 Education Governance report. In regards to the options outlined in the report - I am in favor of Option 3B: Realigning Boundaries. My children go to school in the Chinook School Division which the second largest school (in regards to area covered) division in the province. I understand the need for review and to determine if the Education System can operate more efficiently in regards to finances. However - additional change to the Chinook School Division (eg. increasing the area, number of students and schools) at this point can only have a negative impact on the students education, teacher workload and in meeting the literacy and Mathematic goals of the province. Bigger is most certainly not always better and the smaller rural schools have their own set of needs and goals and play a large role in the vibrancy and quality of life for families outside of the larger centers. The larger schools within our division are large enough and most certainly would have an extremely hard time attempting to accommodate larger class sizes. Please keep in mind - teacher workloads, class sizes (smaller is better for everyone!!!), individual student needs, the importance of school and community pride throughout our province and the importance of each and every students well being and how it affects the daily lives of all families across Saskatchewan when you are making your decisions. I am in favor of Option 3B: Realigning Boundaries. Thank-you for taking the time to review my letter.

Thank you for soliciting feedback regarding options for change. Based on the Perrins report, I cannot support Option 1 or 2. The biggest reason being the vastness of Sk and the variation of needs and situations of the students, communities (city, town, village, reserve, hamlet) and the resources best suited to generate a fair and equitable high standard of education. A misguided "one size fits all" approach will fit very few and leave the majority disadvantaged. Option 3 Division change makes the most sense to me with a slight bias towards realigning boundaries. I am hesitant to say I support because quite frankly I fear the Administration "monster" will overcome true positive change. My observation of what happened locally after the previous round of school division amalgamations was the administration "Monster" grew. The "Monster" grew with the building and renovation of office buildings- not schools, proliferation of rules and processes with an accompanying army of administrative people hired to feed the "monster". While those directly working with students (teachers, education assistants, support system professionals, office professionals in the schools) were asked to do more with less, communities had to fund raise to improve the schools and school grounds, children with learning challenges had to be patient. My view of the Administration "Monster" is influenced by what I have seen within our Horizon School Division. The Division with the highest administration spend outside of Saskatoon or Regina. My question to Perrins, the Government and other agents of change is: "What are the stops you will put in place to prevent Administration from taking away gains that should benefit students, teachers and Saskatchewan as a whole?" Change can be good but accountability and reality must be a priority for all.

My children have attended schools within Prairie Valley School Division for 10 years. We have had excellent support with wonderful teachers and other staff. I am strongly opposed to any further amalgamations. I do not think that amalgamating school divisions is going to solve any financial difficulties. In fact, I think it will be very expensive and time-consuming with no real benefit to students. I believe that Prairie Valley runs well the way it is. There is a strong commitment within Prairie Valley to serve students across the 27,000+ km. Focus needs to be on the things that matter for our students - math, reading, writing, attendance, access to services (psychologist, speech, counselling, etc.) and so on. Prairie Valley services a very diverse population and is doing it well. Making bigger school divisions or merging Prairie Valley into a regional-type division (ex. with Regina) will not be an effective use of resources. I believe that each school division has its own unique set of circumstances. There are unique challenges in rural areas - and Prairie Valley strives to do its best for all students. Prairie Valley is doing an excellent job at educating students with diverse needs, in diverse populations - from big schools to small schools. I understand that student achievement results within Prairie Valley exceed the provincial averages, largely due to the strong commitment, dedication and organization this division has. I also believe that other school divisions are familiar with their own unique needs, and know best how to best serve their populations. I am concerned that if amalgamation occurs, urban schools will receive more focus/resources than rural schools. Locally elected boards are important. Leave things the way they are! School divisions are familiar with their own unique needs, and know what their students need. If amalgamation occurs, urban schools may receive more resources than rural schools. Rural schools have unique needs. Prairie Valley School Division runs well now - excellent learning supports, great teachers and staff. I am sure other school divisions are equipped to service the students in their jurisdictions. I am opposed to Prairie Valley joining with other divisions. Actually, none of the options on the Perrins report look good. Keep things local, keep them as they are. If it's not broken, don't fix it!

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report we would offer the following feedback: We do not feel that the options presented in this report will result in significant cost savings without negatively impacting the quality of education for our students, eroding community voice, and affecting the sustainability of our community. We support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for students and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). We do not support the concept of an appointed Board of Education. We believe local voice is an essential part of a successful school-community relationship. We do not support any of the 3 models presented in the report. We feel forced amalgamation puts our school, and many like it, at risk of closure. We want to know what potential changes there will be to the rural school closure thresholds that are currently legislated. We feel this is a critical consideration in evaluating the options. We would like to see a permanent solution for high school transportation and are concerned what impact forced amalgamation will have on bus ride times for our students. We believe that further progress can be made in existing school divisions to find sector-wide efficiencies and cost-savings and recognize that the government may need to be more directive in requiring these sector-wide efficiencies to be realized. Sincerely,

Although I can see the benefits of some school board amalgamations, I strongly oppose with the concept of a government appointed Board. It is important for communities to have a say in the direction of education and to ensure the unique needs of their area be taken into account. I feel by electing the Boards, community members have an opportunity to be on the Board, or can vote for a member that they feel will properly represent their needs, feedback and concerns.

Dear Mr. Morgan: Thank you for allowing the public to express our opinions on the upcoming potential changes for education in the province. I am a Student Community Council chairperson and a concerned parent. First off, I think it is necessary to have elected school board officials as opposed to appointed ones. How else can our local voice be heard? Each elected official knows their territory, knows the people in their area. Our particular school board rep is incredibly personable. Relationship driven. When we approach her with an issue, I know for a fact that she's heard it and understood it and it WILL be taken care of in a timely manner. Please don't give us faceless; appointed government people located a long way off from our rural community. Regarding the options offered in the consultant's report, I'm really not sure any of them are great options for our province. The province wide division option is terrifying. Then we really would lose our local voice. Our division already is HUGE. Despite that, we have fantastic communication with all our higher ups. I don't want to lose our local voice. We are a trail blazing division with technology in the classroom. Schools are seeing things that are working well in our classrooms and piggy-backing those programs into their schools. Our distance learning centre offers 150-200 different courses that are well used within the division. We already have overworked school councillors, speech paths, physiologists, EA's. We don't need them spread further out. We are a collection of rural schools that have approximately 1000 children attending school within our town alone. We matter. Our local voices matter. We have completely different needs than say, a northern saskatchewan school. We stand to lose a whole lot if some of these options suggested come into play. If our division gets any bigger, our rural school loses out. Big time. We will have to travel further for services even though our taxes are the same as the city. Our class numbers will get bigger. Some of the class options offered for our kids won't exist anymore. Our kids lose out. This decision shapes the future of our province. Please consider how this affects the children, especially in rural communities such as ours. Thank you & good luck in your decision making. Sincerely,

I believe it is important to maintain local school boards - including keeping the public and catholic separate. I recognize there may be duplication but there has to be another way to help control costs and expenses. They can work together - possibly having an overseeing body to ensure that supply purchases for example recognize savings because of volumes, but to combine boards and/or eliminate some local boards would not be the best. Each board has its own identity and purpose - the separate school board for example strives to teach Christian values which are important for the overall society values. Would welcome the opportunity to discuss further if necessary. Thank you for the chance to express my view.

I have worked for the School Division for over 15 years. In 2001, I started working for School Division, 5 years later, in 2006, School Division amalgamated with Horizon School Division. That was 10 years ago, has there been huge changes in School Divisions over the year - yes there has. Have those changes all been beneficial - good question! In some ways we have seen benefits, in other ways, I am not so sure. Have we lost the focus of education? Our main focus for a school division should be the children. The School Divisions have gotten bigger, therefore, it is harder for the special needs children to get the help and answers they need. What about the child that needs just a little bit of help, he is put to the bottom of the pile, because his/her need is not as great as the other children. I believe if we make our School Divisions bigger, these issues will increase. Students will not be the focus it is today. The cost to tax payers will be huge - jobs will be lost, huge severances will need to be paid out. More than likely, the division offices will relocate to bigger centres, this means employees will leave rural Saskatchewan, or have to commute, meaning less time with their families. I am very much against seeing School Divisions getting larger.

Hi there, I have several thoughts that I would like to share regarding the information and ideas presented in the Perrin Report. First, I feel that consolidation of the 18 school boards into a single provincial school board would result in a loss of regional community input. Each area of the province has its own unique challenges and opportunities that arise because of various factors (e.g. urban schools vs rural schools, student population size and diversity, etc). A single school board could not effectively capture these differences, and as a result the ability to be flexible and adapt to challenges/needs based on the area would be lost. This would not be in the best interest of students. I also feel that school board trustees should continue to be elected, and not appointed. Although perhaps more convenient, appointing trustees may lead to the ministry being able to push their own agenda/ideas by appointing only those who support certain ideas, etc. Thank you for hearing my concerns.

As a parent of four children in the PSSD school division, I do not feel that parents have been given adequate time to respond to the situation or that families have been adequately informed to the situation at hand. Losing our core group of trustees in our community is disheartening as every voice needs to be heard and represented from a local representative and this decision needs to be revisited.

In today's world with both parents often working local input and representation into the education of your children is CRITICAL. The education budget is over 2 billion and the local governance represents approximately 9 million; less than 1/2 of 1%. None of the options for board distribution are palatable. However 3a is the best of what was presented. That said because local governance is so important and is literally a rounding error in the budget I recommend leaving the board's distribution alone. Any redistribution will likely cost more than it'll save and at a grave cost in local governance. Spend resources tackling larger items and inefficiencies. Starting with having common IT, HR, payroll, and busing systems and agreements. Additionally have just 1 provincial agreement on all items besides school days would reduce administrative costs associated with all the school board sub divisions. Lastly I'd suggest term limits on all school boards. Limited to 2 or 3 terms. Term limits will increase local governance accountability and also allow the ministry to have a bigger impact on boards through fresh and dynamic leadership. Thank you.

Education belongs to communities. Whatever changes that are envisaged should ensure that local boards remain and that the boards are locally elected by their communities to make them more effective and accountable to them, the electorate.

I would like to see the school divisions unchanged. I feel decisions made by the local people in the areas are the way to go.

Dear Sir/Madam: I am a child psychiatrist. One of the strengths in my practice is the fact that I have a good working relationship with the local school boards which enables prompt attention to children in need and strengthens our ability to decrease the amount of time that children spend out of school for medical psychiatric reasons. My ability to directly contact and meet with personnel from the school boards as well as the fact that they can easily contact me in cases where they are concerned for a child's mental health, increases our rate of success in dealing with children and families in distress. This is a very specific example from our city, however, I am sure that there is close collaboration between other medical professionals and local school boards in other areas as well. These relationships will definitely be negatively impacted by a central school board as there would be no local interest and meeting which involve health, mental health, school staff and division personnel would be impossible to have. Regards,

I must admit I was impressed by the even handed and thorough report produced by Mr. Perrin's. Here is what I noted Saskatchewan has by far the fewest number of school divisions of all western Canadian provinces. Gains have been noted in the past few years, particularly in the very important measure of Grade 3 reading levels as well as some improvements in Indigenous Student graduation rates. Significant changes to the governance model and/or amalgamation will take much needed time and energy away from learning and toward structural change. While there may be some savings that could be realized by governance changes or amalgamation I do not believe that they will be significant enough to take our attention away from the learning of our provinces children. It would be sad to lose the positive momentum that has been achieved in order to focus on structural or governance changes. The two primary pieces of feedback I would like to give are as follows: Wholesale, major changes such as amalgamation or governance changes should not be made at this time. They will not realize big savings and will divert energy and attention away from the learning agenda. Some tweaking of boundaries may be needed but that is likely all. Secondly, current provincial and local collective agreements must be upheld and the bargaining process must be respected into the future. I trust that the driving force behind the decisions made by this government will be what is best for our children rather than what is best for the bottom line.

I find it very interesting that Dan Perrins reported that there is "unanimous support to keep the status quo and elected school board trustees" among the rate payers, however his recommendation is still to reduce school divisions and appoint trustees. This move by the government has left the general public in the dark. I have only heard about this move to reduce the number of School Division once. I do not remember any call for general consultation with the public or any requests for input from the people who pay the taxes to keep this government operating. Students do not seem to be a priority in this report. As a tax payer my first priority is to our children and preparing them for the future. I do not believe that reducing the number of school united will ensure the best education for them. With government appointed school boards, communication and feedback to and from parents/communities will be negatively impacted. Elected school board trustees have a vested interest in my community, not the government's mandate. As a government we entrust you to look after our best interests. Our children are a major priority in our lives. If you need to reduce government spending you may want to look at reducing the number of ridings in Saskatchewan long before you reduce the number of school united.

We request that home educating parents be part of any stakeholder groups such as the proposed provincial advisory board to the Minister of Education. We feel there is a great benefit in hearing our voices along with public, Catholic, First Nations and Metis, and Francophone students. We request that Saskatchewan Home Based Educator (SHBE) and Home School Legal Defense Association (HSLDA) represent home educating parents as part of any stakeholder groups such as the proposed provincial advisory board to the Minister of Education. We request that home educators register with one province-wide registering authority (as opposed to the current local school divisions), and that SHBE have input into the selection of that registering authority. Additionally, SHBE suggests the province allow SHBE to approve the ministry's choice, or to have the ministry choose from a list of nominees provided by SHBE. We request that there be a re-evaluation of home education funding in Saskatchewan with the purpose of ensuring that funding be directed toward home educating families. We request that SHBE and HSLDA be involved in the re-evaluation. Currently, thousands of dollars in funding is given to the local school division for each home educated student. We receive in PSSD a paltry \$200 per year towards supplies. The rest of that money goes into the public pot and is used for other children who attend public schools. This does not seem right. There needs to be accountability for that money and if it isn't being used for the designated home educated children, then PSSD shouldn't be receiving it.

Just a few comments from a teacher who still substitutes on occasion: - Is it not time to amalgamate Separate and public schools to save costs? - Could there not be at least some provision to keep schools open until 5:00 o'clock to facilitate families where both parents work outside the home? - In an increasingly amoral society should we not be teaching an ethics class? - I do quite a bit of substitute teaching and, from my observation, perhaps it is time to reintroduce a dress code. I have a saying: Unless it walks like a duck, flies like a duck, and quacks like a duck..., it ain't a duck.

I am employed _____ with Regina Public Schools and have been _____ for the last _____ years. I am very thankful for my union and our collective agreement. I am very concerned about the recommendations/options that have been put together and such a rushed fashion. I don't see how these options and I quote..." Will focus on student success while ensuring accountability and efficient operational structures within the education system". The government gave Dan Perrins three weeks to study the amalgamations/restructuring and write his report. Why did Mr. Perrins recommend reduced school divisions and appointed trustees? There has been no meaningful public consultation, and a change of this scale has the potential for many errors. Why is the government rushing this? There's no evidence or report that states amalgamated/re-structured school boards and government appointed trustee's and CEO, will save money. It will only guarantee that the parents, workers and communities have no voice. Please stop this ! The public feedback supports our existing school division boundaries and keeping our democratic process of elected school boards. Why would the government want to change this? Why was this not brought up during the elections? I love my job working with students and they are my priority every day when I go to work. Why did the report not reference how this change will impact the students and their learning? Students are not a priority in this report! This is a business model, with government appointed school boards , Communication and feedback to and from parents/communities will be negatively impacted. I love my democratic right to elect a school board trustee who will be accountable and represent my community. Elected school board trustees have a vested interest in my community, not the governments mandate. How fast can major decisions, such as school safety issues, be made if there's no local contact or voice? I am asking that you hear the deep concern in our public voices... Local democratically elected school boards are the best choice for my community. Local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities. Sincerely,

I have been very pleased with Prairie Valley School Division. They have provided excellent care in meeting the needs of students so they can succeed! Great thought and resources have been put in place so students achieve in the areas of literacy , math and other core subjects. This school division have made student learning a priority! This division has provided social workers, educational psychologists, speech pathologists and many others to ensure that all students get the best educational experience. My children have greatly benefitted by the wisdom and the strategic planning of this school division and want other children to have the same educational experience my children had. I respectfully ask you to refrain from school amalgamations and to keep our school boards as elected positions. A local elected board has always been the best way to ensure that parent's concerns are heard!

This sort of decision is in no way in favour of students growth. According to me this sort of decision doesn't make any sense for me. If it's for the sake of budget cut, then why the government bring so many refugees and feeding them at our expense. Government is totally deviated from what it wants, spending money for refugees at our tax money.

Amalgamate our divisions to eliminate the high cost of our board. We want fairness and equity for all students in our division.

We request that home educating parents be part of any stakeholder groups such as the proposed provincial advisory board to the Minister of Education. We feel there is a great benefit in hearing our voices along with public, Catholic, First Nations and Metis, and Francophone students. We request that Saskatchewan Home Based Educator (SHBE) and Home School Legal Defense Association (HSLDA) represent home educating parents as part of any stakeholder groups such as the proposed provincial advisory board to the Minister of Education. We request that home educators register with one province-wide registering authority (as opposed to the current local school divisions), and that SHBE have input into the selection of that registering authority. Additionally, SHBE suggests the province allow SHBE to approve the ministry's choice, or to have the ministry choose from a list of nominees provided by SHBE. We request that there be a re-evaluation of home education funding in Saskatchewan with the purpose of ensuring that funding be directed toward home educating families. We request that SHBE and HSLDA be involved in the re-evaluation. Currently, thousands of dollars in funding is given to the local school division for each home educated student. We receive in PSSD a paltry \$200 per year towards supplies. The rest of that money goes into the public pot and is used for other children who attend public schools. This does not seem right. There needs to be accountability for that money and if it isn't being used for the designated home educated children, then PSSD shouldn't be receiving it.

I am a parent and SCC member and I am a strong supporter of our current school divisions and locally elected trustees. My children attend a small rural school that could easily be in jeopardy if another round of amalgamation is forced upon the school divisions. Previous amalgamations have shown us that it does not save money, and that it removes the focus from educational agendas to operational needs. We know schools close and that it takes a tremendous amount of time to find a new groove. With this, and knowing local tax dollars are funding more than half of the costs to begin with, I believe that leaving things as they are is the best option for everyone. I understand the value of local representatives. It is the only way to ensure that local community needs are addressed. The needs of rural Saskatchewan vary from place to place and are tremendously different from Regina or Saskatoon. Please allow the local knowledge of elected trustees continue to better serve the needs of our children.

I have been thinking about my submission since the link was released, trying to formulate my "best response". I have considered how I could be affected as an employee, how the various options could affect my child's learning and how other children in Horizon School Division and throughout the public school systems in the province, would be affected. I have thought about the various scenarios from the standpoint of both a community and SCC member. In the end, I have many thoughts and opinions on the Education Governance Review of the public education system and the report that was released in late December. As an employee, I believe that Horizon School Division is doing amazing things. Our literacy results are phenomenal, with our spring 2016 data showing 77% of our grade 3 students at or above grade level in reading. We are continuously improving our practice and changing how we operate to ensure that we are always putting the needs of students, above all else. In addition to this, we have implemented numerous cost saving initiatives and streamlined our practices, all while keeping student learning outcomes first and foremost in every decision that is made. Amalgamation, or a change in governance from elected to appointed trustees, would instantly change this focus. The focus on the needs of our students would change as our energy would need to shift to the needs that come with amalgamation. Having been with Horizon School Division since shortly after the amalgamation in 2006, I feel that we are just now settling into our division and making tremendous strides forward. "Transformational Changes" would negate the work being done through the ESSP and put the focus on the mandated changes. I then shifted into parent mode and began to think how unfair these options are for my child and the other students in the public system. While the focus in the separate school systems and the CEF can remain on improving student learning outcomes, the reality for the public divisions will be much different as they will be managing change in structure and governance with very little time to focus on the needs of students. This is the reality. If divisions were to amalgamate, and/or governance were to shift to an appointed Board, I believe that the local voice will be lost, I believe that the uniqueness found in each community would be lost and I believe that education in the public school system would suffer. As a sector, the focus must remain on improving student outcomes. As a sector we must continue to find efficiencies, and improve our practices, and continue to be better, but this can be done and greater things accomplished, without governance changes or amalgamation. I would like to thank you for taking the time to collect feedback from stakeholders. The view of all stakeholders must be taken into consideration before any changes or decisions are made.

I am proud to work for students. These are the people that I provide a service for, but with the cuts in education I feel that I can no longer provide this service. I feel that if these cuts are to help our future then why are the frontline people the only ones that are receiving cuts. If the government is asking us to accept the cuts then the political leaders should also expect the same cuts.

As an educator and parent working in a Saskatchewan school I have concerns regarding changes being made to the governance structure: 1) The timeline of this proposed change is simply too short. I do not feel that I have adequate time to review the options or seek answers to the many questions that accompany a new governance structure. More time is needed so educators as well as the public can be addressed and our questions can be answered. 2) Most concerning is the first option of having one large school division. Smaller, rural schools often have less resources available to students when compared to larger centres. I cannot help but fear that the students of these schools will be forgotten if pushed into one large division. 3) Elected boards are the best way to represent our students. I do not believe that government appointed trustees are in the best interest of our children or schools. We have a right to vote and choose a local voice and representation for our local taxes. As the Minister of Education, I strongly urge you to oppose the amalgamation of our school divisions at this time and oppose government appointed school boards. Sincerely,

I thank you for the opportunity to share my voice on the matter at hand. My thoughts are that amalgamation of school divisions would not create efficiencies or improve student learning. In fact I believe it would be detrimental to the system as a whole and could have a negative effect on student learning. My reasons for these thoughts are that education is really about working with individuals to help them achieve the best results possible. When you strip away autonomy and individualization of schools, communities and divisions you are also stripping away the individualization of student. Education is about meeting the needs of individuals. Each area, community and student is unique and therefore require personalized and unique services and cookie cutter education will simply not work. I was working in the system very shortly after the amalgamations of 2006 and 11 years later we are just recently becoming a true team. We are meeting the needs of Individual students, schools and communities with efficiency in and effective manner. Another amalgamation would certainly set our system back many years. Now, can I say our entire system is running at maximum efficiency. Definitely not. I have thought for many years that as divisions we could improve through expansion of shared services. Provincial wide procurement, centralized purchasing, service supports and knowledge sharing are just a few areas where we could realize substantial gains. That said autonomy of division territories is the best way to meet the individual needs of communities, schools and ultimately our students. As for the governance of divisions I feel our local boards do an excellent job of providing direction and guidance based on recommendations of senior staff and data driven decision making. In short, can we improve? Absolutely. That said I am displeased with the sudden fork in the road we within the sector all face. The uncertainty we all face is extremely stressful for all staff members who could or would be affected. That is all of us. "Transformational change" seems to be an unknown desire with no actual clear vision of the future of Saskatchewan education. From a personal standpoint "tranformational change" brings along with it personal fears of potential unemployment or role changes due to a vision that is not clear to anyone involved. A secondary concern is based on the ultimate decision about the future of education, and my personal future, being made by people who have never set foot in a classroom, or worked directly with school staff, students or communities. We all work hard to do a great job, and to have our world turned upside down with no clear vision or for no apparent reason simply is not the right thing to do at any level. Are we doing something wrong? If so please point out our weaknesses and guide change as individual entities. If no weakness can be identified then I feel "transformational change" would seem to be an exercise in futility that will cost the taxpayer dearly, and damage the very fibre that makes Saskatchewan a great place to live and work. My final concern is based on the fact that seperate systems will not be affected. If true change is desired in the public sector, I struggle to understand why all divisions are not included. If seperate systems are operating in a desired manner and do not require change, then why is "transformational change" not simply stated as a clear desire to model the seperate systems of the province? Oh ya... That would mean we would all remain individualized and nothing would change! (tongue in cheek) Again, I thank the committee for providing a means of collecting feedback. I personally feel amalgamation is the wrong way to go, but that our government has a golden opportunity to lead positive change, not force unclear change. I have a pretty good idea what those working on the front lines of the system will say. I only hope that the government will listen.

Our school boards need to be locally elected and decisions close to our communities, not farther away.

I think that they need to look at keeping the school division areas in regions not to large so it is easier for staffing, bussing and students. For example our SE cornerstone area is huge already and would lose quality control. Some smaller areas could be put together. Possibly into 6 regions? By going into less than 6 areas to 1 like they did with health care will see the rural areas suffer. It always comes down to the bigger centres getting more services and rural getting cutbacks. The amount of money they think they will save will be wasted on administration. Our money should be spent more on the teachers for our students.

To whom it may concern: I would like to add my voice in support of locally elected school boards. I think they are better able to serve the needs of students.

I would urge the government to maintain the role of the 18 locally elected public school boards in school governance in Saskatchewan. Ideally any changes made to governance system would enhance community participation rather than undermine it. I fear the proposal to reduce the number of public school boards and to possibly appoint, rather than elect, the members of boards undermines the Saskatchewan tradition of community participation in school governance. Community participation in school governance has been a valued tradition in Saskatchewan. The role that public school boards play in this process is a vital one. Saskatchewan is a geographically large and diverse province. Local school boards are in better positioned to understand the needs of the communities and families they serve and to respond effectively and efficiently. Access to local school boards, and the ability to elect members, gives parents and community members a voice in decisions that affect them directly. Decisions such as where schools will be built, what schools should be closed or renovated and what supports or new programs are needed are best made at the local level with community consultation and feedback. Such processes are threatened when school boards are removed from the local community. Further, local school boards are in a better position to implement changes that can support the goals outlined in the ESSP. Local school boards can identify ways to be more innovative and efficient in ways that can improve education service. The further removed a bureaucracy is from the realities of local communities, the more difficult it is to see such opportunities. School boards operating at the local level are also in a better position to work closely with local schools and communities to implement changes. The changes that are proposed would have significant and long lasting impacts on education in Saskatchewan. These changes would be difficult to undo and it is not certain that they would be able to affect the kind of changes we would all like to see in our education system. Instead, I would like to see the government try to work with the local public school boards to create transformational change that can improve our schools for the children and communities that they serve.

I was a substitute teacher in the Prairie Valley School Division for many years. I have a grandchild in _____ School and 3 other grandchildren who will hopefully be a part of the Prairie Valley School Division. It is my opinion that it is of utmost importance to continue with a Division Model. Rural school divisions face unique challenges which I feel can only be adequately addressed within a reasonable sized division. It is also extremely important to continue with locally elected school board members. The people we elect to represent the interests of the children within our area, live and work here. They listen to the concerns expressed by parents and members of the communities and do their best to address those needs and concerns. They have a vested interest in best practices within their board. Therefore, it is my opinion that we continue with the Division Model and with locally elected school boards. It is in the best interest of education in this province and especially for my grandchildren. I don't want their education to suffer to save money in a proposed Provincial or Regional Model. I also feel that appointed members to a board could not possibly understand or care as much about the students as do locally elected members. An appointed member could not have the knowledge necessary to make the best decisions for the children in their area. Thank you for your consideration of my opinion,

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report we would offer the following feedback: We do not feel that the options presented in this report will result in significant cost savings without negatively impacting the quality of education for our students, eroding community voice, and affecting the sustainability of our community. We support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for students and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). We do not support the concept of an appointed Board of Education. We believe local voice is an essential part of a successful school-community relationship. We do not support any of the 3 models presented in the report. We feel forced amalgamation puts our school, and many like it, at risk of closure. We want to know what potential changes there will be to the rural school closure thresholds that are currently legislated. We feel this is a critical consideration in evaluating the options. We would like to see a permanent solution for high school transportation and are concerned what impact forced amalgamation will have on bus ride times for our students. We believe that further progress can be made in existing school divisions to find sector-wide efficiencies and cost-savings and recognize that the government may need to be more directive in requiring these sector-wide efficiencies to be realized.

I feel very strongly about the amalgamation of our school division. Education in this province needs to be held at a HIGH priority, not one where cuts are made. I am against this amalgamation. Amalgamations in the past have not saved the government money, but have cost money. Our schools need to be heard and in order to do that we need local boards not one board for the province.

Educated and informed answers can only be provided if information is available to form a rational opinion and make a logical choice. Due to a lack of info related to the costs and details no choice of options can be made with any sense of confidence.

We request that home educating parents be part of any stakeholder groups such as the proposed provincial advisory board to the Minister of Education. We feel there is a great benefit in hearing our voices along with public, Catholic, First Nations and Metis, and Francophone students. We request that Saskatchewan Home Based Educator (SHBE) and Home School Legal Defense Association (HSLDA) represent home educating parents as part of any stakeholder groups such as the proposed provincial advisory board to the Minister of Education. We request that home educators register with one province-wide registering authority (as opposed to the current local school divisions), and that SHBE have input into the selection of that registering authority. Additionally, SHBE suggests the province allow SHBE to approve the ministry's choice, or to have the ministry choose from a list of nominees provided by SHBE. We request that there be a re-evaluation of home education funding in Saskatchewan with the purpose of ensuring that funding be directed toward home educating families. We request that SHBE and HSLDA be involved in the re-evaluation. Currently, thousands of dollars in funding is given to the local school division for each home educated student. We receive in PSSD a paltry \$200 per year towards supplies. The rest of that money goes into the public pot and is used for other children who attend public schools. This does not seem right. There needs to be accountability for that money and if it isn't being used for the designated home educated children, then PSSD shouldn't be receiving it.

To whom it may concern: I wish to take this opportunity to provide the following feedback. We are an active home based schooling family in the province. We educated our children from kindergarten to grade 12.

We are very proud to be able to education our children and are very thankful for the support and guidance of the Regina Catholic School Board. In the province's review of the education system we would ask that the Saskatchewan Home Based Educators (SHBE) be counted as stakeholder in any discussions. We also request that the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students. As well, we respectfully ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators. Thank you for your consideration of our input.

I have read over the report and I would like to share some of my concerns. I don't think the education system should be compared to the health system. I am not 100% against amalgamation. However I still would like to see the boards elected not appointed. Government must also realize the rural needs and urban needs are different and should both be treated fairly. I am also concerned when cuts take place it will be done to schools with smaller enrollment which may lead to rural school closures which would be devastating to small town SK. I am also concerned that when cuts are made it will be made our teachers and not to high paid people in management position and this will limit our students ability to learn and and become strong assets to our wonderful province. I hope that if amalgamation does happen, the voice of rural SK is not forgotten. While many of our city people were raised in rural Saskatchewan, they are quick to forget how important the farming community is and will only care for their best interests.

I fully support the following letter prepared by the Pense SCC: K-12 Education Governance Review Advisory Panel, After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report, we offer the following feedback: - We do support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). - It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! We do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. - We do not support any of the three models presented in the report. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support that change to governance or further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. - We have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold we are legislated by. - We need a permanent high school plan, including transportation, to accommodate the best interests of our students, their families, and our community. - Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in. Regards,

I truly believe that the locally elected boards of education are the necessary advocates to ensure the excellence in education. The needs of students are unique in each division and even each school within divisions and most of all, the locally elected boards are to help hold the provincial government to account. We cannot afford to lose them if we want to maintain the effectiveness and the quality of the education in Saskatchewan.

I think it is essential that the school board remain elected so that parents and community members are properly represented. Moreover I am concerned that the individual and unique qualities of specialized schools (language, religious, etc) cannot be properly maintained in an amalgamated system.

I have reviewed the report provided by Mr. Perrins and wish to provide my feedback as a parent of two high school students, a member of a rural Saskatchewan community and more recently, as an employee of one of the 28 Saskatchewan school divisions. The purpose of the report as stated is to provide options surrounding the best system of governance and structure needed to achieve the outcomes established in the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth and the ESSP. The letter of transmittal begins with an acknowledgement of the unanimous support communicated by school boards, the STF, SEIU, SSBA, SASBO, parents and the general public for elected boards, no more amalgamations, commitment to the ESSP and agreement over the need for sector wide efficiencies. With such an overwhelming demonstration of support for the status quo, any proposed changes to the current structure would need to be supported with irrefutable facts and data in order to be widely accepted. The quality of the education provided to our children is directly correlated with the future stability and prosperity of our province and nation, and we have a responsibility to ensure careful thought, planning and detailed analysis is performed to ensure dramatic change does not have unintended consequences. When considering the issue of elected versus appointed boards, it's clear from the feedback provided within the report that stakeholders support elected boards as the most effective way to ensure local voice is heard and represented in board decisions. Decisions made at the school board level impact the children and therefore the future of our communities. The local voice must be represented in these decisions. Our society is built on the value of democracy. It is concerning that we would be asked to contemplate the replacement of elected officials by appointed officials in order to tighten government control over the sector. At first read, there appears to be merit in the suggestion that appointed officials could be selected to represent the skillset required to enhance the effectiveness of governance over school boards. However, on reflection, this suggestion is counter to the very definition of democracy: "a system of government by the whole population through elected representatives". I don't want to contemplate a future where the population is not given the ability to choose who will represent them in matters that so strongly impact the local community. Those who let their names stand as representatives on school boards in our province have passion, commitment and a vested interest in the success of local schools and children. Who is better to represent them? Professional development opportunities can and have been used to provide these individuals with the skills they need to effectively govern. In support of this work, the concept of an education quality control council is intriguing and could create a mechanism by which school divisions, and therefore their boards, would be held accountable to their results as measured against the goals of the ESSP. When considering the four options provided for the structure of school divisions, it is disheartening to see separate school divisions excluded from the discussion. It will be difficult to demonstrate that any change is truly transformative when it is limited in scope right from the start. In order to drive transformative change in the sector, I challenge that we need to think differently across the entire sector. We can't just do what we're currently doing on a larger scale and anticipate that we will be able to make significant change, either in terms of PISA scores, graduation rates, or sector efficiencies. Looking back at the challenges faced in the previous round of amalgamations makes that abundantly clear. We are in an environment where there currently exists a high level of support for the ESSP both within government, school board offices and classrooms. The appetite for collaboration both within individual school settings, between schools within a school division and between school divisions throughout the province in order to meet and exceed the goals contained within the ESSP is high. I am concerned that forcing amalgamations will hinder the progress we have made in building this culture of collaboration. Significant effort was expended to form cohesiveness and a system focus following the previous round of amalgamations; I worry that additional amalgamations will result in further upheaval that will take us off track in our current work on the ESSP. Education is unique in that it is highly relationship driven. Close relationships between students and teachers, schools and communities as well as school divisions and the provincial government are necessary to achieve results. Larger is not necessarily better; particularly when size prohibits the building and sustaining of these relationships. I am concerned that larger school divisions will become less responsive to individual school needs and therefore to individual student needs. I'm also concerned that it will become more difficult to ensure all schools are moving forward towards the same goals when the sheer size of a school division makes close contact between administration and school staff prohibitive. I believe now is the time to capitalize on the investment we have made in the ESSP. We have invested a considerable amount of time, effort and tax dollars in building the systems and supports necessary to achieve the goals contained within. We are starting to see significant results. Now is not the time to change course or radically alter the playing field. Rather, we should be holding school divisions accountable to their results and creating opportunities to collaborate together to share best practices in order to ensure the success of all of our students.

Education funding should not be used to cover other funding deficits. If absolutely required to cut costs to direct funds elsewhere then alternatives should be sought first before restructuring. Regional elected boards are the best structure for education results.

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report we would offer the following feedback: We do not feel that the options presented in this report will result in significant cost savings without negatively impacting the quality of education for our students, eroding community voice, and affecting the sustainability of our community. We support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for students and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). We do not support the concept of an appointed Board of Education. We believe local voice is an essential part of a successful school-community relationship. We do not support any of the 3 models presented in the report. We feel forced amalgamation puts our school, and many like it, at risk of closure. We want to know what potential changes there will be to the rural school closure thresholds that are currently legislated. We feel this is a critical consideration in evaluating the options. We would like to see a permanent solution for high school transportation and are concerned what impact forced amalgamation will have on bus ride times for our students. We believe that further progress can be made in existing school divisions to find sector-wide efficiencies and cost-savings and recognize that the government may need to be more directive in requiring these sector-wide efficiencies to be realized. Sincerely,

Charlebois Community School in Cumberland House, a historical community within the provincial borders of Saskatchewan and boasts a pride rooted with Indigenous nations such as the Swampy Cree, and Métis people. A system derived of northern values rooted in practices connected with land, kinship values, and the vast physical and social system within our delta. A culture rooted well with the Northern Lights School Division and the values of a uniform demographic that are always striving for the best of northern people. Please hear out the people of Saskatchewan and empower the school divisions to continue striving for educational success. NLS 113 is the heart of our schools, and taking away the beat of our northern connection will create an artificial pace maker that will produce overall negative side effects. A new system will create a defect that will disempower northern and southern cultures in the upcoming generations. Money is one thing, but the heart is what keeps our education alive. Thank you

I support things staying as they are now in Saskatchewan. Locally elected boards are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. They are important advocates for ensuring excellence in education.

I support a local Catholic School Board that is that we would have our own Catholic School Board here in Saskatoon, thanks

To the Advisory Panel and the Ministry of Education: I am concerned with the direction being considered for the future of our school boards/divisions and the talk of amalgamation. I worry about the future of our children in Saskatchewan with the cuts being made and considered in education. As I look at today's youth their needs are great. Students are coming into the schools with great deficits both academically and emotionally. They are starting school already behind; limited vocabulary, weak number recognition, poor number sense, limited letter/sound recognition, poor verbal reasoning, inability to problem solve and weak social skills. They are coming to school with attention issues, on the autism spectrum, and behaviour issues but do not meet the formula for additional support from an EA or an overloaded Student Support Service Teacher leaving the classroom teacher on their own to differentiate for each student's learning needs. They come from homes where they are not getting any sleep because they are worried about why their mom is not home at night, their parents are in the middle of a separation, their mom has passed away, their mom does not have time to spend with them when it is their turn, they are unable to come to school because they do not have money for gas, they have witnessed drugs being used in their home. All of these things make learning for them difficult because they have these huge obstacles to overcome. Yet at the end of the day it is the role of the teacher to get each student to meet grade level outcomes and meet the provincial goals set out. The teachers along with the support of the school divisions are advocates for the learning of all students. They work hard to find the supports and put them in place for all these students. By breaking down these supports and making them less accessible to the schools and classroom teacher (due to geography or number of personal available to support or an in-depth understanding of the school community) student learning is compromised. What might seem logical financially today will harm us provincially down the road. We need to invest in our students and their learning now to build a stronger future for our province. Students are already coming to school broken and I worry that this will only enhance these issues into bigger problems down the road costing our province more with social assistance programs, health services, and higher crime rates. I want my children to grow up in a province that is thriving and in order to get there we need to invest in all children and their education, rather than breaking it down. Please carefully consider these things in your decision making process. I worry that there is pressure to make budget cuts immediately and I don't feel that the ramifications are being thoroughly examined. A decision this grand should not be made quickly. It needs to be properly investigated and thoroughly debated.

I feel that local representation is still important. I think the way it is now is working just fine. Focus on improving the school buildings and keeping teachers not all this administration spending in fixing something that's not broken.

Reduced communication between the board and the public? The public's access to decision makers would be reduced? Demonstrating equity between rural and urban schools would be difficult with one board? Electing the board members puts the choice in the hands of the taxpayers - you know - the people who elected your government. So what it appears that the government is trying to do is take the power away from the taxpaying citizens - you want to "appoint" someone, instead of allowing we, the taxpaying citizens of this province, to elect our own. Continuing with the various elected boards, and no more amalgamation, which, by the way, you admit had unanimous support from the 32 stakeholders in the development leaves the power in the hands of the taxpayers, as it should be. You admit many problems, including that effectiveness will be impacted in the short term. You do realize that means the students - they are not just numbers, they are human beings who are working hard to obtain a decent education. So for those unfortunate to be in school in the time frame your "little project" takes to get off the ground, what do you tell them? "Oh, sorry, we will have to give you a compromised education. You understand, right? It's for the better of the system in the long run." SK has a poorer grade record than many provinces in many subjects, however, we have less school boards than any of those you listed other than PEI - why would you interpret amalgamating the school boards as going to improve grades, when BC and AB are doing better, with more than twice the school boards SK currently has? What kind of insane reasoning is that? Why would you not look at increasing the number of school boards, to personalize what is required? Obviously AB and BC are doing something right! Even though nowhere else has there been such a large-scale amalgamation done so that we can see it will be successful, and you admit that there are MANY cons, you are still presenting this. Your list of pros and cons is so full of holes it is ridiculous. You are putting our next generations at risk, and for what? Taking the power of choice in elected schools away from the people involved with them is nothing less than Communism. Then again, Sask Party is famous for implementing programs that have no background in success, or even worse, have shown in other circumstances to have actually failed. It's time to listen to the "unanimous", and look at your list of "cons", that is where the intelligence is. Otherwise you are going to send our education system straight into third-world hell. Think about the children who are going to be negatively affected while your "little project" gets off the ground. If it bothers you so much about the different pay for the same positions in different school boards, do a Joint Job Evaluation as was done for the Health Regions across Saskatchewan, but please do not further amalgamate the school boards, and leave the process so that board members are elected.

Greetings, I am writing this letter to share my view that no further amalgamations of Saskatchewan school divisions should occur and that school board trustees should remain elected and not appointed. After reading through Mr. Dan Perrin's report, I see a disconnect between the clear desire to move to Option 1, a single school board, and evidence to support that it will have the desired outcome. In the introduction of the report, Mr. Perrin describes the situation in numerous other provinces and makes mention of New Brunswick and PEI moving to regional districts and a single board entity, respectively. However, comparing the situation in NB and PEI to SK seems like comparing apples to oranges in terms of land mass, population diversity, number of schools and population of students. Just because it may have worked in PEI with their 66 schools, will this model be effective with our 606? I don't feel enough evidence has been presented to support that this idea will be effective in a place like Saskatchewan. Mr. Perrin also makes mention of Saskatchewan's results in the 2015 PISA results and 2013 PCAP results. While there are inherent flaws in standardized testing, I am curious to know which provinces ranked in the top of the assessments and how their governance model works. This is not included in the report. It seems funny to jump into the apparent uncharted territory of a single school division when there is no comparable example presented that demonstrates this will achieve the outcome it is hoped to have. Secondly, I am surprised that there is no financial analysis of the "cost saving" of the amalgamation to a single entity school board, or any other option for that matter. The Premier has been critical of the federal government's lack of financial analysis on the effect of a carbon tax on the economy, but we are simply to believe that there will be financial savings in the case of the school board amalgamation without an analysis? In fact, John Weins, retired Dean of Education and professor at the University of Manitoba who studied education finance, governance and policy suggests that there won't be significant cost savings to a further amalgamated system (<http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/saskatchewan/school-board-amalgamations-john-weins-1.3855670>). I believe that local voices should be part of the school divisions' governance. It helps build community and connection. I believe that forcing together two school divisions like Regina Public and Prairie Valley which have such different situations, is not going to be effective. Strategic direction can still be accomplished when multiple divisions are operating. The success demonstrated with the Sask Reads program highlights this possibility. A single entity is not needed to achieve this. Education is a pillar of society. Yes the system needs to be sensitive to costs, but cost should not be the deciding factor of how well educated our children will be. Cuts to education are already hurting the current generation's academic achievements. Respectfully submitted,

I am writing as a member of the School Community Council. Our SCC unanimously supports our elected board as we believe this structure to be the best way to accurately represent our students in our school and community. Our children are the future of Saskatchewan and I am concerned that the true reason for amalgamation is to reduce costs without thinking of the repercussions this will cause our students, especially in the rural areas. Also, why is there such a short timeline to make a change of this magnitude? We strongly urge you to oppose the amalgamation of our school divisions and oppose government appointed school boards.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit a response to the K-12 Governance Review: The intent to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of a system is admirable, and although it has not been stated, ultimately economics typically drives these types of structural changes. The education of our children is a cornerstone of the future of this province, and it is imperative that the increase in efficiency and effectiveness of educational governance does NOT come at the expense of our students. I do not see any of these basic options stemming from a basic goal of improving student education, but rather they focus on cost savings. Please confirm that savings will not be at the expense of quality education. The quick timeline set for review and comments about the document does not allow enough time to read, digest, discuss, and formulate an articulate and well thought out response to a VERY large and important aspect of educational program coordination in the province. Perhaps change is needed, but the timeline is too rushed for a change of this magnitude. Options 1 and 2 for governance change are large and unwieldy, and are risky because of: 1) Reduced communication between board and community; 2) Inequity between urban and rural schools; 3) Decreased ability for community and school personnel to contact and interact with board (resulting in decreased input from communities and schools regarding local issues); 4) An undefined, and as yet unstated, amount of time, money, and effort, to get up and running; and, 5) "...the anxiety created by this level of change will impede functioning at all levels." (p. 23) If you are intending to implement one of the four options (I see no mention of maintaining the status quo), Option 3B seems least objectionable because it appears to have the lowest amount of challenges associated with it; it appears least disruptive, while preserving at least some local input to the school boards. If the ESSP stated goals were to be met in the timeline stated, (by the year 2020): A change in policy allowing students to repeat grades where deemed appropriate would be needed. On pg. 13 the PISA numbers state that Saskatchewan was ranked last among the provinces in reading, math and science. The current educational policy of not allowing students to repeat grades does not adequately support the education of each individual child; it does nothing to foster any kind of success in certain individuals at future levels if there is not success at the current grade level. Any child that can be passed from grade to grade even though they have not completed the work, not mastered the stated skills, and in some instances, not been in attendance in the classroom for enough days to learn the material, does not have the necessary foundation to be successful at the next level (grade). Changing this policy to allow students to repeat grades where deemed appropriate by their teachers would have a positive effect on many of the outcomes stated to be important in your ESSP. Students moved through the system without "passing" do not fare well in the work force after high school. How will the goal of First-Nation and Metis graduation rate be met if band schools are not at the table as part of this discussion? Recognizing that these schools operate under a different level of government (Federal) but many of these schools feed their students into the provincial system, perhaps some of the discrepancies between these two systems should be addressed first? Teachers /principals are the best people to know where their own budgets can be trimmed, and can relay this to their existing school division. School divisions should be able to find efficiencies on their own first, before any restructuring is done. Restructuring itself often has a significant cost. This cost must be presented and compared to existing costs. If cost savings are realized, will cost savings be kept within the education system? To my knowledge, the education system does not even see children below the age of 4, so the goal of the education system supporting the development of children under this age does not appear possible as things stand. If the province were to institute a one-window approach aligning the appropriate provincial department (Health?) to also screen for learning disabilities/ speech or hearing issues (and any other educational and developmental screening a pre-K child should have that would assist them in getting the correct early intervention that would allow for their future success in the school system), then it should be done in coordination and conjunction with the delivery of the existing provincial immunization program (or a similar program that could reasonably be expected to engage children in the 1-4 age bracket). Other programs addressing nutritional and socioeconomic issues would be needed at this early pre-K level. Attendance (or lack thereof) may also be a socioeconomic issue. Have the following options been considered: a) An increase in taxes? b) Voluntary amalgamation - some school divisions have been amalgamated already. Will there be the opportunity for other school divisions to consider amalgamation first before any of the options are exercised? c) Aligning the RM boundaries with School Division boundaries, thus resulting in a large amount of administrative cost to be able to be redirected toward education?

We pride ourselves in having a connection through Community School Council to local administration and a direct line of communication from the community to the school. Education belongs to community and we want you to know that we support Saskatchewan school boards and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature: We need to keep our school boards locally elected; and, We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

We would like to maintain local representation. The move to a single authority would eliminate the local voice in the decision making process. While amalgamation is a good idea to reduce waste and reduce cost, do not wish to see administrative dollars shuffled around and creation of extra levels of unnecessary bureaucracy. Thank you.

Further amalgamation is not in the best interest of our rural students and communities. Instead of amalgamating schools centralization of procurement and payroll would help reduce administration costs. Locally elected boards matter, they are our local voice if any change is made it should be standardizing the expectations of our Boards. In all of these options educational legislation will be changed and the legislation protecting Rural School Threshold may be removed. This legislation protects small schools from closure. What happens to communities if they lose their school? If schools are amalgamated who will determine what the appropriate ride times are for our children? We fully support finding cost saving systems, strengthening our educational outcomes and standardizing expectations of our Boards, but we cannot support wide sweeping changes as proposed in the Educational Governance Review Report.

Smaller, locally governed school division allow decision makers to be responsive to the needs of their students and families. I agree whole heartedly with the feedback given the stakeholders, and am especially opposed to further amalgamation and to appointed school boards. However, there should be standardization in remuneration and roles of school boards. The government has already shown its willingness to put the bottom line ahead of students' well being. Their dishonesty in refusing to uphold their funding responsibility to the teachers' collective agreement does not inspire confidence. They do not need more control over the school divisions' decision making. People who care about children and the good of our society should make decisions about the education system, not governments who care about privatization and profit. Well informed stakeholders have given their feedback. It should be respected.

I strongly disagree with appointed school boards over locally elected boards as our province is very diverse as are our different school districts. I believe that people living outside the different areas won't have the understanding or background knowledge of each distinct region to properly make educated and positive decisions for each region or district. Appointed boards often follow the mandate of the group that appointed them and don't necessarily make the proper decisions with regards to the people who will truly be affected by their decisions...our children.

As a teacher with experience teaching in BC and SK, I agreed with the findings of Mr. Perrins' report. I think that further amalgamation would be incredibly difficult on everyone, and it will not provide the kinds of benefits that the government is hoping to see, particularly in the financial sense, and that any possible savings that might occur will come at great cost to our students, our teachers, our schools, and our province. I hope that options 3A or 3B are considered, as I do believe that some evaluation of those decade-old amalgamations may help improve some of the administration therein. The goal of any such actions should, however, be oriented toward student success through reducing redundancies whether or not that entails financial savings. Any decisions that are made should serve to enhance the abilities of schools and regional divisions to enact policies to support students in their communities, and I am opposed to any actions that remove the responsibility and ability for meaningful decisions to be made on those levels. In addition, the pressures that have been placed on teachers - who already have a widely acknowledged and proven high level of stress and intensification of work as part of the way in which our profession has changed over the past - through this entire process have been significant. The fact that many of the agreements in our Collective Bargaining Agreement have begun to be questioned (mostly indirectly, but still evident in the subtext of this entire exercise) is of great concern to me and my colleagues. I am disappointed with the manner in which the government has conducted this entire process from the start. It seems as though their intent has been to undermine teachers and school divisions and to create misperceptions in the public in regard to the needs of students, teachers, and communities. I sincerely hope that the government will choose to proceed in a way that collaborates with students, families, communities, teachers, staff, elected school boards and trustees, existing administrative structures, and all residents. Thank you. Respectfully submitted,

Option 3. A clear division of power is needed for the different needs of each school division. It would be impossible for an entire province to have only one or four board oversee all educators and schools in the province with a clear understanding of the needs and without bias.

When I hear about potential for big change, I find myself experiencing 2 strong feelings. The first is one of hope and optimism. Despite my strong confidence in the Saskatoon Public School Division, I know that there is always room for improvement. As a province and as individual divisions, of course we can always do better, so why not take the time to reflect and see areas we can improve. The secondary feelings I have are a bit of fear and trepidation. Why are we looking at change, and are we giving it enough thought to do it well? So, my response to the panel and our provincial government is this: With any and all change that will unfold, can we make sure that student outcomes and wellbeing are our number 1 priority? Our students only get 1 crack at education and it is our obligation to create an environment that gives them the very best chance to succeed and reach their potential. I humbly ask that with any and all potential changes, that the government would first ask, "Will this impact student outcomes for the better?" If the goal of these possible governance changes is to save money, then at minimum we need to be confident that students and families will feel no impact with respect to their potential to succeed. Ideally they will feel energized and confident that things will be better than ever. The Saskatoon Public School Division is inspired and motivated by the ESSP and has done phenomenal work in creating strategies to move us closer to the goals set out for 2020 with respect to reducing the difference in graduation rates between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal students and having the best graduation rates in the country. It is critical that we and the rest of the province can continue to bring momentum to these efforts. Can we ensure that families feel supported, protected, and empowered before, during, and after any changes are made? It is critical that our communities are confident that their voice is heard, that they have power and influence over education. Our current governance structure allows families and supporting community members to have their voice heard. Most obvious in this process is giving all citizens over 18 an opportunity to choose their school board trustee democratically through the electoral process. This right to choose a local representative is fundamental to our belief system in our democratic country. As outlined in the report, electing trustees moves the balance of power away from government and into communities. Parents, educators, and community members deserve to have this influence on our education system. Our communities deserve local representation. The elected trustee works to develop trust relationships with their school communities and then can be an informed voice to our administration and government. Being elected forces accountability and if community members are unhappy with the result, they have the power to make a change by electing a new representative at the next election, or to run in the next election themselves. In this system, the government is showing respect and trust for their people and giving a balance of power to them. In our current structure, each school also has a School Community Council which is a parent group that is designed to be a voice from school to trustee and trustee to school. This is a great avenue for families to have a significant impact on the school community. With any changes that may come, it is essential that the SCC is upheld with a clear avenue to communicate with decision makers. As we reflect on our current structure and the inequities we see in our province, it is essential the government have proportionate representation from minority groups within our school boards. I strongly believe that this can be achieved within our school divisions, while keeping democratically elected boards. If and when there are people groups that are under-represented in governance, might I suggest creating opportunities for mentorship within those communities? Let's consider proven methods of empowering minority groups to support their interested leaders in seeking election. We are best when we have diverse leadership who can represent ALL people. This can be achieved without removing democracy. I would emphasize that having locally elected trustees is fundamental to who we are as a province and country. Taking away democracy speaks of a lack of trust in our people and their ability to provide and elect strong leaders. I am convinced we are best when we empower and give voice to those most involved at the ground level - our community members, our parents, our staff. Let's provide opportunity to build on the strengths we already have in this respect, rather than remove it by appointing trustees. In closing, I am a strong believer in change, in evaluating current structures, and in finding ways to improve no matter how fantastic we already believe we are. I am excited about an opportunity to be even better. However, in making change, we must protect our most vulnerable and most valuable resource, our children. We must ensure their educational outcomes are at minimum maintained, but ideally improved. Students and families should be able to reflect back 1 year after any changes are made and say with confidence that all changes were made with the students success in mind. Community members must feel empowered throughout the changes and know that their voice is critical to us achieving our 2020 goals. Thank you for giving voice to the community through public consultation. I look forward to seeing how this feedback is used to inform your decisions in the months ahead.

Option 3. A clear division of power is needed for the different needs of each school division. It would be impossible for an entire province to have only one or four board oversee all educators and schools in the province with a clear understanding of the needs and without bias.

We are writing to show our support for Prairie Valley School Division and to express our concern regarding the proposed changes to the governance and administration of Saskatchewan K-12 public education sector. We support elected governance and are happy with the current direction of the school division and having a voice at the local level. We believe forced amalgamation and decrease in the number of school divisions will have detrimental impact to our schools and children's education. Rural schools have very unique needs and challenges and we do not feel they would be well served by the proposed changes. In large governance structures, how does a small school like Kelliher access resources accordingly? A formula does not work for us. We have very unique needs, including a high First Nation population, multiple students with behavioral disabilities or learning disabilities and busing just to name a few. We need to maintain our rural voice and have the opportunity to work with an elected official who knows the community. Someone in the city sitting behind a desk would not know or understand our needs! Change is an opportunity to make a positive difference in the lives of our students. The focus should be on them. We have a good school division that has the outcomes to prove it. The changes proposed do not improve students education they are an attempt to reduce budgets, we would argue that they would actually cost the government more in the next five years while disrupting our students education. A good opportunity to make positive change is being missed with the proposed options. We could be building better relationships with our First Nations population, we could be looking at how to better focus on the needs of individual students. Thank you for taking the time to hear our concerns. School Community Council

Health Care is a different entity entirely from Education as Health Care covers the whole spectrum of age while Education is from K-12. Thus having a boundary based on Health Care is not to be used for the Education boundary. The students' individual needs will vary from city to town and thus you can't lump all different schools together. One size does not fit all. Each school has individual needs for the building, community, etc. What I mean is some buildings are newer and others are older and perhaps need some changes. Availability of resources from division office will change drastically if you amalgamate making less school divisions (doesn't matter if it's 1 or 14). The ease of receiving them, accessibility and thus creating a strain on the system for schools to be able to get the required resources for their students. Teachers will struggle in getting assistance from our resource people such as Speech Therapist, Counsellors, etc. because of larger school divisions. One person cannot evaluate all the teachers in the province. As teachers, we use feedback to grow and improve if we don't have support--what will happen to our education system and the value of our education? Students may have to be bussed a further distance this means a longer bus ride and could mean less time with family or time to be involved in other activities due to longer bus rides. By allowing the boundaries to become larger students more likely will fall through the cracks. I do not see the need for change as I notice difficulties with the present school divisions that were made 10 years ago. I would also like to mention that the timing of this report being during January and finals as a high school teacher is frustrating and adding more stress to an already stressful time. The months of December to January are stressful and very busy times with concerts, exams, finals, report cards, etc.

I am _____ with Regina Public Schools, an employee for the last _____ years here in Regina. I am also very thankful for my union and our collective agreement. I am very concerned about the recommendations/options that have been put together and such a rushed fashion. I don't see how these options and I quote..." Will focus on student success while ensuring accountability and efficient operational structures within the education system". The government gave Dan Perrins three weeks to study the amalgamations/restructuring and write his report. Why did Mr. Perrins recommend reduced school divisions and appointed trustees? There has been no meaningful public consultation, and a change of this scale has the potential for many errors. Why is the government rushing this? There's no evidence or report that states amalgamated/re-structured school boards and government appointed trustee's and CEO, will save money. It will only guarantee that the parents, workers and communities have no voice. Please stop this ! The public feedback supports our existing school division boundaries and keeping our democratic process of elected school boards. Why would the government want to change this? Why was this not brought up during the elections? I love my job working with students and they are my priority every day when I go to work. Why did the report not reference how this change will impact the students and their learning? Students are not a priority in this report! This is a business model, with government appointed school boards , Communication and feedback to and from parents/communities will be negatively impacted. I love my democratic right to elect a school board trustee who will be accountable and represent my community. Elected school board trustees have a vested interest in my community, not the governments mandate. How fast can major decisions, such as school safety issues, be made if there's no local contact or voice? I am asking that you hear the deep concern in our public voices... Local democratically elected school boards are the best choice for my community. Local accountability comes from locally elected boards making decisions for local communities. Sincerely

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report I would like to express my concerns with the options provided in the Educational Governance Review Report: Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in. I do not support any of the three models presented in the report and wish to remain a part of Prairie Valley School Division. The document options clearly acknowledge that changes to the current system may compromise student outcomes, reduce accountability, reduce community communication and access to decision makers, put more work on SCC's and disrupt our schools. The negatives far out way the positives. I also support finding cost saving systems, strengthening our educational outcomes and standardizing expectation for of our Boards, but cannot support wide sweeping changes as proposed in the document. Could the current local structure not be maintained while centralizing the purchase of large items such as paper, IT equipment, copier machines and consolidating transportation? Although I understand budgetary restrictions, a lower teacher/student ratio is crucial for success of all students with regards to academic achievement and socio-emotional well-being. None of the three proposed plans support this fact. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support that change to governance or further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! I do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. I value the connection our community has with our elected Board member and do not feel a move to appointed boards would benefit our remote community. I fear loss of our local voice will negatively impact our students experience and performance may suffer as a result. Our current Prairie Valley School Division board member is very visible in our schools and community. I have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold. Rural communities thrive, grow, and revolve around their schools. Closing schools will "close" small town Saskatchewan. I believe that all children should have equal opportunities and having public and separate education with separate funding does not support equality in education. Having any of these proposed models will not only affect how teachers are able to best deliver their course loads, but I question if the already limited access to current School Division Support Teams will further diminish (Support Team meaning: Occupational Therapists, Speech and Language Pathologists , Child and Family Support Workers, Social Workers, etc.). Nearby schools are at maximum capacity and there are great concerns for distance, safety, and time spent on buses for rural children. Regards,

I believe that we need have educational assistants in the classroom. They play a huge role in the students doing well. These people love their jobs and what they do daily. Often they come into work a little bit early each morning and stay extra in the day. A lot of them will be the voice for the students who will need it. Many people don't understand how much they do but come into a classroom with one and you will see what happens when they are there . Please think of the students and families that need this. Thanks for listening to my concerns

Do not close rural schools - Schell School, Holdfast, specifically. We are a school of necessity and are on the outer limits of the division. We have room to grow and house may more students. Our community thrives on the school being here, and all that it offers. With respect to this review, be transparent. Don't pussyfoot around the issues and give us a crumb here and there. If you already have a 2-year/5-year/10-Year plan laid out, let us know. We do not want to be stunned and hurt when things are at the point of no return. If our school closes, our property values decrease and you lose support in the rural communities. City centers are not the only focus. Rural communities make this province what it is! We are a praising province and rural families- Agricultural families- are a big makeup of Saskatchewan. Be smart, and by all means, be on the same level as everyone in the province. Don't be sneaky and pretend to give us a say when you have your plans in place. **DO NOT SHUT DOWN OUR SCHOOL. PLEASE AND THANK YOU!!**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this report. I must be honest, that reviewing this report is quite overwhelming for myself and other parents I have spoken with. Working in healthcare, I see the benefits and challenges of amalgamation and streamlining. I notice some of the current challenges in RCSD, but overall feel that the voice of our community is mostly heard, that our Catholic identity is being preserved (along with vital community and parish relationships) and that our children are receiving quality education. These are what are important to our family. I understand the need to be more efficient in making funds stretch farther, but if it is with cost to our values, what have we gained? I feel unsure as to how each of the options could potentially affect these values. So, if I were ever to be put in the position of choosing, I would feel inadequately prepared. If more parent and community feedback is helpful in this decision-making process, we will need further guidance to help understand the options being presented.

I am ok with dissolving boards if the money saved went directly back to student learning. I am all for saving money if it means putting those savings directly towards our students learning, materials, resources and support staff. The current school board model is outdated and must change. Our main goal is to serve our children and support their learning, we can achieve this but we need to change how we are currently running our organizations. Students First.

My husband and I are very much not in favour of eliminating elected boards of education. We feel each division has its unique assets and sets of problems as each school does. Who better to address those problems than someone who answers to the electorate and is familiar with their division. We are Saskatchewan, where community still means something. We feel government appointed boards would be a huge mistake. We know that there are a lot of us that feel the same way. We can't let the fabric of this province erode by taking away the personalization and accountability in the school system. We appreciate the chance to be heard. Sincerely,

I have been sitting here for hours reading the Perrins report trying to wrap my head around everything so I could write a decent letter. While I am here, I am feeling guilty that I could be using this valuable time to relax before a busy week with my students or to plan for the week, which I always spend lots of my Sunday doing. Obviously, big changes are going to have to happen to help with our province's deficit, but I am very shocked at how quickly these proposals came out and that we have such little time to fully understand these changes and to voice our concern. We got the Perrins report 2 days before Christmas! Just when we were exhausted, tired and glad we can finally focus on family time and Christmas shopping, we get a long report in regards to a huge educational reform. Don't get me wrong, I truly appreciate the government asking for feedback and allowing us to have the opportunity to share our thoughts through this survey and other ways, but I think such a large decision like this needs time and a "plan". One of my main concerns in regards to the Perrins report is that there is no mention of how this is all going to work. I am worried that the meager amount of money that will, eventually, be saved is overshadowing the root of all the divisions in Saskatchewan, which is the education of our children. If any of these changes were to happen, and so suddenly, there will be more of an emphasis on transitions and figuring out how this will all work rather than focusing on shaping the future minds of tomorrow. I also believe in electing our school boards locally is very important and helps shape exactly what the schools in the area need. For example, Regina Catholic school division does not have the same focus as say Chinook school division, who deals with several rural schools. Rural and urban schools have very different goals and work with several different situations. There are motives behind numerous school divisions, because they help meet the needs of the students in those areas, which differ from one area to the next. It is important to respect the unique characteristics of all schools as they work to meet the needs of the students in their communities. Would it make sense to amalgamate all divisions in Canada? Never. It is the same for Saskatchewan. There are First Nation, Hutterite, rural, urban, Catholic and more communities all over Saskatchewan whose priorities and necessities are rather different. Education belongs to community and as a new teacher, I hope we keep decisions closer to our communities. I am going to jump right to the fact that I am not good at writing this kind of stuff. I am very good at creating fun activities for my students and teaching them fun French songs. This is my fifth year of teaching and I am very thankful I became a teacher because it is very rewarding. However, I would never sugarcoat teaching because it is beyond harder than I would have ever imagined. I won't get into details, because you have heard it before, but know that teachers are already concerned about certain issues like large class sizes, assessments, supports and other issues stated in the Teacher Workload Intensification Recommendations. I hope that whatever your conclusion is, that you continue to keep students the focus of your decisions. Furthermore, I hope that our LINC agreements will still be honored and our voice will continue to be heard. We love our students and spend a lot of extra time and money into making sure we are giving the best education possible. I am honored to be a teacher in Saskatchewan and I am very proud to be shaping the minds of tomorrow. I hope we can all work together to help our province, all while keeping education and health a priority. Thank you for your time.

As a teacher with experience both in and out of our province, I have had the opportunity to see school and student needs handled in many different ways. I have been proud of my Saskatchewan education, and want to ask the Government of Saskatchewan to keep first and foremost student learning and positive school environments in mind as they consider changes to our system. Students who have what they need as they learn in our schools grow up to become adults who improve our communities and province. I ask that any changes enhance our existing educational system and student learning. Any savings as a result of changes to administration or governance should be funneled back into our schools to strengthen education in our province. I also ask that those in this decision-making process keep in mind the importance of supporting teachers, principals, and school communities in providing the resources and time needed to nurture student learning. Local agreements are important to our abilities to provide for student needs, and they must be honoured as we explore options for our educational system. When we work through complex or difficult issues with students in the classroom, we try to find the best outcome for everyone through respectful dialogue and a process that respects the dignity and experience of all involved. It is my hope that these consultations and decisions about governance do the same, offering respectful and meaningful consultation and negotiations with all stakeholders throughout the process.

In my experience there has been an ongoing trend for many years now to attempt to centralize and consolidate the governance and administration of just about every organization that I have been involved with. There seems to be a prevailing assumption that everything can be directed and managed more efficiently with lower cost by moving away from a localized control system to a centralized top down system. I have considerable personal experience serving on numerous boards and committees where the organization was consolidated and centralized with the intent to increase efficiency and improve level of service and generally better operations. In every case what actually happened was more like a loss of flexibility and the ability to adapt to the circumstances that will present them self in the real world in which the individual organizations must operate. The resulting bureaucratic approach is often anything but efficient or helpful in delivering a desired service or product to the desired people. The schools in this province are clearly covering a geographically vast area and many are as fundamentally different from one another as can possibly be in just about every imaginable way. I think it is a deeply flawed notion that anyone can possibly begin to understand and react appropriately to the local circumstances in a organization as diverse, and often unique as the school divisions. Using the data on the table on page 28 of the report, it is relative easy to take note of the many drastic difference in the reality of the numerous school divisions. The reality is that many of the school divisions that happen to be mostly rural have sparsely located students. 11 of the divisions have less than 0.5 students enrolled for each SqKm of land mass. Only two of the divisions have more than 100 students per SqKm of land. That's an enormous discrepancy in student density. Changing where the important decisions will be made is not going to change this reality. There are children living in locations that are a considerable distance to a larger center, they should have the right to be educated in that area. I am a staunch believer that there is no such thing as the absolute right or even a best way to accomplish most things. There will always be vastly different circumstances, expectations, requirements and desired results that will be encountered in just about any undertaking. The larger and more autocratic the administration, governance and management is less likely there is flexibility to adapt to the reality faced by the individuals involved on a local level. Any economic gain that may have been achieved form centralization will be consumed by bureaucratic overhead and a genuine lack of understanding of the issues that are important to the local group. Recently some individuals have expressed concern and dismay as to how the growing populous movement is taking hold around the world. Well! It is no mystery, that people many do not want to be governed from afar by a faceless bureaucratic machine. In the event that this report results in further erosion of individuals' rights to self-determination and freedoms by forcing the closure of any rural schools it would be seen by many as a call to action. There is no sensible reason why a grade school student should be forces to spend hours each day on a bus passing by perfectly suitable building in order to attend school in some mega structure just because some individuals likes to think they can control everything better from afar. Currently there are a considerable number of home schooled children in this area and there could be more. I truly and honestly believe that in some rural areas, it would likely be very possible to have a completely autonomous grade school run at the same cost or less then the education system now in place. I do not believe that this old style education system would be any less successful in producing well rounded individuals with a perfectly satisfactory level of education. It appears that part of the issue is cost of Governance in the educational system. I believe that by empowering local boards with real responsibility and control of local schools it is likely governance could be done entirely on an elected , non-paid basis the cost could be brought to virtually nothing. This may sound unlikely to some, but I could point out a considerable number of very substantial undertakings and local projects that were done completed very successfully using only volunteer governance and administration. There should be a provision in law so that a group of individuals can rightfully start or maintain a school with qualified teachers using tax money allocated to them by local taxpayers. If the centralized educational system continues its failing ways, I can envision a movement to completely empower local boards to go it on their own, leave education, at least at an elementary level, up to the discretion of the parents.

First of all there's not enough info for us to fully understand what is going on or happening. Secondly, I don't know how you feel that joining the whole province of schools as one division a benefit and to help save money. Our kids are not robots, they aren't programmed to all work the same! With the way things are run in the schools now works just fine. If kids need services to help them learn they are to them within hours or lined up for the next day. If your stationed out of one center how are you going to drive all over the province to help the kids that need it? Is that saving you money? Kids these days have the resources they need and have access to all the technology that they need. By putting them in bigger centers that will all be taken away from them, we will be stepping back in time 8+ years. Bigger centers with more kids per room are a huge disadvantage for everyone and the kids are going to be the ones that are going to be hurt. They are our future, if we don't educate them right what is that going to do for the long run. Just because our province is in debt and in trouble do not take it out on the children and the education that they need. Leave them where they are and don't relocate them to benefit you!

Deputy Premier and Education Minister Don Morgan, Educational Governance Review and Advisory Panel Members and Co-Investors: How wonderful it is to read of your dedication and investment into the processes and structures of education and its governance! It is encouraging to know that diligent and thorough efforts are underway to continue to provide the very best environments and to foster the very best relationships possible for Saskatchewan's students. I applaud your heartfelt industry! And I thank you for this opportunity to join you in your quest to champion the responsibility of educating our future. As a provincially certified, now home-based educator, I greet the opportunity of working towards educational refinements with great enthusiasm. It is my passion to see our children learn to embrace their responsibilities, freedoms and privileges with excellence in stewardship, generosity and innovation. In response to the invitation to engage with and to provide feedback to the Minister and the Advisory Panel, I submit the following thoughts: 1) I cheer on investigations into educational governance options that focus on student success while ensuring accountability and efficient operational structures within the education system. To that end, I ask that home-educated students be recognized as distinct and unique members of the Saskatchewan student body needing representation and place within review discussions. 2) I ask that the homeschooling community or an elected representative thereof be formally and fully recognized, accepted and integrated as a stakeholder into educational governance review discussions. 3) I ask that the province appoint and designate responsibility to registering authorities to disclose the provision of all provincial funds allocated to homeschooled students and their homeschool supports. I suggest that home-educators be held equally accountable to their registering authorities for their use of all provincial monetary home-education supports. 4) I ask that any governance model up for consideration be transparent and include specific and direct participation of home educators. 5) I thank all those who endeavor for the very best for the students of Saskatchewan. I ask that we all work together in a climate of mutual educational development from whatever platform we launch into our hearts desires and aspirations. I look forward to the possibility of hearing from and working with you. I thank you again for this opportunity to engage in educational review.

To whom it may concern: As a rural business owner, teacher, parent, volunteer, and SCC member involved in our K-12 rural school, as well as being a teacher with experience in an urban school 9-12, I have gained some insights into how governance, financial means, and teachers can affect a child's educational experience. Greatly affecting a students' experience is, first and foremost, the teachers' ability to structure a safe, supportive and engaging classroom experience. This ability comes from having teacher access to financial means and the time and support to properly adapt concepts into IEP's. When teachers spend too much time navigating administratively driven reporting, and are faced with large class sizes and minimal funds it can be extremely draining and counterproductive within the classroom. Teachers need to easily access help on demand as the year progresses without fighting layers of political processes which make the central offices' job easier! Our system needs to constantly strive to make the students experience in the educational system easier and more engaging. In my opinion the way we can improve our system is to keep the focus on low student teacher ratios, improved support systems and more counselling available for students and more involved families, and perhaps family based supports within the school system. This grassroots focus of student/classroom resources is crucial, while administration is secondary. Every region in Saskatchewan has different needs which are constantly evolving. Place the power to address these needs in the hands of those who can directly make an impact on the students' daily experiences-this being the professionals-the teachers. Local elected officials need to be involved to ensure the grassroots demands are addressed and supported. Equality in facilities and access to equal educational experiences is a must. Having local representation with some decision making power along with more funding available may help improve the students' k-12 experience. Saskatchewan people are very resourceful. But without having engaged governing stakeholders (merely appointed) the direct relationship building and accountability may be less than those are appointed from within who live, work and invest in the said educational region. I have taught through two amalgamations. I did not see the direct financial savings translate into a more engaging and meaningful educational experience with more resources for the students studying within the regions amalgamating. It saddens me as a teacher and frustrates me as a parent that administration and governance is looked at so carefully, and funds are allocated to studying governance when perhaps we could inject such funds into more resources or hiring more teachers to make our students' educational experiences more meaningful. Please keep our administration regions small, find more funding so rural resources match that of urban facilities and keep our officials elected. Thank you for your consideration in this matter,

School Community Council Member

To whom it may concern, Please note that I am against the amalgamating of school divisions and the elimination of elected boards of education. I am very satisfied with the way our locally elected boards function and represent us. I strongly believe that those elected by our individual communities are best suited to represent myself, my children and their individual needs and the community as a whole. Please leave things the way they are.

I have grave concerns regarding the possibility of the Lloydminster Public School Division being required to amalgamate. All communities have their unique dynamics which require unique structures. I fear that a "one size fits all" model will drastically impact students, teachers and learning in negative ways by creating more focus on redesigning structures and less on student learning. Lloydminster specifically is unique being on the border with funding from Alberta and the fact that the city also has structures in place to create provincial equality for students in our border city. I worry that the change in all of these structures is not conducive to our community. Our two school boards work together to provide education structures with Calendar and other collaborations to suit our community's needs. I would hate to see this change and negatively impact our families in Lloydminster. Many families count on this consistency. I am in full support of LPSD maintaining it's own school board so that together the two Lloydminster School Divisions can continue to meet the particular demands of this dual province city.

The current K-12 Education Governance Review happening in Saskatchewan is not the first and likely not the last review to take place in our province. Clearly, it has been put in place for financial reasons, or perhaps to improve educational outcomes for our children. Whatever the reason, we should learn from the experience of Saskatchewan Education and the amalgamations of 10 years ago. Has it saved money? Have the educational outcomes improved? If so, it would make sense to undergo further amalgamations, but it does not appear to have saved money with added costs for administration of the business aspect of larger divisions - new executives who were once secretarial and maintenance staff now making 6 figure incomes to manage departments in large school divisions. Saskatchewan still leads the country in school dropout rates and no improvement has been made on graduation rates for our youth. We must learn from the experience of other countries in the 80's and 90's. USA, England and Australia. Lessons learned were that educational outcomes are improved when personalization and reduced size is the focus. Schools of the future must be responsive, adaptable, and quick to meet the needs of their populations. Larger, more bureaucratic organizations will not be able to meet these rapidly changing needs of our Saskatchewan communities. A post-industrial economy is dependent upon education and the health of our province is dependent upon how educated the workforce is, therefore, we must ensure that good educational outcomes emerge from the K-12 education governance review. My one last concern that I must state is to ask if education has become part of a movement toward privatization? I hope not as other provinces and states have seen devastating consequences as private schools increase the divide between 'have' and 'have not' communities further reducing graduation rates for First Nations students. I do not speak against an education governance review, but I ask that we do not move forward without thoroughly thinking through the desired as well as the unforeseen consequences of those changes.

Amalgamating school divisions and eliminating elected boards of education is a horrible move. Each division will lose it's own identity. When you have your own local boards they see the real needs of the community schools. What would gov't elected boards possibly know what the needs of each rural community are and how they operate when they live in the big cities. No one can tell me that you can run a better ship by amalgamating. We saw that with health care. Everything went to Saskatoon and the left hand did not know what the right hand was doing. Take a long hard look at this critical situation, there are a lot of children future at stake here.

I have big concerns with options 1 and 2. I feel it is very important that there is local public input into education. Having locally elected boards accomplishes this. I don't feel that further amalgamation would result in further efficiencies, unless it could be shown otherwise. I think the diversity in education from rural to urban and from north to south in the province results in the need for local decisions being needed. Option 3: I think there can be more efficiency figured out at the division level. Perhaps the current model of delivering education will have to change. Some places where some efficiencies can take place: 1) We cannot afford the resources that are being used for high special needs children. I think it is appropriate for them to be integrated into Division 1, grades 1-3, but after that I think they could make better use of facilities at places like the FIP room at the Weyburn Comprehensive School. They are not institutionalized, they are with similar peers, they are not a distraction to other kids in the classroom, and they can still participate in the activities they are able to participate in. 2) The assessments the teachers are continually asked to perform take away from children's learning time. I think they already know most of the data that is returned to them. This could be streamlined. 3) Online learning is very efficient for those students who are suited to it and for classes that do not require group discussion. It should be encouraged. 4) I think the government needs to focus on getting parents involved in their children's learning. This would cut down on discipline and after school time required by teachers to deal with many issues. Instead of constantly focusing on issues such as bullying, public education of self-esteem and raising children not to be victims is going to result in more efficient learning. 5) It seems the public and Catholic schools need to share more resources. Items such as bussing, sports and even some technology should be shared to assist in finding cost savings. There is too much overlap of overhead.

We are not sure what you are expecting from us. I have read the report and would like you to know how the school has influenced our family. I assume we will remain anonymous to protect the youth's privacy. My husband and I have been foster parents to two First Nations children. Both with Treaty status, although they have never lived on reserve. They should both be graduating this year. The first program that benefitted our children was PEP Program. We attended for two years with our children in Esterhazy. Not having a program in Langenburg. We cannot say enough good things about how the program prepared them for kindergarten. The PEP staff met with the school staff to discuss their strengths and areas to be worked on before they started school. The teachers were excellent and more than willing to work with them and our family. PEP was a great support to our family and opened many doors for opportunities such as speech therapy... that we had problems accessing before. For parents with children who processed the world a little differently, the program was a success and very therapeutic for all. We had raised three biological children to graduate, but raising these two children was a totally different experience. One of the hardest challenges we have had. Our son and daughter have had all their education at Lang. With the exception of very few teachers or staff, our teens have been treated with the utmost respect. We don't believe they were discriminated against because of race or being in care. They always tried to work with Social Services and support and work with our family. Our children have received academic awards almost every year. Sometimes with distinction. The staff have tried to draw out their potential and truly want to see them succeed. They work very hard on anti-bullying. Very safe and nurturing environment. The drama program has been excellent for our son, but mostly our daughter, and many others. Millwright has been a great opportunity for our son. We have strong opinions and feelings about outdoor school? Feel it would be beneficial and healing to anyone involved. Especially if they do not do well in traditional classes. Also, for the First Nations teens. Anyone we talk to who is involved or teaching about this experience, cannot say enough good things about it. We are very concerned with the band/music program has been going. Art too, so important for their development and as a therapy for relaxation and healing. Would also like to see more psychologists and professionals available for students, staff and parents. Not nearly enough and not easy or even sometimes possible to access their services through schools. Extremely important! This is putting an incredible strain and responsibility on teachers and families who need or want these services. My husband and I would especially like you to know how the staff has been involved with our family over the years. They have supported and encouraged many appointments with Dr's, councillors, therapists and us individually. Taking into account our children's background, advice from specialists and giving us their advice or opinion. In the last few years, they have been more than accommodating with medical, mental health, and coping issues arising more as teenagers. From concussions to teens being hospitalized. Or going back and forth from facilities. In December, our son who is in Gr 12 with 21 credits, had not felt he could cope with school. The principal, guidance counsellor and other teachers have gone above and beyond for him to continue his schoolwork at home. He is completing assignments and hoping to write the tests at school and receive the credits. The teachers have been excellent in going out of their way to get him to feel comfortable about coming to them and going back to school. They have been very encouraging and helping him to still finish his Grade 12. With all the different supports, we are hoping he will be back at school next semester. Our family and youth have been and continue to be blessed by their school years. Thanks and appreciation for the Teachers, Staff, Boards, and government for the ways they have contributed. We have travelled to a few other countries, but even notice a huge difference from other districts or provinces. GSSD is a fantastic school division! Thank you! The NEW SCHOOL is AWESOME!

I have concerns regarding the possibility of the Lloydminster Public School Division being required to amalgamate. All communities have their unique dynamics which require unique structures. I fear that a "one size fits all" model will drastically impact students, teachers and learning in negative ways by creating more focus on redesigning structures and less on student learning. Lloydminster specifically is unique being on the border with funding from Alberta and the fact that the city also has structures in place to create provincial equality for students in our border city. I worry that the change in all of these structures is not conducive to our community. Our two school boards work together to provide education structures with Calendar and other collaborations to suit our community's needs. I would hate to see this change and negatively impact our families in Lloydminster. Many families count on this consistency. I am in full support of LPSD maintaining its own school board so that together the two Lloydminster School Divisions can continue to meet the particular demands of this dual province city.

I believe that the best option would be Option 3A. Demographics have changed and increase/decrease in numbers for divisions do affect what each division has as their own 'personal' goals or targets. I believe a centralized focus on education outcomes, as outlined on page 20, is key to this Option be beneficial. The Shifts in Governance listed on page 20 sound wonderful and necessary for Saskatchewan Education to move forward and succeed as a united, supportive province who cares about our students education.

Minister Morgan: As a parent, a teacher, an administrator and a rural resident in our province, I can't help but feel concerned over the report on Educational Governance prepared by Dan Perrins. After reading the report, I have several unanswered questions. Why the urgency? It seems like the government is rushing this decision, one that will have an effect on future of our province, our children. With these new proposed models, it seems that rural schools will risk losing their voice in a larger school division. Being a rural resident, it is difficult sometimes to compete with our urban counterparts. Without local elected school board trustees, this inequity will only get worse. Why is Saskatchewan considering option 1 & 2? Only one other province is currently structured like this, PEI, but it is SIGNIFICANTLY smaller than our province with a fraction of the student population. What about the kids/students? They seem to be completely disregarded in the report. It rarely mentions students, let alone challenges they will face if we move towards fewer school boards. A strategic plan, the ESS Plan, was developed to help school divisions cut costs. Why not at the very least let the school divisions complete the term set out in the plan to see if savings can be obtained. What is the cost savings in each model? When making your decision concerning our schools, our children and our future, I would hope that you will take into consideration the questions that I have outlined above. A concerned citizen,

I believe that school divisions within the province should be kept small and manageable, keeping decision-making at a local level with each division having elected trustees in place to govern. Offering quality education for the province is an expensive endeavour and one that should not have to pay the price for a government who did not lead a fiscally conservative agenda when times were good for the economy, and in doing so, failed to create an adequate financial reservoir. The education system is chronically underfunded, and in looking at it for a source to provide cost savings only serves to try and draw water from a rock. It would more stress on an already strained system and will be ready for a collapse. Amalgamation uproots all that is firmly planted built upon and causes enormous setbacks for everybody involved, taking years to regain shaky footing. Teachers have no more left in them to give to shoulder the burden so that students aren't feeling the effects of the demands on the school systems. Multi layered paraprofessionals within the education system needs to increase so that teachers can perform at a level in which they can continue to meet the needs of their students and keep job satisfaction in place. With the threat of amalgamation, also comes potentially increased travel time for in-service, adding more cost to both the division as well as teachers (i.e. additional childcare costs), but also stress on their families and themselves. It was mentioned that these changes are not necessarily meant to be done out of the need for cost savings, but to make improvements to the system, but I feel as though that we are being lied to on this front, otherwise these changes would have been called for in the best ten years that the Saskatchewan economy faced, not the worst year. So, please start being upfront about the agenda behind these "transformational changes". Also, in using such a vague term as "transformational change" the government is trying to do a smoke and mirrors routine so that the public doesn't even really understand how they will be affected once those changes take place. Rather than doing this dance of asking for public opinion and advisory committees, simply tell the public what the proposed changes are that the government is wanting to see implemented and then allow the public to respond to that as needed. The entire Education Governance Review has been handled in an undermining way to the people of Saskatchewan. Start from scratch, do it properly and don't rush the result.

The democratic process in our province allows us to elect government, municipal and school board officials to ensure we have taxation with representation. I would like to ensure we have locally elected boards and the Perrins report does not unanimously support further amalgamation of school boards. The divisions are large enough in Sask. and compared to other western Provinces, operate below in regards to board and student ratios, costs, governance, and size of area represented. NWSB operates very well and has many successes in regards to the outcomes in the ESSP put in place by the province. I attended the public forum and listened to the board as they passionately explained that they wanted to remain status quo to ensure they can continue to meet student needs, while ensuring student success for ALL students in this division. They make their budget balance from the funds provided by the province.

Having read the Perrins Report on K-12 Governance Review, I am concerned by a lack of clarity with respect to how such broad-handed restructuring would actually benefit students, tax payers, or any other stake holders. Although no such benefit has become clear enough to me, a number of thoughts and concerns do come to mind, many of which I have also heard articulated by colleagues and neighbours: - first, in a province such as Saskatchewan, we are in broad agreement as to the end goal of supporting the needs of all of our students, but there are differing perspectives about how that should look; - it appears that some positive gains have been made in terms of collaboration among the ministry and the various school divisions in the province, and that perhaps it would be wise to stay the course and continue to build momentum in these areas; - given that the educational rights of minorities is (justifiably) protected in Saskatchewan, we could not achieve a fully centralized (or regionalized) department/district of education without stepping on that, so it

seems unwise to embark on an incomplete restructuring whatever the benefits may or may not be; - the cost of transitioning into any of the potential centralization or increased amalgamation scenarios would result in a significant cost to divisions, teachers, and ultimately students; such an upheaval would, in my opinion, require a clearly articulated and significant gain in all three areas of accountability/transparency, cost-efficiency, and, most importantly, student success; - as a teacher, I define student success as comprising two things: (1) the more commonly referenced quantitative values (e.g. graduation rates, literacy rates, etc.) and perhaps more importantly (2) the more qualitative measures such as positive affective experiences of students, inclusion and responses to diversity, etc.; - the above-mentioned qualitative values have a causal effect, positively or negatively, on the desired quantitative outcomes; - the qualitative values of inclusion, response to cultural diversity, response to other needs (e.g. mental health of students, social supports, nutrition support) require regional responsive support and cannot be adequately met from a centralized office; - our constitutional and legislative checks and balances already have structures in place to protect diversity and to promote accountability both to the province and to the community; - our trustees provide community engagement and a voice specific to the needs of our divisions; - the needs of urban divisions are vastly different from those of rural divisions; this is why we have developed and worked hard to preserve local associations and LINC agreements; - we balance the needs of students, the need for efficiency and accountability, and the needs of teachers (necessary for retention and promotion of best-practices) in different ways in Saskatoon Public, for example, than would work in remote and/or small-town rural areas; - finally, as provincial governments come and go, bringing varying perspectives and methods for strengthening/supporting SK education, locally elected boards of trustees provide much-needed consistency and stability, allowing us to focus on delivering the kind of quality education that we all agree is our collective priority.

I am a member of the Prairie Valley School Division. I am also a home educator. I just had an opportunity to review the Governance Report. I admit it was disappointing to read. The rights of parents in the education of their children was overlooked in the study. Page 4 it is written that the constitution gives the responsibility of education to the province, except for First Nations living on reserves. The rights of minority faith and official minority languages are covered but there is no mention of the rights of parents in respect to the education of their children. Our children's education is our responsibility and right as parents. Some may share that responsibility with public and private schools but ultimately it is the parents, not the province as the ultimate authority over their education. I also saw no mention of how this would affect the homeschooling community anywhere in the review. SHBE has long been a unified voice of homeschooling families, and has been consulted in previous years with regards to how changes in legislation and educational changes would affect homeschoolers. Although that could be questioned with the most recent legislation changes that were pushed through a few years ago by the previous minister in regards to home education. SHBE was also not mentioned as "other partners in education". I would like to request that SHBE and the HSLD be counted as stakeholders in these discussions. They know better than our school boards and districts what our needs and views truly are and will understand the implications of the changes that are being proposed and can give you honest and true feedback. Valuable assets to involve in this process. And might I add, reasonable also. I also request that if the minister of education does move forward with its desired changes that the Province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding and services to support home educated students. Also that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators. Transparency at district and Provincial levels has been an issue for a long time and we do expect accountability in the divisions and at a provincial level. We do have different needs than regular public/private school attending students so our voice will be unique to that of public and separate school attending students. There were a number of points brought up in the review about efficiency, audits, responsibility for funding, how students were doing compared to other provinces, the changes that have occurred over the past 15 years especially in the past 10 years. Some issues are valid and could be taken care of without the drastic changes this review is suggesting. Really what it comes down to is the Minister of Education is wanting to change the governance policies of the Education system to give the minister more power especially over fiscal matters. There was continual reference to pg. 20 in each of the options presented, which referenced "redefining the roles of the Minister in the legislation and regulations" to be included in any changes regardless. That was the one consistency. Giving the Minister more power over expenditures, policies, staffing, curriculum, school boards and who is actually on them by having appointments and "qualified" according to the minister's standards, services and contracts within the division, funding distributions, and much more. I can understand why a Provincial Division would be an attractive option for the Minister of Education if his ultimate goal is for more power of the education in the province. But I do not think it will be of the best benefit to the students. The students were not of highest priority when doing this review. It was very "efficiency" based. Students and their education should be the driving motive of such drastic

changes. From what the review has provided, it looks like the school districts are actually doing what the minister has been requesting of them. They have been working on the ESSP and have made good improvements. As mentioned in the review, changes do take time and I think the divisions have made good progress in 2 years. If there are some who have not, work with them and don't lump all other divisions in with their issues. I have been very pleased with our Prairie Valley School Division and how they are continually striving to better the education of the students within their division. They consult with the communities and have been addressing the needs of such a diverse division. My concern is with these proposed changes, that the boards and provincial leaders will really be out of touch. I am concerned that since we live very close to Regina that we will have our boundary changed to be included in the Regina divisions and the reality is, the cities do not understand or even comprehend those communities outside of the city. Communities simply do not have the same needs and when you put an urban division in charge of a rural areas, the needs of the urban centres, in reality again, are placed first over the needs of the rural communities. Amalgamating divisions, having appointed board members not elected in reality puts those who are in higher authority positions out of touch with the needs of the schools and its students. School divisions are responding to the requests of the Minister already. Just last year they were asked to evaluate their expenditures and come to an efficiency target of \$5 million by August 2017. The divisions did it by August 2016, and not only did \$5 million, they took it seriously and surpassed it and achieved \$8 million. It takes time for the implementation of changes and that was very impressive. Truly, the people who have the welfare of students as their biggest concern are going to be those who are directly involved with them. They need to be listened to when considering these proposed options in this review. I hope the Minister keeps the concerns of parents, teachers, and existing school boards and divisions in mind when making his decisions. Think outside the box. Many times a small change or a change in one or two areas is really all that is needed to support and help. Looking specifically at certain issues and saying well we could make a change here to help, may be all that is needed. There is always more than one way to do something.

To Whom it May Concern: In today's broken world where core western values of democracy, education and freedom of religion are being challenged, it is disheartening to see that the provincial government is considering taking some of these liberties for granted as it reviews options to move to appointed school boards and possibly even amalgamate the Public and Separate divisions. The removal of elected boards would ultimately cause the stakeholders in our education system, which is really ALL of us in this great province, to lose our collective voice. Appointed boards would result in people not being represented properly in their respective regions while the appointees would undoubtedly reflect the political motives of the government of the day. Ironically enough, appointed boards could also add to administrative costs by creating bureaucratic leadership who are only responsible to those who appointed them rather than elected leadership who are constantly being held accountable to the electorate. The most concerning thought surrounding appointed boards for the Separate school system would be losing the ability to take faith based considerations when electing leadership. There would be a serious danger of appointed officials not representing the core Catholic beliefs of the Separate school supporters and thus, the schools would lose their ability to deliver a strong FAITH-based education as they are designed to do. Representative democracy in our education system is something we shouldn't take for granted, nor should we underestimate the importance it has on all of us. A poorer, less accountable appointed leadership in our education system would undoubtedly lead to a weakened overall education experience for our future generations. A future workforce with an inferior education would have a much larger negative financial impact to our economy in the long term through lower economic productivity and would easily negate any possible administrative cost savings today. This is NOT the area to nickel and dime for such immaterial short term administrative savings. Amalgamating school boards, specifically the Public boards with Separate boards simply to try and save some administrative costs, is a troublesome notion. Christianity is now the most persecuted religion in the world, and although this amalgamation may not be direct "persecution", it is definitely a step in removing the right for Catholics and other Christians in this province to be able to obtain an education that reflect their core values. Christians have already lost rights in the Public system through recent precedence that disallows very simple faith based activities or even faith related words in the Public schools. Based on that precedence, the existence of the Separate school division has an even greater importance to protecting the rights of Catholics and Christians in Saskatchewan's schools, so much so that it would be cause for legal challenge if it were seriously threatened. It would be a sad day in this province if it ever came to that. Appointed boards and any amalgamation of the Public and Separate systems would have grave consequences for not only our future generations, but for every citizen of Saskatchewan who enjoy the benefits of our strong economy. With that, we urge our elected government representatives to take that into consideration and realize that both options would be poor long term choices for the citizens and youth of Saskatchewan.

I worry that the changes to Saskatchewan school divisions will greatly impact all students within the education system. In many ways, it already has. Twenty-first century learners are coming to the classroom with greater anxiety, sensory needs, mental health challenges, cognitive deficits and limited family and community supports to provide for them. I have students come to my classroom who haven't slept because their mom had a party on a Thursday night and others who haven't had breakfast because the food bank wasn't open and still others who I am relieved arrived safely at school, despite abusive parents. Yet I teach them, I feed them, I counsel them, I support them the best I can. I'm in a "rural"/ "small town" school. These are NOT even the students with a formal diagnosis, on the spectrum or with an intellectual disability, however students with Intensive needs also exist within our walls. In my school there are 35 students who require the guidance of an Inclusion and Intervention Plan, that is nearly 13% of our student population. These students receive individualized programming and supports from specialized services, like occupational therapists, educational psychologists and counselors. Our school division provides these expert supports. With the changes the government is proposing, how will small, rural schools be able to access services for students who require intensive supports? We are in need of MORE services, made EASIER to access, not the other way around. Educational assistants also support many of these students in the classroom. Educational assistants make connections with students that engage and encourage them to participate in their education, not just sit on the sidelines. EAs are not just helping students with special needs, but they are coaching our teams, operating our booth and guiding our clubs. Because an EA is in the classroom, teachers are able to build & maintain relationships with the students to ensure engagement and learning occur in the classroom. EAs are not expendable, they are essential. Changes to the classroom have been happening over the past 10 years, those changes are in the dynamics of the students and their families in Saskatchewan schools. Teachers, now more than ever, need the support of government to do their job to educate future generation of Saskatchewan people. Teachers do not need to be distracted from their mandate to educate. The Government of Saskatchewan is causing a distraction with these proposed changes, yet teachers continue to do their job at the busiest time of year (for high school teachers – final exams, report cards, semester change). Yet here we are, advocating for the needs of our students, OUR STUDENTS. I hope the Government of Saskatchewan recognizes that OUR STUDENTS are also theirs. I welcome your response.

I was disappointed to not see any mention of home-based educators or home based education students. On the surface however that was encouraging because it led me too To assume that we could safely consider ourselves among the population of all students. That being said I would say the governance principles of transparency, equity, and participation are definitely lacking in our division and their approach to us as home-based educators. I would like to see the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to homebase educators specifically in regard to their use of provincial funding that is provided to Support home educated students. In our division there has been very little transparency or accountability when it comes to understanding why and when and how decisions are being made regarding funding for the instructional needs of home-based education students and teachers. One organization I would like to see invited to this table is SHBE. As a parent of several home-based students I feel a having someone who intimately understands my journey and the thought process that goes into being a home-based educator is very very important when it comes to supporting our students our children and our journey as educators.

I am the mother of 5 children, who have received public schooling as well as being home educated. As a parent , I believe it should remain my right to decide how my children would best be educated; and I highly value that this has been respected as my right in Saskatchewan. I appreciate the school division and the support they have offered to us as a home educating family. I would like SHBE and HSLDA to be recognized as stakeholders in the discussions regarding the future of education in the province of Saskatchewan, I also think that open and transparent communication is important for the future success of our education system. Accountability at all levels of government is important.

I worry that large scale amalgamations are not in the best interests of our either our schools and nor our students. Shared resources that are divided up from the top down do not see the needs of individual schools and students. Nor do people without a vested interest in our students, which is why I am opposed to having an appointed board instead of an elected one. These appointed boards would not give parents and community members a voice in best practices and concerns in our immediate regions. In addition, our division has worked hard to provide teachers with supports and ways to collaborate together, which would be even more difficult in larger divisions. I hope the government considers the possible negative ramifications on our students, schools, and staff before making changes to supposedly save money. We need to invest in our students, and the programs and supports available to them, not further change them for the sake of financial concerns in the province. Public programs like health and education should not pay the price for current deficits.

I would like to start by saying that the timing of the panel review couldn't have been more conveniently timed for receiving the least amount of public display and or reaction. Very slick, lets pick the busiest time of year to push changes on the public so we receive the least amount of back lash, good on you! Even our MLA had no input or public awareness on the situation. Regardless I believe the public has a right as to why these changes are coming about to begin with. We pay taxes, which pay the governments funding, so if you feel you need to amalgamate and downsize somewhere maybe start at the legislative assembly first, if you feel it so necessary. As I heard commented earlier from a local, "maybe we should amalgamate the amount of MLAs in the province and see how that goes over", maybe food for thought? Is it a budget issue, is it because the school board doesn't conduct its business correctly, is the curriculum not satisfactory, are we below standards for graduates, exactly why is it? I don't quite understand how downsizing a on a grass roots level will help out a province that is increasing in population daily, which is something the government is always very proud to announce on a regular basis. If anything we need more interaction to better understand the people's needs. Every area of this great province has its own geographical personality and as such requires a grass roots representation to properly address the demands and changes accordingly to their area. I believe you need to hold off on this decision to amalgamate and take a good hard look and realize that what we have works, so why would you want to take that away. Our area is quite diverse and not to mention, northern. Just a small northern town in the eyes of others, but our area thrives and has proven to release some very smart and athletic individuals. By making these changes, does this help the future of our children's education? Will they have the same opportunities as they do now? By amalgamating who determines funding for what areas? These are just some of the questions that could not be answered, and as a Saskatchewan tax payer I believe we deserve answers. Why has this been so fast tracked and not publicly discussed amongst the tax payers? It is our kids after all that are going to feel the repercussions. There is not enough information. What is the main agenda here?

We do not support any of the three models presented in the report and ultimately we wish to remain a part of Prairie Valley School Division. We do support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). Currently under the direction of the Prairie Valley School Division we celebrate some of the highest performance scores in Reading and Math as well as extraordinary High School graduation rates. What guarantee is there that these standards of excellence will be maintained through provincial amalgamations? It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! We do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. Our current Prairie Valley School Division board member is very visible in our schools and community. Provincially appointed board members will not be as accessible, nor will they know their communities' needs. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support the change to governance or how further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. We have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold. Rural communities thrive, grow, and revolve around their schools. Closing schools will "close" small town Saskatchewan. Nearby schools are at maximum capacity and there are great concerns for distance, safety, and time spent on buses for rural children. We need a permanent high school plan to accommodate the best interests of our students, their families, and our community, as well as a permanent high school transportation plan. We would rather our students be part of a smaller school, than being in overcrowded classrooms in larger centers. This is one of the reasons people choose to reside in rural areas. Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in. In Mr. Perrin's report the opening letter to Minister Morgan states that ALL stakeholders who approached Mr. Perrin for conversation UNANIMOUSLY support elected boards and NO more amalgamations! WHY would we continue with pursuing drastic changes?

As a parent of a young child with special needs, I have been pleased with the division model we have experienced for the last 3 years. We have felt supported as we began our journey through school with our child. Friends that live in Regina have shared their stories with me about the struggles they face to get support for their children with special needs. I felt lucky that us in the Prairie Valley division had more to offer our children with special needs. However, recent school division budget cuts have impacted us (seeing EAs cut), and we now wonder what impact a change in school division model will have on our community.

It is my hope that all children in our community, with or without learning challenges or disabilities, will get the services they require to be successful in their school career and later, in society. There are many wonderful benefits to the smaller school board models. Having local board members can help us keep our voice heard. Please help us find ways to meet the specific needs of the rural school communities and its children. Thank you for your consideration.

If the gov't decides to move ahead and amalgamate our school divisions into only a few or 1, our rural communities, schools and students will suffer. With appointed Board Members, not only will the parents, SCCs and communities lose a voice in the system but the rural schools will be forgotten. These schools work because of community input and support which will be lost if the only way for them to voice their opinions are to a distant appointee who they rarely or never see in their community. If everything is looked upon as a way to cut costs, then how long until a small school loses it's programs and funds? How long until someone far away in Regina or Saskatoon decides that a small town school that they have never been to or heard of is to be on the chopping block? Please, do NOT do more to destroy our rural way of life and our communities. Please, keep elected Board Members. Please do not make the School Divisions so large that we are forgotten. Cuts can be made responsibly and with good planning and decision making but hurting the people of Saskatchewan by destroying what we have built over generations is not the solution. Please listen to the people of Saskatchewan.

As a parent of young children, I hope that decision making stays closer to my children's classrooms. I have witnessed the power that a locally elected board has to affect positive change at the classroom level. Because locally elected board members live, work and raise their families in the community, they are accountable to the community members and students they serve. As an educator, I encounter our board members on a regular basis in our community--they know the needs of each school they serve and their passion for serving their community is evident. I am not certain an appointed board far removed from the communities it serves would be able to adequately serve the educational needs of each school and student in our province. As an educator, I have experienced restructuring of school divisions and the disruption that takes place for students and staff when that occurs. As a student, I experienced the fear of school closures in the small Saskatchewan community where I grew up. Both situations were efforts to create efficiency, but also created anxiety for students and families and significant changes in communities. While creating efficiencies is desirable in this economic climate, it should not be at the expense of students or classrooms. While reading over the statistics, one can't help but notice that Saskatchewan already has the fewest school divisions due to the last round of restructuring, yet still the lowest scores of the provinces on PISA, etc. Is there any certainty that yet another round of restructuring and moving decision makers even further away from the classrooms and students will have the desired impact on student learning? Will it truly reduce costs significantly enough to merit the noted several years of "growing pains"?

Further amalgamating school divisions will have no benefit to the current and future students receiving education in SK. As a parent with young children, I am very concerned about the decline in quality of education that has been apparent in our schools over the past years. Too many students are leaving high school unprepared for secondary education and/or the work force. Removing decisions and board members away from our communities, by further amalgamating school divisions, will take away the 'voice' that parents and local members are able to give to our children's education. The education that our children receive is the future of our country and therefore needs to be delivered in their best interest.

I am worried individuals who impact the education of our children will live too far away. This could lead to not having a deep understanding of the communities they serve, thereby creating a negative impact on the standard of education. In addition to this, I am worried about additional services such as speech therapists, psychologists, etc. being shared. As the distance increases, their ability to address the the needs of the people they assist could decline. Finally, if there is an issue, can a larger organization identify it and resolve it as efficiently?

I have no issue with examining governance structures in education and trying to improve them; especially if improving governance improves student learning. In this process of governance review it is the Ministry's goal not to make changes that would disrupt the classroom or teachers. I believe that any changes to governance will have an impact on the classroom. As governance structures change at some point there not be a disruption to some of the services necessary to ensure student learning. While I am not against change I believe it needs to be well thought out and well planned to ensure that these disrupts are minimal. I worry that the timelines this process is working in will cause these disruptions. In his report Dan Perrins' states that during the transition period, focus on restructuring may compromise the focus on student outcome the the Plan for Growth and ESSP. Any changes need to be what is best for the education system and student learning and not to meet a deadline. I hope that whatever the outcome of this review that it helps improve student learning in Saskatchewan education.

It is my hope that changes in school governance will recognize the right of parents to choose the kind of education given to their children. Kindly consider the inputs of the provincial home schooling body SHBE and its national counterpart HSLDA. Also give thought to the development of a province-wide registration system and funding formula for home schooling families. Thank you for your consideration.

Options 1 and 2 do not allow for local public input into education. Having locally elected boards accomplishes this. The public needs proof that further amalgamation would result in further efficiencies. Diversity in education from rural to urban and from north to south in the province results in the need for local decisions being needed. Option 3. There is no double more efficiency could happen the division level. The current model of delivering education will have to change. Efficiencies can take place in the following ways: 1) The resources that are being used for high special needs children is not sustainable. It is appropriate for them to be integrated into Division 1, grades 1-3, but after that facilities at places like the FIP room at the Weyburn Comprehensive School should be utilized. They are not institutionalized, they are with similar peers, they do not distract other marginal learners in the classroom, and they can still participate in the activities they are able to participate in. 2) Teachers are continually asked to perform assessments that take away from children's learning time. Most of the data that is returned to them is already known. This could be streamlined. 3) Online learning is very efficient and should be encouraged for those students who are suited to it and for classes that do not require group discussion. 4) Government needs to focus on getting parents involved in their children's learning....this would cut down on discipline and after school time required by teachers to deal with many issues. Instead of constantly focusing on issues such as bullying, public education of self esteem and raising children not to be victims is going to result in more efficient learning. 5) Public and Catholic schools need to share more resources. Items such as bussing, sports and even some technology should be shared to assist in finding cost savings. There is too much overlap of overhead.

Thank you so much for the opportunity to feed into the province wide consultation regarding the report by Dan Perrins. I have a child in both high school and elementary school, so am extremely interested in the direction education is going, and believe passionately that there is no greater priority for our government at this time. I am thrilled that the government has committed to a continuation of the Catholic education system. This is the system my children are registered in and I believe it is an important choice that parents can make for their families. Thank you so much for carrying on this Saskatchewan approach to alternatives for families. I am from Prince Albert and have engaged with the administrators in discussions relating to student achievement in our system. I have seen the statistics demonstrating improvement in the past three years. I believe our schools are on track or ahead in achieving meaningful progress and growth. I am hopeful that the next three years plan currently under development will be supported as it continues to align with the overall provincial plan. I am concerned that, in an effort to save money, there may be decisions made that take away local decision making opportunities. I sit on a parent council at one of our schools, and have seen firsthand how the relationships and partnerships in our school administration and management have contributed to student success. In particular, I would point to the graduation rates of the First Nations and Metis students and the unique manner in which they are supported in our school. I am concerned that the successes we have seen would be undermined should decision making be retrenched to a bigger provincial organization. I appreciate the difficulty of the decisions ahead and am hopeful that, at the core of the decision making, there continues to be an absolute focus on what will give the students the very best education possible. The future of our province depends upon it.

Bounded Rationality at it's best: partisan influence at center stage in Perrins' "Hurry Up" report. Before delving in to the content of the Perrins' Report, it is important to acknowledge the task and the difficulty of work presented to him. And, in all fairness, his end product is commendable given the scope and distinguishable influences at play. In Herbert Simon's theory of bounded rationality, he argues that it would be better coined "satisficing", a combination of two words: "satisfy" and "suffice". Perrins was presented with a focus of bounded rationality. He was asked to seek something that is

just “good enough” as he wasn’t given the time or latitude to develop a report that fully answered Don Morgan’s key question regarding education governance and administration in Saskatchewan. Despite these cognitive limits associated with bounded rationality and the forced lack of consideration for the student experience, Perrins provides well thought out options. At the onset, I am pleased with the report’s focus on answering the key question: “what system of governance and structure is needed in Saskatchewan’s K-12 education sector to achieve the outcomes established by the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP)?” The Minister has deliberately indicated on a regular basis that “everything is on the table” when determining possible options for governance. I couldn’t agree more, everything must be on the table when conducting an exercise that attempts to consider all options and improving student outcomes while ensuring the workload of teachers remains unchanged. However, I believe that we are in a state where both plans, the Sask Plan for Growth and the ESSP, can co-exist and to some degree in a mutualistic relationship. A relationship where each plan exists and benefits from the other. Upon reviewing the inter-jurisdictional comparison matrix on Page 7 of the report, even readers that are completely unfamiliar with the education sector should deduce that an increased number of school divisions should be a viable option. Saskatchewan is unique when we look at the 5 factors portrayed (land mass, # of boards, # of Board Members, Number of students and taxation authority). This Minister’s commitment “that everything is on the table” and blatant disregard of the possibility that an increased number of boards, or the status quo, may be the best option for student outcomes lends to the notion that everything was not on the table. Further, the table seemed to be set already and Perrins wasn’t given the option to have gravy with his mashed potatoes. Transformational change in education cannot begin, nor be focused primarily on governance or administration; it must begin with students and those that teach them. The Perrins’ report and the focus of the government have viewed the experience of students and teachers as somewhat of a collateral item. The biggest mistake made regarding transformational change and its conception is that the scope didn’t include the layer of stakeholders where transformation should/shouldn’t occur. It needs to be clear, the misnomer of transformational change should be regarded as a cost cutting measure and a gain of control. Key Challenges Contributing to need for legislative, structural and governance change: 1) The K-12 Education System is Challenged to Achieve Broad-based Improvement in Student Achievement Perrins states, “The Minister has the authority to publish goals and objectives for the system but cannot directly impact the achievement of students. The Minister must rely on the efforts of teachers, principals and administrators who are employed by boards of education to effect (consider spelling) change” Firstly, regardless of an authoritative change, student achievement is always going to rest on the backs of school based staff – let’s move on from this one. In practice, this challenge or dilemma is a self-inflicted wound. The Minister and his team have involved themselves in the administrative side of school divisions and have completely lost their reverence as an educational leader. The level of sophistication of the Minister’s office in the area of administration and Infrastructure compared to the “education side” of their operations is embarrassing. There seems to be more time spent on running around and canvassing the value for money of P3 schools than there is providing teachers with the resources and learning environments required. Of course, the Minister is having trouble impacting the achievement of students – the Minister’s focus is misguided and the direction of Ministry resources has shown their disregard for exercising quality educational leadership. Perrins cites Michael Fullan’s need for vertical accountability regarding goal achievement. In the Education sector, vertical accountability cannot be unidirectional – it should flow both ways. Currently, the Minister is not providing the tools to teachers to ensure accountability. Perhaps, that is where the real challenge is...changing the strategic direction of the Minister to be more focused on student learning. Poor PISA results and plateaued graduation rates are not a challenge as these are the results. The challenge lies in convincing the Minister to become a support system that provides educational leadership. 2) Each School Division has Broad Authority to Determine How to Allocate Resources to its Priorities. This must be Perrin’s comedic section of his report – how is this a key challenge? The notion that a student “may” have a different educational experience from division to division is a profound one. Students across this province, much to the disbelief of the Ministry, are different. Furthermore, they require a different experience than other students in order to be successful. Please don’t misunderstand this point to mean that I don’t support best practice, but this is an extremely weak challenge outlined by Perrins. A counterargument could be made that this is a “benefit” of the current structure of school divisions and their ability to respond to local needs. This challenge is prefaced by a discussion of the discretion of Boards and the unconditional funding they receive. Perrins states the challenge is the potential of and likelihood of differing educational experiences. Let’s be honest, the challenge is a loss of control and, if given the control, the Ministry does not have the wherewithal and expertise to respond to local student needs. Any other option than 3b contributes to the sector’s inability to respond to local needs and increases government’s overall control – what the Ministry appears to be after in the first place. 3) The K-12 Education System is Challenged to Achieve Broad-based Efficiencies. Although I’d agree with this issue of selective participation when it comes to cost saving initiatives, Boards

seem to get painted with a dirty brush here. Savings have been found...and it certainly wasn't through the brainwave of LEAN. As ill-managed as the Boards are made out to be in this challenge put forth by Perrins, I can assure you their discretion is better exercised than that of the good ol' folks involved in the GTH land deal. A deal where efficiencies were realized at the cost of good value for money and sound judgement. Albeit, one could argue Boards may not be quite as efficient or expeditious when acquiring assets such as Land. 4) Page 20 and the Options: The meat (see... everything is on the table) of this report, and what Perrins believes will address these key challenges, begins on page 20 and ends with the options for government consideration. Sadly, this section was most likely written on a "Keep Saskatchewan Strong" sticky note and dropped in Perrins' wall-mounted hot file at Johnson Shoyama prior to receiving his mandate. Don't worry fellas, the public won't find the sticky note. But, we may have questions about the letter of transmittal stating that Perrins was asked on November 15th to develop a report and several of the references cited on page 31 had been accessed prior to November 15th. Probably a good time to fire up Jeremy Harrison with his "no wrongdoing..." skit. 5) Shifts in Governance: 1) Strategic Direction and Accountability; Redefining the role of the Minister isn't necessarily a bad thing, but please ensure there is willingness to become a structure that supports school divisions and teachers. A structure that contributes to the Ministers responsibilities in the area of educational leadership; Accountability to the Minister and overall control of the Minister will be increased as a result of this report. What barrier will be in place to ensure that students don't feel partisan influence and the government's ever-changing focus; What does the # of board members per board have to do with strategic direction and accountability?; The provincial auditor has identified board member competencies and areas of expertise such as: leadership skills, experience, ED sector experience, finance, etc. Board members are lay people that represent the values and voices of the communities they live in. They are not financial experts as that is not their role. Equally off kilter is the notion that the provincial auditor has been selected as the unwavering pillar of expertise in the education section and policy governance...really? Unlike most members of the public, I will not take a stance on which option is best suited to answer the minister's initial question. He promised that everything would be on the table – it wasn't. Perhaps, transformation should occur at the ministry level and governance structures should remain status quo. Perrins' ill-quipped report and the push for a "transformational change" is the government's red herring. An exercise in patience that will give the government more control and reduce costs. It should never be and cannot be regarded as a process that is student-centered. Clearly, there has been little consideration of what is best for students.

The thought of 1 to 4 divisions in our province is ridiculous. What is Saskatchewan coming to? We are made up of many rural and urban settings all of which have unique needs, characteristics, challenges and wants. As a parent with children in the Prairie Spirit School Division, we have already noticed major cutbacks in staffing and funding. Our school division is the fourth largest in the province with over 10,000 students. We need to be able to have our needs be heard locally by our board, not from a group somewhere else in the province. Boards are accountable to government and their communities. In addition, Boards hold their administration accountable to ensure the school division operates effectively and efficiently. Education seems to be taking a hit with funding as of late and we need to change that. Schools need money to run quality programming for their students so they can meet the needs of all of their students and be able to do so in a realistic class size. Thank you for your time.

I like things the way they are now. I don't want school division amalgamations strictly to save money. While I understand there could be cost savings found by centralizing IT, administration and financial services, there still needs to be regional boards/committees that will likely be more in touch with the needs of the schools, students, teachers and communities in the area rather than these decisions being made from one or two centralized locations. The following are some specific concerns I feel are important no matter what final decision is made regarding the future of school divisions in the province. 1. No loss to student extra-curricular activities. 2. Students do not have to travel extra distances to participate in extra-curricular activities including sporting events. 3. Students are not required to take the bus/drive further distances to get to school. This includes not having students from Pilot Butte school bused to Regina schools or Pilot Butte school becoming part of Regina Public. I feel like the quality of programming, teachers and student/teacher ratio at our school might be lost should this scenario be realized.

After reviewing the Educational Governance Review Report the following concerns were noted: The report refers to two studies completed in 1993 which evidenced that having 35 public school divisions would be ideal, which is not dissimilar to what we have now. The report also refers to previous instances where the number of school divisions was reduced from 119 down to 82 over a period of six years. Given the reduction of divisions is similar, at least in the first two options, it seems that the timeline for this to be accomplished is much narrower. This is concerning, given that reducing to a single public division is more complex than previous reductions. Ultimately, the concerns are similar to that noted in each challenges section of the presented options. Of particular concern are the challenges surrounding accountability and transparency. As noted on page 2 of the document others have expressed the importance of elected boards. We would like to echo these concerns. If fewer divisions have a responsibility for a greater number of students who deserve a varying degree of supports and services, there is a risk of these types of changes having a detrimental impact on the students. Moving to a provincial board, there is an inherent risk of becoming unable to recognize and respond appropriately to the diverse needs that exist within the current school divisions, and given that Saskatchewan, as noted by the report, already has one of the fewest amounts of school divisions, there is a possibility that benefits observed in prior reductions may not be reproducible with any of the proposed options. Further, there is concern that an increase in the role and responsibilities of the SCC may create further barriers in both parental and community engagement. We understand that as time changes so do economies and numerous other variables that require hard decisions. It is our hope that moving forward that a full scope of supports and services are offered to each student across the province. We thank both Mr. Perrin for his work in the report and the Ministry of Education for working to provide the best environment and education for the students for the past, present and future. School Community Council

It is my belief that further amalgamation of Saskatchewan school divisions is unwarranted and will lead to disruption of student learning. After the amalgamations which took place in 2001 it is clear that for several years following, as new cultures are being formed, new practices implemented, and shifts of staff to new locations and/or positions are occurring, energies are shifted away from students and their education. The haste with which this report came out as well as the extremely short period of time in which the public has to respond is concerning to say the least. Decisions which will impact not only a generation of our youth but also Saskatchewan families and workers should be made thoughtfully and with evidence to support its merit, not with haste. While I believe that we should not realign school Division boundaries or have any further amalgamation, it is also concerning that this is the second time the Separate school board has escaped review and consideration to be part of a review process. As no savings have been documented from the last round of amalgamations, I would simply submit that practices are reviewed and efficiencies put in place across the province.

I feel that some of the smaller schools in our rural areas are very important to the communities they serve. I don't believe that bussing kids for an hour a day or longer is healthy. My grandson lived with me for the past four years. Due to the new bussing route, from the time he was in kindergarten until the current school year, when he was in grade four, he has had to spend an hour to an hour and fifteen minutes on the bus, twice per day. And that is to get to our small town school that is 15 km away. How ridiculous. And yet making our divisions possibly even larger is an option being tossed around. The current division can't serve the rural communities fairly as it is. How will making them responsible for an even larger area help? The school divisions need to take into consideration not only the sizes of the schools that are in a community, but also the area which the school serves. Trying to make larger schools serve a larger area is even more detrimental to what is going on now. If our small town schools closed then our kids will spend even more time on a bus. To go to school. Not only is this harmful to the children who are forced to spend two useless hours a day on a bus, it exposes them each and every day to the dangers on the highways. For a full two hours, or longer if some of the smaller schools close. I don't know very many adults who want to commute 75 minutes to get to work, let alone children who want to do it to get to school. Imagine a child who is five years old having to spend that much time on a bus. There are failures in our system, not only in discussions about what schools to keep open or close, or school divisions to make bigger or smaller. But how to get our children to school? I drove my children many many days when this new bus route came in. Due to the fact that our driver comes from Vibank, the kids closest to Vibank got to be picked up first and dropped off last. Every single day. Never a change to the route to make it fair for our kids. Never. First on. Last off. For a full 60-75 minutes twice a day. Yet other kids on the route have a 10 minute ride. Twice a day. Is that fair? Which child is going to be fresh enough and have the energy to do some homework? Which child is going to get some fresh air when they get home? I bring up the bussing as yet another failure to our rural children and communities. Money is everything. Saving money on the backs of our children is a poor decision. When a school division is changed or a school is closed,

the cost of busing is not taken into consideration because the provincial government pays for the busing, not the school divisions. So it seems that the costs of transportation need to be taken into consideration also. Of course if it changes to one school division for the whole province, then likely the provincial government would really take a look at keeping the smaller schools, as their costs would go sky high if kids all have to be transported greater and greater distances due to closure of small town schools. Putting kids on a bus for over an hour each direction is extremely unhealthy for children and diminishes their quality of life.

As a

home educator, I know we have no representation within the education board, though there are over two thousand registered homeschool students in our province, and growing. I understand we are a small group but not insignificant and therefore, feel we should be represented and have the opportunity to be stakeholders. Francophones are stakeholders but homeschoolers are not, yet have almost double the students. If I am required to be accountable and under the authority of my local board and provide that board superfluous documentation and reports, I feel home educators should have a say. The board appoints an administrator, without consultation from homeschool educators. The appointed usually knows very little of homeschooling and is typically unsupportive of it, to begin with (which seems silly to appoint a representative to a community they themselves do not support). The board writes policy without consultation of home educators. Funding is never transparent in regards to what the province provides and what we actually receive and therefore is unaccountable for how the money is actually spent. Personally, I would prefer our representative be voted by home educators or at the very least, a supporter of homeschooling who has done it and understands. I know many don't support homeschooling. I understand why. I also believe there is a lot of misunderstanding and misinformation about homeschooling and I truly believe being unrepresented as stakeholders is part of the problem. Public education is an incredibly valuable service provided to our society, as is homeschooling and the vast benefits it provides to our future. My hope going forward is that the province is looking towards the future and understands the homeschool community is ever expanding and that is a positive change for the educational futures of our children. Thank you,

As a parent and an SCC member, it is important to me that I give my opinion so here it is. I don't like any of the 4 options in their entirety but there are excellent suggestions in this report that I hope you will take seriously. I like the idea of a Provincial Advisory Body and An Education Quality Council to try to unify the province as mentioned in options 1 and 2. I like implementing an entity for operational efficiencies especially where they say in option 3 "with mandated school division participation". And maybe as mentioned in Option 3B the school divisions could be more efficiently mapped out. From this report it looks like Saskatchewan is fine, in comparison to other provinces, where they are regarding the number of school divisions, school boards, etc. I'm worried about where we stand as a province regarding science and math but feel we are on the right track with the ESSP and that will come together in time if all stakeholders are on the same track and schools and students can continue with implemented school division plans without disruption. Before anything else is done, I feel that full consideration should be shown towards the Shifts in Governance. All points make sense to me. The general feeling I get from people I have talked to regarding appointed boards is that Brad Wall will just hire friends, both personal and business, who will be loyal to him but not to the students, parents and community members. I have not heard one good thing about appointed boards when talking with various people in the community regarding this. So if this is the route that you are thinking of going, my feeling is that community members need to be appointed who have a stake in their school, not people from the city who have no idea about rural education; and the pay cannot be more than what the elected board members actually take home in their pocket now. Of course, I don't like amalgamation of the 18 boards into 1 or even 4. It doesn't make any sense to do that and still have elected board(s) and I hope unloading board function onto the SCC isn't even considered. Uniting parents, school and community is our role which makes sense. Our time is best spent raising community funding for projects that include student wellbeing and added help with literacy and math. The SCC Boards are functioning at their best with the roles we have right now for students, parents and community. It takes money to make money and the \$2,000 given to our SCC by the PVSD Board has doubled and has the potential to triple or more this year alone with all of it going towards projects that benefit our students. And I don't like amalgamating the 18 school divisions into 8 or 14. It sounds like there would be minimal cost recovery and I think PVSD would get split up. Instead of getting split up, I think PVSD should stand as the model of what other divisions should have done or should do to bring in cost recoveries which may include school closures if the school is too small but it has to make sense to do so.

I am writing on behalf of

School Community Council. Our questions and concerns are as follows:

1. 2020 seems to be an unrealistic goal to “reduce the difference in graduation rates between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal students by 50% and to lead the country in grade 12 graduation rates”. How will any of these changes help meet the goal?
2. Couldn't most if not all of the key benefits happen without these shifts in Governance?
3. How will these processes address the factors that are impeding success? Factors include:
 - nutrition
 - attendance
 - lack of support from home
 - transiency
4. How will the levels of support services be addressed? Will it be based on need or number of students?
5. How long until we see the benefits of restructuring?
6. Why not look at raising taxes?
7. Where will the savings go?
8. What does this mean for our teachers and our SCC's?
9. The benefits seem so uncertain while the challenges are very clear. How do we determine whether benefits outweigh challenges?
10. Cant school divisions be left to determine their own efficiencies?

11. Couldn't individual school divisions look ahead at eliminating positions as people retire etc?
 12. What stands in the way of divisions sharing resources (busing, support services etc.)?
 13. Shouldn't the focus be taken off graduation rates and redirected towards implementing beneficial strategies to help identify early learning inconsistencies among kids which would increase the number of graduates?
 14. Some of these options have never been implemented before. Why are they options and where is the proof they will work? How far into them do we have to be before we see any financial and educational benefits or before it is realized they wont work?
 15. Seems risky and hasty to be making such big decisions in such short time. Why the rush?
 16. This is supposed to be for the kids yet little or no reference is made as to how any of these changes will benefit them.
 17. Student teacher ratio should be lowered not increased with behavioural and learning disorders as high as they are.
 18. It would be harder to monitor bullying with schools at max capacity.
 19. Fear of loss of local representation within our community/division.
- Should there be a change deemed necessary we feel Options 3A or 3B would be of least disruption to child learning.
- Thank-you for your time and consideration to read our questions and concerns.

Dear Ministry of Education: As a parent of students in the Prince Albert Catholic School Division, we would like the Ministry of Education to consider the following as feedback to the Dan Perrins report: 1. Catholic education is important. We applaud the Minister of Education on valuing the Constitutional Right to have publicly funded Catholic education in this province. 2. Student Achievement is a priority. We encourage our Ministry to support our school division's next three year plan that staff, parents, community stakeholders, School Community Councils, Catholic constituents, trustees and children are developing that will help our children meet the 2020 provincial growth plan. 3. Relationships are important. We encourage our Ministry to consider local relationships and partnerships in administering and managing the educational affairs of the school division. Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback at this critical time.

Sincerely,

I have read the report regarding K-12 Governance in Saskatchewan. I have taken the liberty of taking Appendix A in the report and changing it to reflect the student numbers in each school division (given that that is why we are all here). The appendix submitted shows some of the challenges faced by large geographical areas in the rural divisions and the vast student populations in the urban divisions. As you can see the number of students represented by each board varies significantly and the cost of administration and governance per student is substantially different. As you have already alluded to in the report, changes are required to control costs and improve student outcomes. What drew my attention was how costly some of the rural divisions are per student and how low the costs are in the urban areas. What was more interesting was how some of the school division costs vary, for example the large urban boards between separate and public are significantly different. Changes are required but I would suggest the large urban public boards are the most cost effective delivery model.

	Number of Students per Sq KM	Number of Students per Board Member	Governance \$ per student	Administration \$ per Student	Average Student per School	Number of Students per Teacher	Number of Students per Other Ed Staff
Public							
Chinook	7.20	593.80	65.38	521.24	97.34	12.49	20.29
Creghton	2.21	86.00	297.08	936.75	430.00	13.27	23.24
Good Spirit	3.88	558.73	77.70	438.41	438.41	14.47	38.15
Horizon	4.92	449.36	108.89	661.79	153.44	13.14	27.95
Ile-a Crosse	1.31	54.86	238.17	1,108.22	192.00	12.39	27.83
Living Sky	4.53	555.40	73.07	461.80	185.13	14.76	19.47
Lloydminster	0.01	569.43	49.92	510.55	398.60	14.78	35.18
North East	6.27	487.40	69.71	451.56	221.55	15.46	33.00
Northern Lights	77.04	464.67	154.97	732.14	209.10	12.83	20.61
Northwest	5.10	428.91	71.30	571.75	196.58	13.70	29.00
Prairie South	4.97	659.70	70.45	476.52	160.90	14.24	28.60
Prairie Spirit	1.49	866.25	54.50	352.55	231.00	16.01	32.08
Prairie Valley	2.92	735.45	77.92	462.93	207.44	14.65	30.68
Regina	0.01	3,022.86	21.13	286.70	391.85	14.51	49.68
Saskatchewan Rivers	1.85	844.60	70.04	443.96	263.94	15.63	24.14
Saskatoon	0.01	2,281.90	32.48	277.42	393.43	15.21	52.19
South East Cornerstone	3.65	804.30	60.02	419.69	206.23	14.77	26.78
Sun West	6.62	524.22	74.59	597.13	117.95	14.17	24.57
Separate							
Christ the Teacher	2.64	166.60	121.88	761.23	185.11	14.70	30.68
Englefeld	2.60	20.60	169.37	889.21	103.00	11.98	41.20
Holy Family	5.43	121.80	131.82	908.30	243.60	16.28	31.97
Holy Trinity	0.08	253.75	103.76	727.52	225.56	13.98	31.82
Light of Christ	0.06	276.14	117.50	677.09	276.14	14.96	40.27
Lloydminster	0.02	352.57	75.21	568.67	411.33	17.40	30.36
Prince Albert	0.66	422.14	76.41	511.90	328.33	16.33	37.08
Regina	0.02	1,508.86	64.23	354.62	352.07	15.45	85.87
St. Paul's	0.26	1,619.30	51.38	374.40	359.84	15.98	36.59

Francophone							
Conceil des Ecoles Fransakoises	22.40	206.13	132.27	1,650.99	126.85	10.22	19.63
Averages	6.01	676.28	96.83	611.97	253.81	14.42	33.18

45 individuals submitted the following content:

Catholic education is important. Student achievement is a priority. Relationships are important. Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.

4 individuals submitted the following content:

We need to keep our school boards locally elected. We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. We do not support further amalgamations. We do not support changes to our subdivision boundaries.

856 individuals submitted the following content:

Dear Education Governance Review Panel Members & Minister Morgan: I believe that local representation in education is crucial in a democratic society. Locally elected boards are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. They are important advocates for ensuring excellence in education. Who better to serve the needs of students – which are unique to each division, and even each school within divisions – than those elected by our residents to govern education at the local level? Past experience with school board amalgamations in Saskatchewan is that they are disruptive and time consuming for boards, teachers, parents and school communities; and there were virtually no cost savings realized. Our existing school divisions are responsible stewards of our resources and are constantly finding ways to stretch resources and find efficiencies. I do not believe that further amalgamations of school divisions would enhance the education of our children. Would they increase reading and math proficiencies? Would they improve graduation rates? I believe not. As the panel appointed to study this change and report to cabinet, I would ask that you recommend the status quo regarding education governance in Saskatchewan. This would ensure locally elected boards of education are maintained as vital aspects of our thriving democracy and hallmarks of education in Saskatchewan.

3 individuals submitted the following content:

As a home based educating family in Saskatchewan, represented by SHBE (Saskatchewan Home Based Educators) and HSLDA (Home School Legal Defence Association) Canada, we hereby request the government to remember that parents have the foremost right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children. We choose to personally educate our children because we simply decline to delegate that right, responsibility and joy to anyone else. Therefore...
 1) We ask that SHBE be counted as stakeholder in these discussions, 2) We ask that the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students, and 3) We ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators.

10 individuals submitted the following content:

We currently have a workable model for public engagement and a strong voice for communities through our elected trustees. We feel further amalgamation will dilute community voice and increase government control.

3 individuals submitted the following content:

1) We ask that SHBE be counted as stakeholder in these discussions, 2) We ask that the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students, and 3) We ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators.

211 individuals submitted the following content:

Dear Ministry of Education,

As a parent or guardian of a student in the Prince Albert Catholic School division, I would like the Ministry of Education to consider the following as feedback to the Dan Perrins report:

1. Catholic education is important. The Minister has made a commitment to continued Catholic education in the province. We are pleased with this response and we would like to affirm this with the Minister and Ministry of Education. I applaud the Minister of Education on valuing the Constitutional Right to have publically funded Catholic Education in this province.
2. Student achievement is a priority. Our school division is in the midst of completing the next three-year strategic plan and has had statistically meaningful academic improvement for our students in the last three-year plan 2014-2017. I encourage our Ministry to support our next three-year plan (2017-2020) that staff, parents, community stakeholders, School Community Councils, Catholic constituents, trustees and children are developing that will help our children meet the 2020 provincial growth plan.
3. Relationships are important. As parents and guardians of children participating in Catholic education, I would like to have the Ministry of Education consider local relationships and partnerships in administering and managing the educational affairs of the school division. These are important as our school division operates efficiently and has one of the highest graduation rates of success in the province for all students especially First Nation, Métis graduation rates. I believe in developing long term, positive relationships with staff, parents, community stakeholders, School Community Councils, Catholic constituents, trustees and children to respond locally to our children in Prince Albert with the goal of supporting students to be engaged citizens who have a strong sense of self and community.

In conclusion, I thank the Ministry of Education for the opportunity to provide feedback at this critical time.

Yours in Catholic education,

8 individuals submitted the following content:

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report I would like to express my concerns with the options provided in the Educational Governance Review Report: Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in. I do not support any of the three models presented in the report and wish to remain a part of Prairie Valley School Division. The document options clearly acknowledge that changes to the current system may compromise student outcomes, reduce accountability, reduce community communication and access to decision makers, put more work on SCC's and disrupt our schools. The negatives far out way the positives. I also support finding cost saving systems, strengthening our educational outcomes and standardizing expectation for of our Boards, but cannot support wide sweeping changes as proposed in the document. Could the current local structure not be maintained while centralizing the purchase of large items such as paper, IT equipment, copier machines and consolidating transportation? Although I understand budgetary restrictions, a lower teacher/student ratio is crucial for success of all students with regards to academic achievement and socio-emotional well-being. None of the three proposed plans support this fact. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support that change to governance or further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! I do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. I value the connection our community has with our elected Board member and do not feel a move to appointed boards would benefit our remote community. I fear loss of our local voice will negatively impact our students experience and performance may suffer as a result. Our current Prairie Valley School Division board member is very visible in our schools and community. I have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold. Rural communities thrive, grow, and revolve around their schools. Closing schools will "close" small town Saskatchewan. I believe that all children should have equal opportunities and having public and separate education with separate funding does not support equality in education. Having any of these proposed models will not only affect how teachers are able to best deliver their course loads, but I question if the already limited access to current School Division Support Teams will further diminish (Support Team meaning: Occupational Therapists, Speech and Language Pathologists, Child and Family Support Workers, Social Workers, etc.) Nearby schools are at maximum capacity and there are great concerns for distance, safety, and time spent on buses for rural children. Finally, I wish to repeat that I do not support any of the three models presented in the report and wish to remain a part of Prairie Valley School Division.

37 individuals submitted the following content:

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report I would like to express my concerns with the options provided in the Educational Governance Review Report: I do not support any of the three models presented in the report and wish to remain a part of Prairie Valley School Division. The document options clearly acknowledge that changes to the current system may compromise student outcomes, reduce accountability, reduce community communication and access to decision makers, put more work on SCC's and disrupt our schools. The negatives far out way the positives. I do support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). I also support finding cost saving systems, strengthening our educational outcomes and standardizing expectation for of our Boards, but cannot support wide sweeping changes as proposed in the document. Could the current local structure not be maintained while centralizing the purchase of large items such as paper, IT equipment, copier machines and consolidating transportation? Although I understand budgetary restrictions, a lower teacher/student ratio is crucial for success of all students with regards to academic achievement and socio-emotional well-being. None of the three proposed plans support this fact. I would rather our students be part of a smaller school, than being in overcrowded classrooms in larger centers. This is one of the reasons people choose to reside in rural areas. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support that change to governance or further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! I do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. I value the connection our community has with our elected Board member and do not feel a move to appointed boards would benefit our remote community. I fear loss of our local voice will negatively impact our students experience and performance may suffer as a result. Our current Prairie Valley School Division board member is very visible in our schools and community. I have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold. Rural communities thrive, grow, and revolve around their schools. Closing schools will "close" small town Saskatchewan. I believe that all children should have equal opportunities and having public and separate education with separate funding does not support equality in education. Having any of these proposed models will not only affect how teachers are able to best deliver their course loads, but I question if the already limited access to current School Division Support Teams will further diminish (Support Team meaning: Occupational Therapists, Speech and Language Pathologists, Child and Family Support Workers, Social Workers, etc.). Nearby schools are at maximum capacity and there are great concerns for distance, safety, and time spent on buses for rural children. Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in. Regards,

4 individuals submitted the following content:

As a taxpayer, I am very proud of Wymark School. The students there have benefited from many wonderful opportunities that students in larger areas would not have the privilege of being part of.

Some of the wonderful benefits and opportunities have included:

1. Smaller class sizes, which allow for students to have a more personal relationship with all staff members and even all students in the school. Growing up in a small town and attending a small school gave a sense of belonging. I found that the school (teachers, support staff, and students) was like its own little family who help each other out, give support and encouragement and grow together.
2. More opportunities of one on one time with the teacher. With smaller class sizes, the teachers are able to help students out more than if there is a class of 35-40...just ask any high school class or even middle years schools in Swift Current. With the opportunity of more one on one time, students are more successful and feel more confident in their classes.
3. Most students have a shorter commute to the school...who likes to be on the bus for hours at a time? Behaviour issues (and even bullying) can become a problem, which filter down into the classroom and even into the home.
4. The extracurricular activities that are provided to help students become more active and respectful. Being in a small town school, students have the opportunity of playing on all of the sports teams if they wish. In a bigger city, this is not true. Only the most athletic kids get to play sports, due to higher numbers which then results in students whose skills are not "up there", missing out on opportunities as well.

Our hope is that any decisions made with amalgamation, ensures our small rural schools, even those closer to large urban centres have a strong voice.

Respectfully,

3 individuals submitted the following content:

As a home based educating family in Saskatchewan, represented by SHBE (Saskatchewan Home Based Educators) and HSLDA (Home School Legal Defence Association) Canada, we hereby request the government to remember that parents have the foremost right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children. We choose to personally educate our children because we simply decline to delegate that right, responsibility and joy to anyone else. Therefore: 1) We ask that SHBE be counted as stakeholder in these discussions, 2) We ask that the province appoint registering authorities who are accountable to home educators for their use of provincial funding provided to support home educated students, and 3) We ask that any governance model be transparent and include the participation of home educators.

4 individuals submitted the following content:

As a parent whose children completed their primary and middle school education in Wymark School, I would be disappointed to have any decisions made at a provincial level that would jeopardize the viability of small schools, even those closer to a larger urban area.

Our family enjoyed many benefits of a smaller local school as our family grew up:

- Our children had a 15 minute bus ride as opposed to a much longer ride into a larger center. To have young children spend up to 2 or 3 hours a day on a school bus is not conducive to good education.
- We had a close relationship to our children's teacher. They knew our family situation, knew when major family illnesses or family crises impacted our children's ability to learn, knew us well enough to recognize us in the community and visit whenever our paths crossed. This close relationship characterized relationships with every student and family in each classroom. Will this happen if our children are educated in a larger center far from our home community.
- During their school years, our children participated in drama and music performances, played every school sport that was offered, participated in noon hour intramural activities, and had the opportunity to participate in a variety of after-school activities. In a large school setting, only strong athletes get chosen for school teams, and artistically gifted students get chosen for drama and music; there is not space for all students to participate in noon hour intramurals; and there is strong competition; and the drive to pick students up from after-school activities can be hours instead of minutes.
- Our needs and concerns were able to be heard at a local level. We had a school board trustee who spent time in our school and knew what the specific needs of a small school were, who knew the school staff, and could relate to the issues facing a rural school and community. This would be lost in yet another amalgamation that distances decisions even further from rural schools.

I would respectfully request that any decisions made around the issue of amalgamation ensure that small rural schools are preserved and have a voice as we go forward.

Sincerely,

12 individuals submitted the following content:

Dear Honorable Minister Morgan:

As a parent of a student in the Northwest School Division #203, I would like to express my concerns about the proposed amalgamation. I do not have access to enough information to make an informed decision whether this is in the best interest for my child.

Living in rural Saskatchewan, I am in support of having strong, local representation and do not believe that the possible changes are in alignment with this belief.

I am exercising my voice as a citizen and hope that my concerns will be considered with due diligence.

Sincerely,

6 individuals submitted the following content:

Dear Honorary Brad Wall:

I understand changes are being considered in our education system. As the Premier of our province, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community.

Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support the North East SD and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature:

- 1) We need to keep our school boards locally elected; and,
- 2) We need to keep decisions close to our communities.

Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

Sincerely,

5 individuals submitted the following content:

I strongly feel the current education system is adequate with locally elected boards of education that are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. Local elected boards are the community voice and also important advocates for ensuring excellence in learning that serve the needs of all students which are unique to each school division. There are many principles imbedded in the options of the Perrins report that may have serious implications to education and the cost of funding education in our province. Therefore we support the governance structure of today in educating students in Saskatchewan and strongly believe the status quo should be retained.

3 individuals submitted the following content:

Dear Minister Morgan: RE: Transformational Change = Provincial Commitment to Innovation = Personalized Learning. The term 'transformational change' has been often employed in recent months by politicians and bureaucrats alike, but the intent or the definition of that term has not been made clear. We understand that there are processes in place to ensure that the people of Saskatchewan have a voice in shaping that change. The Outlook Elementary School Community Council would like to add our voice to the conversation. For Sun West families, transformational change means: Personalized learning. It works and we are watching it happen in our classrooms every day. For the past number of years, students and staff in Sun West have been enthusiastically pioneering this innovative educational path, which is based on the belief that students - each with their own unique strengths, weaknesses, interests and preferences - need a voice in determining how and what they are learning. As our schools have come to embrace this way of thinking, we've seen wonderful changes in how our classrooms look, in the language that our children use at school and then at home, and in the choices that our children have in regards to their own learning. In this personalized environment, kids get to take charge of their learning and can learn in a way that best suits them. Also in line with personalized learning, we have witnessed the creative integration of technology in our classrooms. Our children have regular access to computers or tablets and a limitless library of digital resources to help them explore topics of personal interest to them as they develop the fundamental knowledge and skills mandated by the Province. And because students can work at their own pace, there are opportunities to succeed and grow in ways they cannot when expected to keep up or wait for their peers. Through the implementation of these innovative practices, we are creating young citizens with the character and critical 21st century skills – leadership, technology, collaboration, social accountability – necessary to excel in the workplace and contribute to successful communities. The work of Sun West School Division, and other entrepreneurial divisions must not be left to scramble for the crumbs that fall after a massive restructuring. There is great work being done - using lean and efficient processes - to personalize student learning in our schools. We very much hope that this continues regardless of the organizational structure of the education system. We wish you well in your deliberations.

School Community Council

5 individuals submitted the following content:

Education belongs to community and I want you to know that I support Saskatchewan school boards and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature. We need to keep our school boards locally elected; and, We need to keep decisions closer to our communities. Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

4 individuals submitted the following content:

I am writing as a concerned parent. I strongly support our elected boards and believe they are the best way to represent our students. Our school board provides a local voice and representation for our local taxes. We do not believe that having government appointed trustees would be in the best interests of our children or our schools. Forced amalgamation will disrupt our students and their learning. Our school divisions are large enough to run efficiently and we believe that additional amalgamation will not create cost savings. We are concerned about the impact of amalgamation on rural schools, vulnerable students, quality education, etc. We trust that our school division will continue to find efficiencies that will not detract from the quality of education our children receive and that they will have our children's best interests as a priority. Our children should be viewed as an investment in the future of Saskatchewan, not a way to save money. Amalgamating school divisions does not benefit them or their educational needs. As the Minister responsible for education, we strongly urge you to oppose the amalgamation of our school divisions and oppose government appointed school boards.

Sincerely,

48 individuals submitted the following content:

Dear Premier Wall:

I understand changes are being considered in our education system. As the MLA who represents our area, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community.

I believe the consolidation of school divisions in our province will again set back the advancements that have been made in literacy and numeracy for years. When the consolidation occurred in 2006, it held back education for at least five years and cost money rather than saving money. As a result, we are just now seeing significant improvement in student learning. There is ample qualitative and quantitative evidence to support these assertions. Student learning needs to remain at the centre of these decisions. The result of previous amalgamations has historically resulted in the reduction of the number of schools within each respective division. We are urgently concerned about the future of rural schools and whether the reconfiguration of the number of school divisions will compromise their existence. According to research prepared for the *Regina Board of Education* (Letihwood & Jantzi, 2007) most contemporary studies of education have concluded, unlike an earlier generation of studies, that small schools are more efficient or cost effective. Please do not compromise the quality of education for our kids!

Education belongs to the community and I want you to know that I support the Chinook School Division and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature:

- 1) We need to keep our school boards locally elected; and,
- 2) We need to keep decisions closer to our communities.

Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

Respectfully,

3 individuals submitted the following content:

I am very concerned about the suggestion about wage rollbacks, cuts and freezing increments. First, we bargained in good faith and thus the government has a responsibility to honour those contracts. Second, if teachers (or any employees) are in line for an increment in wages, that must be honoured as well. We cannot afford to lose young teachers; if the negotiated collective agreement stipulates increments then those must be honoured. The provincial government must provide full funding to cover salaries, not dishonourably tell school boards that they must scrimp and cut to fund shortfalls. School boards do not have money for frills, so there are no more places to cut. The government needs to recognize that education is an investment; if we cut programs then the students suffer. If the students suffer (through incomplete programming or overcrowded classrooms or insufficient resources in the classroom) then they will not likely become fully contributing members of society and thus, as adults, become a drain on government coffers in terms of health costs, lower tax contributions (from lower wages because they could not attain higher education and thus a better job), and possibly unemployment costs. Students, teachers, and in fact all of Saskatchewan's unions should not have to bear the brunt of the provincial government's poor money management, especially since we did not share in the economic boom. There are many places to cut costs (MLA salaries, cost over-runs on projects like the Regina interchange, the billion dollars wastefully spent on the "clean coal" , health care administrative costs...). Invest in our future citizens with the respect that they deserve.

8 individuals submitted the following content:

Dear Premier Wall:

As a School Community Council Member, I understand changes are being considered in our education system. As the MLA who represents our area, you understand the importance of local voice and listening to the community.

I believe the consolidation of school divisions in our province will again set back the advancements that have been made in literacy and numeracy for years. When the consolidation occurred in 2006, it held back education for at least five years and cost money rather than saving money. As a result, we are just now seeing significant improvement in student learning. There is ample qualitative and quantitative evidence to support these assertions. Student learning needs to remain at the centre of these decisions. The result of previous amalgamations has historically resulted in the reduction of the number of schools within each respective division. We are urgently concerned about the future of rural schools and whether the reconfiguration of the number of school divisions will compromise their existence. According to research prepared for the *Regina Board of Education* (Letihwood & Jantzi, 2007) most contemporary studies of education have concluded, unlike an earlier generation of studies, that small schools are more efficient or cost effective. Please do not compromise the quality of education for our kids!

Education belongs to the community and I want you to know that I support the Chinook School Division and ask you to share these important messages with your colleagues in the provincial legislature:

- 1) We need to keep our school boards locally elected; and,
- 2) We need to keep decisions closer to our communities.

Students do not benefit from moving decisions further away from the community.

Respectfully,

48 individuals submitted the following content:

I believe that local representation in education is crucial in a democratic society. Locally elected boards are accountable to the electorate and help hold the provincial government to account. They are important advocates for ensuring excellence in education. Who better to serve the needs of students—which are unique to each division, and even each school within divisions—than those elected by our residents to govern education at the local level. Past experience with school board amalgamations in Saskatchewan is that they are disruptive and time consuming for boards, teachers, parents and school communities; and there were virtually no cost savings realized. Our existing school divisions are responsible stewards of our resources and are constantly finding ways to stretch resources and find efficiencies. I do not believe that further amalgamations of school divisions would enhance the education of our children. Would they increase reading and math proficiencies? Would they improve graduation rates? I believe not. As the panel appointed to study this change and report to cabinet, I would ask that you recommend the status quo regarding education governance in Saskatchewan. This would ensure locally elected boards of education are maintained as vital aspects of our thriving democracy and hallmarks of education in Saskatchewan.

6 individuals submitted the following content:

We believe that valuable input can be made from a representative of our group and we believe that Saskatchewan Home Based Educators (SHBE) and the Home School Legal Defense Association (HSLDA) should be involved in the re-evaluation. We request that home educating parents be part of any stakeholder groups such as the proposed provincial advisory board to the Minister of Education. We feel there is a great benefit in hearing our voices along with public, Catholic, First Nations and Metis, and Francophone students. We request that Saskatchewan Home Based Educator (SHBE) and Home School Legal Defense Association (HSLDA) represent home educating parents as part of any stakeholder groups such as the proposed provincial advisory board to the Minister of Education. We request that home educators register with one province-wide registering authority (as opposed to the current local school divisions), and that SHBE have input into the selection of that registering authority. Additionally, SHBE suggests the province allow SHBE to approve the ministry's choice, or to have the ministry choose from a list of nominees provided by SHBE. We request that there be a re-evaluation of home education funding in Saskatchewan with the purpose of ensuring that funding be directed toward home educating families. We request that SHBE and HSLDA be involved in the re-evaluation. Currently, thousands of dollars in funding is given to the local school division for each home educated student. We receive in PSSD a paltry \$200 per year towards supplies. The rest of that money goes into the public pot and is used for other children who attend public schools. This does not seem right. There needs to be accountability for that money and if it isn't being used for the designated home educated children, then PSSD shouldn't be receiving it.

88 individuals submitted the following content:

K-12 Education Governance Review Advisory Panel, After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report we would offer the following feedback: We do not support any of the three models presented in the report and ultimately we wish to remain a part of Prairie Valley School Division. We do support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). Currently under the direction of the Prairie Valley School Division we celebrate some of the highest performance scores in Reading and Math and are provided current and up to date resources in our school. We are provided with excellent staffing to support our English as a second language community. What guarantee is there that these standards of excellence will be maintained through provincial amalgamations? - It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! We do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. Our current Prairie Valley School Division board member is very visible in our schools and community. Our Board, Director and Superintendents have taken the time to get to know and understand the HUTTERITE culture and specifically our communities, our leaders, our needs and our strengths. Provincially appointed board members will not be as accessible, nor will they know their communities' needs. Our strong relationship with the Prairie Valley School Division Local Board and Director has enabled us to move forward in offering quality educational programming, secondary education, and led to higher academic achievements for our students. We are concerned that amalgamation will cause us to lose our voice, our support, our shared understandings, our staffing, and our resources. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support the change to governance or how further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. We need a permanent secondary school plan to accommodate the best interests of our students, their families, and our community. Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, and community that we live in. In Mr. Perrin's report the opening letter to Minister Morgan states that ALL stakeholders who approached Mr. Perrin for conversation UNANIMOUSLY support elected boards and NO more amalgamations! WHY would we continue with pursuing drastic changes?

6 individuals submitted the following content:

Locally elected boards matter. The roots of Catholic education lie in the ability to make local decisions. Regina Catholic Schools is one of the highest achieving divisions in the Province of Saskatchewan. Amalgamating Catholic boards will distract our attention from our priorities. School division amalgamations are disruptive and time-consuming. The Regina Catholic School Division has been fiscally and financially efficient. Changing governance or amalgamating school divisions is not the answer to the financial challenges that the government is facing. We need to keep our focus on reading, math, writing, graduation and attendance – things that matter to students and families.

17 Individuals submitted the following content:

K-12 Education Governance Review Advisory Panel: After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report we would offer the following feedback: (1) We do not support any of the three models presented in the report and ultimately we wish to remain a part of Prairie Valley School Division; (2) We do support maintaining and improving the quality of instruction for all students, the Saskatchewan Plan for Growth, and the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP). Currently under the direction of the Prairie Valley School Division, we celebrate some of the highest performance scores in Reading and Math as well as extraordinary High School graduation rates. What guarantee is there that these standards of excellence will be maintained through provincial amalgamations? (3) It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! We do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. Our current Prairie Valley School Division board member is very visible in our schools and community. Provincially appointed board members will not be as accessible, nor will they know their communities' needs. (4) We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support the change to governance or how further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. (5) We have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold. Rural communities thrive, grow, and revolve around their schools. Closing schools will "close" small town Saskatchewan. Nearby schools are at maximum capacity and there are great concerns for distance, safety, and time spent on buses for rural children. (6) We need a permanent high school plan to accommodate the best interests of our students, their families, and our community, as well as a permanent high school transportation plan. (7) We would rather our students be part of a smaller school, than being in overcrowded classrooms in larger centers. This is one of the reasons people choose to reside in rural areas. (8) Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in. (9) In Mr. Perrin's report the opening letter to Minister Morgan states that ALL stakeholders who approached Mr. Perrin for conversation UNANIMOUSLY support elected boards and NO more amalgamations! WHY would we continue with pursuing drastic changes?

6 individuals submitted the following content:

After review of Mr. Dan Perrins' Educational Governance Review Report I would like to express my concerns with the options provided in the Educational Governance Review Report: Consideration for any of the models presented or a change in governance will greatly impact the children, families, businesses, volunteer groups, facilities and community that we live in. I do not support any of the three models presented in the report and wish to remain a part of Prairie Valley School Division. The document options clearly acknowledge that changes to the current system may compromise student outcomes, reduce accountability, reduce community communication and access to decision makers, put more work on SCC's and disrupt our schools. The negatives far out way the positives. I also support finding cost saving systems, strengthening our educational outcomes and standardizing expectation for of our Boards, but cannot support wide sweeping changes as proposed in the document. Could the current local structure not be maintained while centralizing the purchase of large items such as paper, IT equipment, copier machines and consolidating transportation? Although I understand budgetary restrictions, a lower teacher/student ratio is crucial for success of all students with regards to academic achievement and socio-emotional well-being. None of the three proposed plans support this fact. We have not been provided any budgetary evidence to support that change to governance or further school division amalgamation will provide a significant financial savings to the province. It is essential that we continue to have a voice for our school and community! I do not support the concept of appointed Board of Education members. I value the connection our community has with our elected Board member and do not feel a move to appointed boards would benefit our remote community. I fear loss of our local voice will negatively impact our students experience and performance may suffer as a result. Our current Prairie Valley School Division board member is very visible in our schools and community. I have deep concern of how transformational change will affect the current rural school closure threshold. Rural communities thrive, grow, and revolve around their schools. Closing schools will "close" small town Saskatchewan. I believe that all children should have equal opportunities and having public and separate education with separate funding does not support equality in education. Having any of these proposed models will not only affect how teachers are able to best deliver their course loads, but I question if the already limited access to current School Division Support Teams will further diminish (Support Team meaning: Occupational Therapists, Speech and Language Pathologists, Child and Family Support Workers, Social Workers, etc.) Nearby schools are at maximum capacity and there are great concerns for distance, safety, and time spent on buses for rural children. Regards, Saskatchewan Teacher

8 individuals submitted the following content:

RE: Transformational Change = Provincial Commitment to Innovation = Personalized Learning

The term 'transformational change' has been often employed in recent months by politicians and bureaucrats alike, but the intent or the definition of that term has not been made clear. We understand that there are processes in place to ensure that the people of Saskatchewan have a voice in shaping that change. The School Community Council would like to add our voice to the conversation.

For Sun West families, transformational change means:

Personalized learning.

It works and we are watching it happen in our classrooms every day.

For the past number of years, students and staff in Sun West have been enthusiastically pioneering this innovative educational path, which is based on the belief that students - each with their own unique strengths, weaknesses, interests and preferences - need a voice in determining how and what they are learning. As our schools have come to embrace this way of thinking, we've seen wonderful changes in how our classrooms look, in the language that our children use at school and then at home, and in the choices that our children have in regards to their own learning. In this personalized environment, kids get to take charge of their learning and can learn in a way that best suits them.

Also in line with personalized learning, we have witnessed the creative integration of technology in our classrooms. Our children have regular access to computers or tablets and a limitless library of digital resources to help them explore topics of personal interest to them as they develop the fundamental knowledge and skills mandated by the Province. And because students can work at their own pace, there are opportunities to succeed and grow in ways they cannot when expected to keep up or wait for their peers.

Through the implementation of these innovative practices, we are creating young citizens with the character and critical 21st century skills – leadership, technology, collaboration, social accountability – necessary to excel in the workplace and contribute to successful communities.

The work of Sun West School Division, and other entrepreneurial divisions must not be left to scramble for the crumbs that fall after a massive restructuring. There is great work being done - using lean and efficient processes - to personalize student learning in our schools. We very much hope that this continues regardless of the organizational structure of the education system.

We wish you well in your deliberations.

Sincerely,