

>>To Michael Del Grande:

>>

>>I am a parent, and high school department head (now teacher) with 25 years  
>experience, all with  
>>this school board. My colleagues I have grave concerns that the Catholic  
>school system that we  
>>have worked for and supported over these past years is in danger.

>>

>>Our union leaders tell us the following 'facts':

>>

>>a seven-period workload is not required by Bill 160

>>

>> - there is enough funding in the secondary allocation to meet the  
>requirements of all parties concerned: students, teachers, and the Board

>>

>> - the requirements can be met with a six-period model

>>

>> - the 1250 minutes/week requirement can be met

>>

>> - the 22 class size requirement can be met

>>

>>If these facts are incorrect please let us (your employees and partners in  
>Catholic education)

>>know. If there are other 'facts' that mitigate an equitable settlement,  
>please tell us what they are.

>>

>>At present it appears to us that our employer is unwilling to negotiate,  
>and for no good reason. It appears that Catholic school boards are shirking  
>their responsibility. My greatest fear is that at some point in time, some  
>reporter or politician will ask - Why do Catholic school boards exist? If  
>that happens it may be the end of any meaningful Catholic education system.

>>

>>If you can clarify the situation please respond:

>>

>> my e-mail: [carloc@pathcom.com](mailto:carloc@pathcom.com)

>>

>>

>>

>>Sincerely,

>>

C. Cardile

>

>THANK YOU

>

>for your concerned note which I share with you as well.

>First any information is as good as it's accuracy. The board does have a  
>negotiating committee and they report to the board.

>

>The funding model is based on 6.67 credit courses. We originally offered 7  
>and then moved our position to 6.5.

>

>6.5 was something that provincial OECTA had on the table and then removed.

>The funding formula is not perfectly clear but we know in year 2 we will be  
>cut 5.7 million from our budget for secondary. That's where the problem  
>is. We can manage year 1 but not year 2.

>

>Look, everyone is banding around numbers but in the meantime the schools  
>are closed. That is not productive.

>

>The board asked the union to come in the same way as the public schools who  
>do have 7. The answer was no.

>

>We asked if they would move to a rotating strike the answer was no.

>

>We need to work through the numbers together but the board manages the  
>system and the programs not the teachers.

>

>We must be fair we must work together. It does not mean that because we  
>disagree that we cannot continue to resolve while school goes on.

>

>I agree our numbers could be wrong but then they have to be clarified that  
>every trustee understands as well as the union membership.

>

>The public schools system loves this. We are killing each other and the  
>children and their parents suffer.

>

>I DO NOT WANT A WIN AT ALL COSTS. WE NEED A WIN WIN FOR BOTH PARTIES BUT  
>THIS HAS BECOME AN ISSUE OF PERSONALITIES, YES I SAID PERSONALITIES. YOU  
>NEED TO QUESTION YOUR UNION.

>

>LET'S GET BACK TO SCHOOL AND KEEP TALKING. NOTHING IS CARVED INTO STONE.  
>WE NEED A PARTNERSHIP NOT A DIVORCE.

>

>MIKE DEL GRANDE

>

>

>