

PERCEPTIONS OF CATHOLIC ADMINISTRATORS  
AND TRUSTEES REGARDING BILL 30'S IMPACT ON  
THE MISSION OF SEPARATE SCHOOLS

BY

MARY LILLIAN BERGAMO ©

B.A., Lakehead University, 1989

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF EDUCATION

in

THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION  
LAKEHEAD UNIVERSITY  
THUNDER BAY, ONTARIO, CANADA.

ProQuest Number: 10611477

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10611477

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346



National Library  
of Canada

Acquisitions and  
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale  
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et  
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa (Ontario)  
K1A 0N4

*Your file* *Votre référence*

*Our file* *Notre référence*

**The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.**

**L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.**

**The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.**

**L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.**

ISBN 0-315-78942-5

Dedicated to my husband

John Bergamo

and our son

Anthony

whose constant patience,

support, and love

provide

"the wind beneath my wings"

## ABSTRACT

This study examines the perceptions of Catholic Administrators and Trustees about Bill 30's impact on the ability of Separate School Boards in Ontario to retain their distinctive mission. The conceptual lens for this study was taken from the Completion Office - Separate Schools' document, Catholic Education and Separate School Boards in Ontario (1988), which outlines the basic model for the provision of Catholic education. This model is represented by three basic means namely; providing qualified staff, developing Christian community, and providing an academic curriculum that integrates faith and life. By investigating three dissimilar separate school boards, this study was able to provide significant data on the impact that Bill 30 is having on each of these basic providers of Catholic education, and subsequently, the distinctive mission of separate schools.

This study employed qualitative research methodology. The process of data collection relied on semi-structured, open-ended interviews with twenty-four subjects. Additionally, a variety of documentation such as policies, goals and objectives, mission statements, and brochures were collected and analyzed.

The findings demonstrate that Bill 30 has transformed the nature of the separate school system of Ontario, and that it is challenging this system's raison d'etre. However, as a result, separate schools have experienced a consciousness of mission and ministry that is

intent on strengthening and confirming the distinctive character of their schools. Relative to mission building, implications for theory, practice, and research are suggested.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Abstract .....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iv
List of Figures.....	ix
Acknowledgments.....	x
CHAPTER	
I ADMINISTRATIVE AND TRUSTEE PERCEPTIONS OF BILL 30'S IMPACT ON THE DISTINCTIVE MISSION OF SEPARATE SCHOOL BOARDS.....	1
The Research Problem.....	1
Identification of the Problem.....	1
Background to the Research Problem.....	2
Research Question.....	5
Identification of the Research Problem.....	5
Subsidiary Questions.....	5
Qualifications for Developing this Research:	
A Personal Ground.....	6
Design of the Study.....	7
Research Methods.....	7
Sample Population.....	8
Significance of the Study.....	10
Definition of Terms.....	11
Overview.....	11
II BILL 30'S PERCEIVED IMPACT ON THE DISTINCTIVE MISSION OF SEPARATE SCHOOLS: A Review Of The Literature.....	12

The Road to Completion of Separate Schools in Ontario.....	12
Separate School Funding.....	13
A New Era.....	14
Bill 30.....	16
Bill 30 - Blessing or Curse?.....	20
The Provision of Catholic Education.....	24
Staffing and Hiring Practices.....	24
Christian Community.....	28
Curriculum and Religious Instruction.....	29
Summary.....	30
III DESIGN OF THE STUDY.....	32
Methodology.....	32
Theoretical Underpinnings.....	32
A General Introduction to Qualitative Research.....	33
Features That Characterize Qualitative Research.....	35
Foreshadowing in Qualitative Research.....	37
Description of the Research.....	38
Setting.....	38
Gaining Entry.....	41
Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis.....	46
Interviews.....	46
Documents.....	47
Triangulation.....	48
Data Analysis.....	49



Validity and Reliability.....	50
Summary.....	51
IV THE THREE STAGES OF BILL 30: BASED ON THE VIEWS AND PERCEPTIONS OF THE SUBJECTS.....	52
Stage 1: Transition and Growth.....	52
A State of Unreadiness.....	52
Imitation and Replication.....	53
Teacher Militancy.....	56
Competitiveness.....	57
Financial Woes.....	58
Summary of Stage 1.....	61
Stage 2: A Consciousness of Mission.....	62
The Awakening.....	62
Mission Focus and Development.....	65
Summary of Stage 2.....	68
Stage 3: Bill 30 Tests the Basic Model for Providing Catholic Education.....	69
Providing Qualified Staff.....	69
Catholic Teachers.....	69
Non-Catholic Teachers.....	71
Lukewarm Faith.....	76
Section 136-1a.....	77
Promotion of Non-Catholics.....	80
Developing Each school As a Christian Community.....	83
Christian Community.....	83

	A Shifting Situation.....	86
	Open Access Students.....	87
	Providing Academic Curricula Including Formal Religious Instruction.....	91
	Integration.....	91
	Teacher As Agent.....	93
	Exemption of Religious Education Credits.....	94
	Summary.....	96
V	BILL 30'S IMPACT ON THE MISSION OF SEPARATE SCHOOLS: A DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS.....	98
	Introduction.....	98
	Rarticulation of the Problem.....	98
	A Discussion of the Findings.....	99
	Safeguarding the Distinctive Mission.....	99
	The Basic Model for Providing Catholic Education.....	102
	Providing Committed Qualified Staff.....	103
	Christian Community.....	107
	Curricula.....	108
	Bill 30: More Blessing Than Curse.....	110
	Conclusion.....	111
VI	REFLECTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR THEORY, PRACTICE, AND RESEARCH.....	113
	Introduction.....	113
	Reflections on the Research.....	113
	Reflections on the Research Study.....	113
	Reflections on the Research Process.....	114

Implications for Theory, Practice, and Research.....	116
Preface.....	116
Implications for Theory.....	117
Implications for Practice.....	117
Implications for Further Research.....	119
The Research Questions Revisited.....	120
In Answer to the Research Questions.....	120
Conclusion.....	121
References.....	123
Appendix One: Interview Inventory of Questions.....	128
Appendix Two: An Interview Transcript.....	134

**LIST OF FIGURES**

FIGURE		PAGE
I	Delivery Model for Catholic Education .....	25
II	Subject Code .....	44

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank sincerely Dr. Rita Irwin for her professional integrity and friendship, as she guided me through this process. I am deeply grateful. Thanks also to Dr. Jim Ryan for his confidence in me and Dr. Hope Fennell and Dr. Doug Thom for their kind encouragement and assistance.

I am deeply indebted to the three separate school boards that responded so positively, and to the many wonderful subjects who so generously extended their time, their interest, and their passion for Catholic education. Thank you also for your kindness and your hospitality.

Special thanks must go to my closest friends, particularly Carole and George Bevilacqua, who throughout this challenging adventure provided me with their constant support and help. Their gift of friendship has helped to make this thesis even more special and rewarding.

Special thanks also to Ed O'Brien, who made his time and talent readily available to me. I owe him a debt of gratitude.

Beyond all of this, I need to say a heartfelt thank you to all of my family, especially John and Anthony, whose constant support and belief has sustained me through my T. F. A. or my thesis fever attack. I thank them for their unselfishness, their love, but most of all their good humor.

## CHAPTER 1

### ADMINISTRATIVE AND TRUSTEE PERCEPTIONS OF BILL 30'S IMPACT ON THE DISTINCTIVE MISSION OF SEPARATE SCHOOL BOARDS

#### The Research Problem

##### Identification of the Problem

On June 12, 1984, Premier William Davis told the Ontario Legislature that he wished to outline a "new course" on a "subject of long and heartfelt controversy in the development of the province, ever since we assumed the burdens and choices that go with responsible government in 1842" (Jamison, 1985, p.14). Further to this, Davis said:

While men and women of courage and conviction have been divided on this issue, up to now, no Ontario government has felt it was able to discharge its duty according to these fundamental principles while at the same time granting public funds to a complete Roman Catholic secondary school system. I now believe this can be responsibly undertaken... (Jamison, 1985, p.14).

As a consequence of Premier Davis' belief that this was a responsible undertaking, Bill 30, An Act to amend the Education Act, 1986, was passed. This legislation creates a complete, publicly funded, Separate School System in Ontario, from Junior Kindergarten to Grade 12 / O.A.C.'s. Until that landmark announcement, Catholic separate schools had received funding only to the end of grade ten. Moreover, funding for grades nine and ten had been weighted at the elementary level and did not reflect the per capita rate for secondary pupils in the public school system. This funding differential, however, was only one of a number of issues associated with the completion of Catholic education in the province

of Ontario.

"The decision to extend the funding of separate schools in Ontario through to the end of secondary school may well prove to be one of the most momentous decisions in the history of provincial education" (Holmes, 1984, p.1). This has proven to be especially prophetic for Catholic education in the province. Ironically, this "road to Damascus conversion" (Jamison, 1985, p.14) has sown the seeds of challenge and concern regarding the raison d'etre of Catholic schools. Essentially, the problem is that full funding has resulted in compromises that may restrict the integrity, character, and mission of Catholic education. Subsequently, this may lead to a loss of purpose for the separate school system of Ontario and result in its inability to retain its Catholicity.

#### Background to the Research Problem

Historically, the issue of Catholic schools emerged in 1841. Following the Rebellions of 1837, Lord Durham was dispatched from Britain to document conditions in Upper and Lower Canada. The subsequent report directed significant attention to education and as a result, in 1841 the School Act came into existence. It is noteworthy that both Protestant and Catholic denominations demanded a clause for the establishment of "separate" schools. This compromise was predicated on the union of the two colonies (Upper and Lower Canada) and granted religious prerogatives to each of the respective minorities. In turn, this original School Act of 1841 sets the stage for subsequent Acts, that improved political and funding guarantees for separate schools in Ontario. According to educational historian Franklin Walker: "It is the Scott

Act of 1863 which is the basis of today's separate schools since the British North America Act, in guaranteeing minority education rights, made permanent all the advantages granted to separate school supporters in this measure" (cited in Stortz, 1985, p.67). These rights included: self-governance (the autonomy to preserve and foster religious and other values of denominational education); entitlement to receive a share of the public appropriation, as well as the right to levy taxes; and the right to hire qualified teachers of their own religious persuasion.

Essentially, Section 93, s.s.1 of the Constitution Act (1867), posits the rights and privileges of separate schools and guarantees their essential Catholic nature. "It states that nothing in any future provincial law relating to denominational schools "shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege...which any class of persons have by law in the province" at the time of Confederation (Stamp, 1985, p.24). This principle was unanimously upheld by the Supreme Court on June 25, 1987 when Bill 30 received constitutional force. The truncation of the separate school system (The High School Act of 1871) which had been unsuccessfully challenged in the Tiny Township Case of 1928, was overturned by the constitutionality of Bill 30. This in effect, represented the final completion of the publicly-funded Catholic school system in Ontario and confirmed the rights of Catholics to conduct schools in accordance with the tenets of their faith.

To accomplish this successfully, the Catholic Church believes that a Catholic school must be Christ centered and the gospel message must be its guiding norm. This is promoted through its tenets of faith and



through its traditions and customs. All members that participate in this school community must be witness to, and share in, this Christian vision. "The extent to which the Christian message is transmitted through education depends to a very great extent on the teachers" (The Sacred Congregation For Catholic Education, 1977, p.14). As well, a Catholic school must be committed to the development of the whole child, including the spiritual and moral aspects, not just the intellectual, emotional, and physical. "Complete education necessarily includes a religious dimension. Religion is an effective contribution to the development of other aspects of a personality in the measure in which it is integrated into general education" (p.8). This reinforces the belief that a Catholic school is "fundamentally a synthesis of culture and faith, and a synthesis of faith and life" (p.13).

The founding advocates of Catholic education in Ontario realized that common schools or non-denominational education would not and could not subscribe to these tenets of belief, which fundamentally represent a whole way of life. That is why separate schools exist and why supporters of Catholic education fought to enshrine their rights and privileges in the Constitution. Such a philosophy, therefore, requires a set of means to foster and provide this Catholic education. Traditionally, these have been: (a) the hiring of qualified Catholic teachers; (b) the provision of academic curricula (including formal religious education) which fully integrates Catholic faith and life; and (c) the commitment to the building of Christian Catholic community in each school (Completion Office - Separate Schools, 1988).

## Research Question

### Identification of the Research Problem

As evidenced, Ontario's Bill 30 is proving to be a challenging amendment to the Education Act, particularly for the province's separate school system, because it addresses in legislation specific conditions (staff hiring, student access and credit exemption) that may theoretically and practically interfere with the basic means by which separate school boards provide Catholic education. As stated earlier, this may lead to a dysfunctional sense of mission and an inability to retain their Catholic philosophy. Their fundamental belief that:

The school must be a community whose values are communicated through the interpersonal and sincere relationships of its members and through both individual and corporative adherence to the outlook on life that permeates the school (The Sacred Congregation For Catholic Education, 1977, p.12)

provides the basis for the following research question: **What are the perceptions of Catholic Administrators and Trustees about Bill 30's impact on the ability of Separate School Boards in Ontario to retain what they see as their distinctive mission of Catholic education?** To examine this primary question, various subsidiary questions focused on the basic means (Completion Office - Separate Schools, 1988), to determine if Bill 30 is having any perceived affect(s) in the three critical areas of staffing, community, and curriculum.

### Subsidiary Questions

- 1) What impact is Bill 30 having on the practice of providing qualified teachers, supervisory officers, and other personnel who are committed to building a Christian community in the

school system?

- 2) What impact is Bill 30 having on the practice of developing each school as a Christian community in all of its academic and non-academic activities?
- 3) What impact is Bill 30 having on the practice of providing academic curricula, including formal religious instruction, in which Catholic faith and life are integrated?

#### Qualifications for Developing this Research: A Personal Ground

My interest in studying Bill 30's impact on the distinctive mission of separate schools has evolved from my experiences as a teacher, a Christian Living consultant/co-ordinator, a sessional lecturer/faculty advisor at a university and a separate school board trustee. Early in my teaching career, I was afforded several opportunities (system committees and curriculum development) that nurtured in me a deep commitment to the philosophy and mission of separate schools. Throughout those years of professional practice, I experienced many changes in teaching and the delivery of education, but I never imagined the changes that would come with the long awaited completion of Catholic education, nor did I imagine that as a trustee, I would be sharing in political decisions (transfer of facilities and staff) that would implement full funding into our own educational community. Consequently, I have had to reconcile many questions and doubts regarding the blessings of Bill 30, for instance, the matter of promotion. What guidelines or policies will be effected regarding the promotion of non-Catholic teachers to positions of responsibility? How significant is this to the retention

of Catholicity?

In the past few years I have returned to school to work at the post graduate level. I think before I even committed myself to doing a thesis, I knew that I wanted to explore and study the impact of Bill 30 on the distinctive mission of separate schools. In my opinion it has had a fundamental influence on the design and operation of Catholic education and I wanted to study other boards, administration, and trustees to ascertain their perceptions about the impact of full funding on Catholic education and the basic and traditional means of providing it.

### Design of the Study

#### Research Methods

Qualitative research methodology was used to collect data for this study. Naturalistic inquiry was favoured because:

Naturalistic inquirers (qualitative researchers) make virtually the opposite assumptions (to positivist, scientific inquirers). They focus upon the multiple realities that, like the layers of an onion, nest within or complement one another. Each layer provides a different perspective of reality, and none can be considered more "true" than any other. Phenomena do not converge into a single form, a single "truth", but diverge into many forms, multiple "truths" (Guba and Lincoln, 1982, p. 57).

Naturalistic inquiry takes the position that social reality is interpreted or mind constructed and that truth is ultimately a matter of social and historical agreement. This perspective is particularly appropriate for this study because it constructs from a composite framework of data, a holistic interpretation (values not excluded) of Bill 30's influence on the ability of separate school boards in Ontario to retain their distinctive mission of Catholic education. It also optimized the

generation of rich and descriptive detail and afforded me flexibility within the process of observing and recording data. Furthermore, because structures did not have to be immediately imposed, the actual collection of data yielded a broader base of information.

For this study, the primary research techniques employed were personal interviews, informal observation, and documentation. These recorded interviews provided the basis of information germane to the implementation and on going administration of Bill 30 and its impact on each of the three Catholic systems studied. Every effort was made to put the interview subjects at ease in order to create a climate of trust and a comfortable and relaxed rapport (Powney & Watts, 1987; Woods, 1986). In almost all cases this atmosphere prevailed and it was soon discovered that this research problem was one, many of the subjects welcomed the opportunity to discuss. My informal observations yielded a few field notes that helped to provide additional information and understanding of the various settings and structures within each board.

#### Sample population

Within the expansive province of Ontario, there are 54 separate school boards and they offer a diverse range of educational programming. Since 1984, or the announcement of full funding, more than 90% of Catholic school boards have elected to provide secondary education and are therefore, subject to the legislative purview of Bill 30, An Act to Amend the Education Act, 1986. However, many of these boards, particularly in the densely populated part of the province, had long been operating private Catholic high schools and had garnered extensive secondary school

traditions; (for example, in the Greater Toronto Area). By contrast, this had not been the sustained practice in many smaller boards throughout the province, and although some had ventured into offering secondary programming on a limited basis, it was not until Bill 30 that all Catholic boards were given the legal right and the legislative grant means to provide complete secondary education.

To benefit from this variance and to experience the different perceptions and perspectives of such boards, this study recognized the need to examine three (3) Catholic school boards in the province: a large board, a middle sized urban board, and a small town board. This cross section yielded a diversity of data and identified the individual and collective impact that Bill 30 is having on the ability of separate school boards to retain their distinctive mission of Catholic education.

To secure permission for the study, communication was initiated with Trustees (Chairperson) from each board and then with each of the Directors of Education. In all cases the response was very positive and a schedule for subject interviews was arranged. These subjects included: the Chairperson of each board, the Director of each board, Superintendent(s) of Personnel and Curriculum, a system Curriculum Co-ordinator, one or more Secondary School Principals, and the same number of Religious Education Department Heads. In addition, pertinent board documentation (Mission Statement, Philosophy, Goals and Objectives) was provided including individual high school Information Booklets. Three Director/President(s) of provincial Catholic educational

organizations were also interviewed for this study.

### Significance of the Study

Since Bill 30, a significant number of separate school boards in the province have responded to secondary extension, even though the passage and subsequent implementation of Bill 30 exacted particular concessions from the Catholic community of Ontario. As a consequence to the political maneuvering of this Act, compromises were struck to ensure that no public school teachers were adversely affected. Although a ten year moratorium on hiring practices (Section 136-1) was identified initially to address the issue of protection for non-Catholic secondary school teachers, Bill 30 itself extends this practice through Section 136-1a and removes from separate school boards the right to prefer Roman Catholic teachers after 1995 unless repealed or ruled unconstitutional. Essentially, it eliminates the right to discriminate on the basis of creed. This coupled with other specific aspects of the Act, particularly open access and religious education exemption suggests that Catholic secondary extension's rapid growth and development since 1984 has not been without challenge to the Catholic educational community. There is concern that Bill 30 is both a blessing and a curse (Mulligan, 1990, p.3; Ontario Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1989, p.5) and that it may have the potential to compromise the distinctiveness of separate schools. In the words of Pope John Paul II who met with the Ontario Catholic Bishops on April 26, 1988, "Even though the financial viability of Catholic schools has been guaranteed, the task remains of ensuring their Catholic character" (O.S.S.T.A., 1988, p.3). To this end, it

was believed that there was a need to assess the perceived influence(s) and effect(s) that Bill 30 may be having on the separate school system's ability to retain its Catholic mission. This was done by examining the impact of full funding on the three basic means by which separate school boards have traditionally provided Catholic education.

### Definition of Terms

Prevalent in this study is the mention of the term "Bill 30". The following is a definition that will clarify its meaning and ensure its consistent use throughout this study.

"Bill 30", An Act to amend the Education Act (1986), is provincial legislation that provides recognition of and funding for secondary education by Roman Catholic separate schools and brings these schools into harmony with the provisions of the law respecting public elementary and secondary schools. It is synonymous with full funding.

### **Overview**

The remainder of this thesis is arranged in the following sequence. Chapter 2 will present the related literature which undergirds this study. Chapter 3 will initiate the introduction to qualitative research and bring into focus the process of how the data was collected and analyzed. Chapters 4 and 5 will delineate and interpret the research data. These chapters will put the data into perspective and answer the research questions. Chapter 6 will summarize the research process and identify conclusions, reflections, and implications for this study.



## CHAPTER II

### BILL 30's PERCEIVED IMPACT ON THE DISTINCTIVE

#### MISSION OF SEPARATE SCHOOLS:

#### A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### Introduction

Full funding was sought after vigorously by the Catholic educational community of Ontario for over half a century. During this struggle for completion Catholic educators and stakeholders maintained a vigilant belief, that their rights to a fully funded denominational education was entrenched in the Constitution and that completion of their truncated system was their entitlement. Ironically, when Bill 30 provided this long awaited full funding it also set into place operative restrictions that appear to have the potential to compromise the integrity and distinctive character of separate schools. This chapter will provide the related literature that undergirds this ironic tension.

#### The Road to Completion of Separate Schools in Ontario

Bill 30's Supreme Court of Canada Judgement confirmed that the expressed purpose of the Scott Act (1863) as stated in its preamble was to: "... restore to Roman Catholics in Upper Canada certain rights which they formerly enjoyed in respect to Separate schools and to bring the provisions of the Law respecting Separate Schools more in harmony with the provisions of the Law respecting Common Schools" (O.S.S.T.A.,1987 p. 15). This final pre-Confederation separate school bill was later embodied in the British North America Act, (1867) and entrenched separate

school rights within section 93 which states that nothing in any future provincial legislation/law addressing denominational schools "shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege ... which any class of persons have by law in the province" at the time of Confederation. However, post-Confederation years led to the erosion of rights to operate at the "continuation class" or secondary level for separate schools by 1871 and culminated finally in the famous Tiny Township test case of 1928. This case ultimately went to the Privy Council, which ruled that, "Catholics had no legal claim to any public financial support for secondary schools they might erect, or to exemption from support of public high schools (Stamp, 1985, p. 28). Despite renewed attempts by Catholic supporters to secure completion, this restrictive ruling would be in force until Bill 30's judgment in 1987.

#### Separate School Funding

This truncation of the separate school system to grade 10, coupled with inequitable funding, restricted accessibility to corporation taxes (company directors were permitted not obliged to direct school taxes in proportion to the shares owned by Catholics), deprived Catholics of a share in utility taxes, and essentially became the target of redress for subsequent generations of separate school supporters in Ontario. Although a significant increased enrollment in separate schools was evidenced by the 1930's, this steady enrollment growth did not mitigate the major problems of finance. Some assistance came through improved provincial grants (which were moving from incentive grants toward equalization grants), but no respite came in the areas of corporation

and utility tax support. In fact, when legislative assistance was passed through the Tax Assessment Act (1937), it met with such vehement opposition that it was repealed forthwith. Although it had been designed by Premier Mitchell Hepburn's Liberal government in 1936 to oblige corporations to divide their school taxes in proportion to the religion of their shareholders, its expeditious demise reflected the political hostility identified with the financing of separate school education in the province of Ontario.

#### A New Era

Following the end of World War II, Ontario deemed it prudent to strike a Royal Commission on Education under the chairmanship of a justice of the Ontario Supreme Court, John A. Hope. This commission was empowered in 1946 to bring forth recommendations that would provide the basis for a renewed vision and restructuring of education in Ontario. However, its ineffectual outcome was decided along denominational lines when its controversial proposal to reorganize the grade structure of schools from elementary / secondary (8/5) to a primary / intermediate / secondary (6/4/3) sequence was made public (Stamp, 1985, p.31).

The commission's scheme for reducing the elementary program to six years involved cutting back the separate school board's sphere of operations. It is doubtful that such a change could have been made in accordance with the terms of the British North America Act, although the majority of the commissioners seemed to think it could. At the same time, several members of the commission published a minority report that protested against these recommendations. The resulting politico-religious controversy overshadowed other aspects of the Hope Report and blocked the adoption of most of its basic proposals" (Stamp, 1985, p.31).

No resolution was forwarded by the Hope Commission. "Public opinion,

while not in favour of extension of separate schools, was also largely opposed to a reduction" (Stortz, 1985, p. 71). Thus the status quo remained and separate schools, ever more vigilant to preserve their constitutional rights, continued to experience financial disadvantage. Their resolve to remedy this inequity persisted, however, and "in 1962, the Roman Catholic Bishops of Ontario addressed Premier John Robarts with a brief calling for 'the same advantages, the same rights, and the same opportunity to grow as is enjoyed by our secular counterparts'" (Stamp, 1985, p.31). Although extension of full funding was ignored, and corporation and utility taxes were unaltered, separate school funding improved significantly by 1964, particularly the equilization grants. Essentially, with this Tax Foundation Plan and the reorganization of school jurisdictions (1969), Catholic schools in Ontario were finally brought into the mainstream of public education.

Simultaneously, there was a renewed effort by all the major players in Catholic education (for example O.S.S.T.A. presented a brief entitled "Equal Opportunity for Continuous Education in the Separate Schools of Ontario"), to appeal to the government of Ontario to complete separate school education. Since Catholics had the support of both the Liberal and the New Democratic parties relative to the principle of full funding, the members of the Catholic educational community felt that the relaxed climate of the time reinforced a positive response to their constitutional claim. With a concerted effort at all fronts the appeal was made but Bill Davis, (former Minister of Education and Premier in 1971), was unyielding in his steadfast belief that "at the secondary level, we

might have a single school system for the secondary schools with panels for the separate school supporters" (Coo, 1985, p.5). His government did, however, provide weighted grant increases to grades 9 and 10, so that just prior to 1984 these funding levels were almost approximating public school grades 9 and 10.

Although separate school extension (full funding) had not been advanced, continued growth characterized Catholic education and the proliferation of privately funded Catholic high schools attested to this expansion. It must have been increasingly untenable for the Provincial Government of Ontario to sustain the imbalances in the grant system and this coupled with other circumstances led William Davis to make his surprising and astonishing announcement of full funding in the legislature on June 12, 1984 which subsequently culminated in the passage of Bill 30 (Ontario Legislature, 1986).

The province's changing demographics, in particular the growing numbers of young Catholic immigrant families in strong Tory ridings, also told Davis that while there was no immediate threat of a Catholic vote being used against his party, the problem might arise at some future date. Other specific factors, such as a lobby by Catholic high school students, the growing number of portables in overcrowded separate schools, impending court action to force a new constitutional ruling on completion, the likelihood of all party support if the Tories reversed their stand, the concerted campaign by teachers, trustees, parents and clergy, helped Davis make up his mind" (Jamison,, 1985, p.9).

It is before this backdrop that the long anticipated completion of separate schools became a reality for the Catholic educational community of Ontario.

### **Bill 30**

The preamble to Bill 30, An Act to amend the Education Act, indicates

that its purpose is to implement a policy of full funding for Roman Catholic separate high schools in Ontario.

Whereas section 93 of the Constitution Act, 1867 embodies one of the essential conditions which facilitated the creation of a united Canada in 1867 by guaranteeing to Roman Catholics in Ontario certain rights and privileges with respect to denominational schools; and whereas the Roman Catholic separate schools have become a significant part of the school system in Ontario; and whereas it has been public policy in Ontario since 1899 to provide for public funds to support education in the Roman Catholic separate schools to the end of Grade 10; and whereas it is recognized that today a basic education requires a secondary as well as an elementary education; and whereas it is just and proper and in accordance with the spirit of the guarantees given in 1867 to bring the provisions of the law respecting Roman Catholic separate schools into harmony with the provisions of the law respecting public elementary and secondary schools, by providing legislative recognition of and funding for secondary education by Roman Catholic separate schools; and whereas the foregoing facts were affirmed by the Premier of Ontario in his statement to the Legislative Assembly on the 12th day of June, 1984; (Bill 30, 1986, p. 2).

From its inception, full funding required compromise and conciliation from Teacher Federations, Trustee Organizations, Administrative Associations, and the Government. Although Bill 30 entitled a Roman Catholic school board to share in the general legislative grants for secondary school purposes (Section 136e), it also sought to ensure the viability of the public secondary schools. This was substantively addressed in Premier Davis' Statement:

We must not undertake a course of action, that by its nature or in its execution, would cripple or limit the viability of our non-denominational public secondary school system, which is accessible to all and universally supported, and which will always remain the cornerstone of our education system (Cavalluzzo, 1985, p.45).

As a consequence of this, specific conditions were applied to the funding of separate schools to ensure and safeguard the public school

system. To begin with, it was clearly understood that large amounts of money would not be allocated for duplication of services, especially capital (building) expenditures: "Rather, the commission (Planning and Implementation Commission) will ensure that our abundant capital stock is effectively employed to provide a full range of programs" (Cavalluzzo, 1985, p.45). Transfers and joint use of facilities, therefore, needed to be negotiated. This involved intense relations between public and separate boards and would necessitate considerable time, energy, and good will. In addition, careful attention was paid to ensure that the interests of the public secondary teacher were not compromised.

Equally, we must consider the interests of our secondary school teachers. It has been a long established practice for elementary Roman Catholic school boards to have Roman Catholics constitute the large majority of the teachers they employ. In light of declining enrollments in our secondary system, it would be unacceptable and unfair to extend this practice to the new Roman Catholic secondary school system. Consequently, for a period of ten years, Roman Catholic school boards will employ non-Catholic teachers in their secondary schools and once hired, they will be permitted to earn tenure, religion notwithstanding (Cavalluzzo, 1985, p.45).

Section 136-1a of Bill 30, which removes the right to hire only Catholic teachers, extends well beyond Davis' suggested ten year (1985-1995) provision for transferring teachers and other staff made redundant by the extension of full funding to separate schools. In effect it eliminates the right of separate school boards to prefer the hiring of Roman Catholics as teachers from 1995 onwards. However, the legislation states that if a court finds Section 136-1a sub-section 1 and 2 to be unconstitutional, it can be severed from the Education Act without affecting the balance of Bill 30 (sub-section 3). Jerry

Paquette in his article, Rewriting the Social Contract of Ontario Education (1990), articulates it in this fashion:

In general, separate boards accepted the principle of universal access to their schools - and agreed to employ on equitable terms public secondary teachers who became redundant as a result of student migration to separate boards during the completion process. Whether this gentlemen's agreement with respect to a ten-year moratorium on hiring redundant teachers without references to religious - cause criteria would stand a constitutional test under section 93 of the Constitution Act, 1982 is, to say the least, doubtful. Section 136-1a frames this agreement in uncharacteristically vague language and, significantly, provides for automatic revocation of that subsection should it be struck down in court, fairly certain signs that its architects recognized its constitutional vulnerability (p.247).

Is it surprising then, that such provisions under Bill 30 give some pause for concern and vexation by the Catholic educational community of Ontario (Ontario Conference of Catholic Bishops; Ontario Separate Schools Trustees' Association; Ontario Catholic Supervisory Officers' Association; The Institute For Catholic Education; Completion Office - Separate Schools)? Kenneth Westhues in his article, Catholic Separate schools: An Ambiguous Legacy (1985) lends credence to this fear:

As this article is being written, the separate school boards of Ontario are worrying about a demand of the Ontario government that has accompanied its decision to complete funding of separate schools through the secondary level. The demand is that the expanded Catholic high schools not discriminate against non-Catholic students seeking admission or against non-Catholic teachers seeking employment. The school boards fear that meeting this demand will diminish the distinctiveness of their schools. Of course it will (p.60).

Additionally, within Bill 30, open access (Section 136-n) is provided so that all students (non-Catholic included) may be accommodated in publicly funded Catholic schools if, of course, space and assessment



factors permit.

It is my hope that the new Roman Catholic school boards will consider, in the most positive way, granting all students and their families universal access to publicly supported Roman Catholic schools, should such access be desired, limited only by the availability of space and the designation of assessment support (Cavalluzzo, 1985, p.45).

Although the Bishops of Ontario addressed these concerns positively in their Pastoral Guideline on Pupil and Teacher Access to New Catholic Secondary Schools (1984), there does appear to be a lack of consensus within the Catholic community of Ontario regarding the impact of Bill 30 on the distinctive character and mission of Catholic schools.

#### **BILL 30 - Blessing or Curse?**

These aforementioned conditions, which govern the implementation of full funding of Catholic secondary extension, posit specific concerns that many separate school advocates see as potentially threatening to the mission of Catholic education (C.O.S.S., 1988; Mulligan, 1990; Blishen Report, 1990). The Position Paper Catholic Elementary and Secondary Education in Ontario (1987) by The Basilian Fathers of Toronto underscored these concerns and addressed the need for the government to recognize the three essential characteristics of Catholic education.

These three points, not in order of importance, concern: the composition of the school staff, the religious education program of study, and the religious life (or liturgical/worship) program of the school. We contend that any effort on the part of either the government or the school authorities themselves to do away with the current Catholic school practice, which has evolved over the years and which is supportive of the formation in the schools of Christian community, will be tantamount to eliminating the authentically Catholic character of the schools (p.2).

Similar concerns were reinforced by J.W. Boich, Executive Director

of the Ontario Association of Education Administration Officials, who pointed out that, "Catholic organizations supported extension, as would be expected, but had serious reservations about public school teacher transfers and student accessibility" (1985, p.32). His reference to a three part study (1975, 1978, and 1984) which examined the effects of total or partial funding of Catholic schools in Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Ontario, and then compared these findings with non-funded schools in British Columbia and Manitoba, provided some insight into the potential problems. "It would appear from this data that the further the distance the time of the funding, the more Catholic schools seem to shift from a sense of community and mission towards a sense of rivalry and financial calculation in terms of salary and bureaucracy" (Boich, 1985, p.35). Boich also predicted that, "The uniqueness of Catholic school systems may be threatened unless overt action is taken by trustees, parents, and priests" (p.36).

This call for action has been heeded by the Ontario Conference of Catholic Bishops. In 1989, they responded with a pastoral letter on Catholic education called This Moment of Promise, which states: "Conscious of our responsibilities as pastoral leaders of the Roman Catholic Church of Ontario, we want to share with our people in choosing those directions which will preserve and promote truly Catholic education" (p.5). Included in this document are significant discussion questions and challenges which promote a renewed focus on the Catholicity of separate schools in Ontario, by addressing such issues as the re-articulation of a Catholic philosophy of education, curricula specifically for Catholic

schools, the development of community and cooperation, the size of buildings, the professionalization of education, as well as the strictures of bureaucratic procedures. "As the system of public education evolves in its newly completed form, we must ensure that separate school boards retain the freedom, autonomy, and distinctiveness necessary to provide Catholic education" (p.20).

The bishops have also collaboratively established with the other Catholic educational associations in Ontario, the Institute for Catholic Education (I.C.E.). This organization recently published an extensive study, The Blishen Report, (1990), which surveyed teachers, parents, clergy, trustees and grade 12 Catholic students to yield a snapshot of the separate school system's strengths and weaknesses. This study reinforced the fact that the Catholic school system's uniqueness (philosophy and goals) extends beyond its teachings, institutions, and organizational structures. It also includes the personal witness and commitment to faith of its participants.

This detailed study, accompanied by other initiatives like Catholic Education and Separate School Boards in Ontario (C.O.S.S., 1988), reflect a wary or cautious appreciation of Bill 30's implementation in the separate schools of Ontario. Father J. Mulligan, in his book Evangelization And The Catholic High School (1990), asks "Will full funding - the long awaited completion of the publicly funded Catholic school system in Ontario prove to be a blessing or a curse" (p.3)? Although he delineates the positive aspects of full funding (relief from fundraising, tuitions, and renewed growth in Catholic education),

he also states: "Yet, only five years later, I believe it is accurate to say that within the Catholic community - students, teachers, and parishes - the relief of the blessing of funding has become noticeably tempered by the potential curse" (p.4).

Mulligan also states that faith formation and faith leadership, which are essential to ensuring the Catholic character of schools, are endangered, if not in crisis. This is supported by Guy O'Brien, Director of Education for the Lakehead Separate School Board, who stated in his Diocesan address to trustees, Leadership In Catholic Education (1990): "My point, simply put, is that the very nature and difference of our Catholic schools is in danger of being compromised by forces both within and external to our separate school system" (p.7). This appears to support the contention that within the Catholic educational community there is an evolving awareness that Catholic education in Ontario is at a crossroads and, moreover, that Bill 30 is a significant agent contributing to this critical period of change. This is reinforced by Tom Reilly, the Director of the Completion Office - Separate Schools who stated that:

Bill 30 has done more than complete our school system. It has forced us to re-examine our purposes, expand our horizons and mature. We are facing the total recreation of our system or, some would say, the forging of an entirely new, complete system which will no longer have any excuses for failure to define and achieve its purposes (1988, p.2).

This demonstrable awareness and concern identified with Bill 30 by Catholic stakeholders reveals their need to affirm and confirm those characteristics which are essential to the provision of Catholic education. Their concerns also manifest the fear that the integrity and character of Catholic

schools may be diminished or eroded by full funding if vigilance is not maintained.

### **The Provision of Catholic Education**

Traditionally, separate schools have relied on three basic means of providing Catholic education as illustrated in Figure 1. This evolved concept (theory) of providing Catholic education derives from traditional and historical practice enshrined in constitutional rights and privileges (Section 93 of the Constitution Act of 1867). It also represents the model that is dedicated to preserving the distinctive character and mission of separate schools. However, some of these essential characteristics appear to be at odds with the operational demands of full funding, for example, the hiring of non-Catholic teachers. Ironically, now that completion has been realized through Bill 30, there is this swelling skepticism that this model is being impaired and that specific provisions within this delivery archetype may be in jeopardy (Mulligan, 1990; The Basilian Fathers, 1987).

#### Staffing and Hiring Practices

"By their witness and their behaviour teachers are of the first importance to impart a distinctive character to Catholic schools" (The Sacred Congregation For Catholic Education, 1977, p.27). Hiring Catholic teachers, therefore, has always been a fundamental principle of the Separate School System of Ontario, and Catholic teachers have traditionally constituted a crucial factor in the Catholic educational frame of reference (C.O.S.S., 1988).

Figure 1

**DELIVERY MODEL FOR CATHOLIC EDUCATION**

**Traditionally, separate schools have relied on  
three basic means for promoting  
Catholic education:**

- |   |
|---|
| <p>(i) by developing each school as a Christian community in all of its academic and non-academic activities;</p>   |
| <p>(ii) by providing qualified teachers, supervisory officers and other personnel who are committed to building a Christian community in the school system; and</p> |
| <p>(iii) by providing academic curricula, including formal religious instruction, in which Catholic faith and life are integrated.</p>                              |

From: Completion Office - Separate Schools. (1988) Catholic Education and Separate School Boards in Ontario. p. 1-3. Toronto: Catholic Education Foundation of Ontario.

This can be attested to by the significant role played by the clergy and religious orders in Catholic education in the past. Their greatly diminished presence in teaching today has shifted the responsibility of preserving teaching as ministry to the commitment and witness of lay Catholic teachers. Consequently, lay Catholic teachers must be both academic and spiritual leaders in the school. "The life of the Catholic teacher must be marked by the exercise of a personal vocation in the Church, and not simply by the exercise of a profession" (The Sacred Congregation For Catholic Education, 1982, p.22). According to B. E. Nelligan in his address, The School Curriculum - The Catholic Difference (1983), "The integrity of the system must be preserved with teachers who strive to be Christian role models for their students" (p.16). It is evident that the role of the teacher is of paramount importance to the provision of Catholic education.

Since the announcement of full funding though, Roman Catholic separate school boards have had restrictions placed on their ability to hire Catholic teachers (Regulation 71 or local agreements), that govern the transfer of redundant public secondary school staff due to completion (Section 136-1). Initially, this hiring freeze was identified as a ten year period (1985-1995) to ensure that the interests of the secondary public school teacher were not jeopardized (Premier Davis' Statement, 1984) and it appeared to be accepted by the Catholic community of Ontario as a morally just principle. Subsequently, since 1985 the numbers of transferred public secondary teachers have varied from board to board in the province depending on local circumstances, and although the numbers

of transferred redundant public secondary school teachers have been marginal for most Roman Catholic separate school boards, some Catholic boards have been affected significantly. However, in addition to Section 136-1 under Bill 30, there was also the legislative inclusion of the permanent loss (after the initial ten years) of the right of separate school boards to discriminate with regards to religion in their hiring practices (Section 136-1a).

For the purpose of maintaining the distinctiveness of separate schools, the Roman Catholic school board may require as a condition of employment that teachers hired by the board after the ten year period mentioned in subsection 136L (6) agree to respect the philosophy and tradition of Roman Catholic separate schools in the performance of their duties.

This is believed to be a critical and fundamental departure for Catholic education in Ontario (C.O.S.S, 1988; The Basilian Fathers, 1987). It ostensibly challenges one of the basic and fundamental means by which Catholic education is provided: "Catholic education places a heavy burden on teachers, who are expected to see teaching as a profession with a Catholic vision, having the specific goal of assisting students to develop their faith and to integrate it with their life and culture" (C.O.S.S., 1988, p.1-4). These restraints on staffing potentially curb the development of a unique faith community within the separate schools. Even though past practices involved the hiring of non-Catholics, these practices were motivated out of need (scarcity of teachers) not dictated by law. As 1995 approaches, that being the trigger date for activating Section 136-1a, separate schools will be compelled to assess or adjudicate the impact that this aspect of Bill



30 is having on what has been a pre-eminent and critical characteristic of providing Catholic education.

### Christian Community

According to its philosophy, the Catholic school seeks to develop a Christian community (a Catholic spirit or ethos) which is permeated by the Gospel values. As The Sacred Congregation For Catholic Education (1977) states:

The specific mission of the school, then, is a critical, systematic transmission of culture in the light of faith and the bringing forth of the power of Christian virtue by the integration of culture with faith and of faith with living (p.16).

Although all Catholic partners in education recognize the fundamental importance of building Christian community (translating the gospel message into action) in the Catholic school, there appears to be a concerned recognition (Mulligan, 1990) that aspects of full funding potentially mitigate against this important means of providing Catholic education. Such aspects include the aforementioned Section 136-1a and "open access" or Section 136-o, which opened up the student enrollment base to non-Catholic students in separate secondary schools and also addresses fees and exemption from religious studies. Although open access students have not materialized in large numbers for Roman Catholic school boards throughout the province, these challenges within Bill 30 have been acknowledged by the Ontario Conference of Catholic Bishops in This Moment of Promise (1989) which states:

The building of Catholic education communities has always been a creative endeavour which calls for the best which each one of us has to offer. Together, we must emphasize and in some cases discover the new responses and new

solutions to the specific challenges which this moment offer us (p.19).

According to evidence from John Boich (1985), publicly funded Catholic schools seem to lose their sense of community and mission as time passes (p.35; Mulligan, 1990; Westhues, 1985). Given the operational conditions of Bill 30 and their direct bearing on the basic means which provide Catholic education (C.O.S.S., 1988), there appears to be reason to suggest that the "challenges" referred to by the Ontario Conference of Catholic Bishops in This Moment Of Promise (1989), may indeed be critical impactors on the development of Christian community in Catholic schools.

#### Curricula and Religious Education

While the Catholic school system has always recognized the importance of religious education, it also articulates the significance of this religious formation within the context of the whole curriculum. The Bishops of Ontario in This Moment Of Promise (1989) clearly reinforced this aspect and supported it as a basic means of providing Catholic education.

Efforts in developing curriculum specifically for Catholic schools should continue. Religious education should not be reduced to one course in our schools. Rather, our whole educational process should become a religious activity. Faith should infuse every subject and aspect of our curriculum (p.20).

This principle undergirds the Catholic vision and commitment to education.

It also assumes that all the partners in Catholic education possess a common understanding and determination to bring about this vision.

However, Bill 30 has legislated into separate schools, operational realities (staffing, enrollment, and exemption) which may lead to a diminution of this pervasive understanding of curriculum. Even more

specifically, exemption from religious studies Bill 30's subsection 136-o (5), which is extended to "open access" students, may potentially create different expectations or two sets of standards within the same school regarding curriculum and the significance of it. Exemptions could become contentious (depending on the number of requests and the size of the school), thereby undermining the central importance of compulsory religious education credit courses in Catholic high schools. According to the Basilian Fathers, if this happens, the consequences are disastrous for the preservation of separate schools.

The schools must be able to require that all staff and students who chose to be part of the school community take part in the religious life program. Anything less than this, we contend, will detract from the essential unity of the school community and seriously threaten, if not destroy, its curricular integrity (The Basilian Fathers, 1987, p.3).

Such clear pronouncements cannot be dismissed.

### Summary

This chapter has examined the literature pertaining to the historical perspective of the provision of funding for separate schools in the province of Ontario. Additionally, specific attention was concentrated on the impact this full funding (Bill 30) is perceived to be having on the distinctive character and integrity of Catholic schools. Concomitantly, discussion has been provided regarding how sections within the operative Bill mitigate potentially against the essential characteristics or basic means of providing Catholic education (C.O.S.S. 1988; The Basilian Fathers, 1987): the hiring of committed staff, the formation of Christian community, and the development of a religious and academic curriculum. Overall, a clear rationale has been provided

to illustrate that an ironic tension exists between Bill 30 and the distinctive character of separate schools.

The following chapter will introduce the qualitative research design and discuss the process employed.

## CHAPTER III

### DESIGN OF THE STUDY

#### Methodology

Chapter III furnishes information about the qualitative research methods used in this study. Theoretical underpinnings are examined and the critical characteristics of qualitative research are reviewed. This facilitates the introduction to and description of setting and leads to the outline of information detailing access. The process employed to collect and organize the data is also delineated. The chapter concludes with a summary that fuses the qualitative research method with the process method used to collect the data.

#### Theoretical Underpinnings

Qualitative inquiry represents an alternative approach to human studies or social research (philosophy, sociology and anthropology). It evolved in the late 19th century as a countermovement to positivism or classical research, because it rejected the prescriptive, value neutral methodologies inherent in scientific realism. Scientific realism assumes that there is a separation of mind and world, and that what is known is independent of the researcher.

This school of thought claimed that social investigation was a neutral activity in regard to values, and accordingly, social scientists conducting research should (1) eliminate all bias and preconceptions, (2) not be emotionally involved with or have a particular attitude toward the subject, and (3) move beyond common sense beliefs. This last injunction meant that social science must develop a neutral scientific language that would 'rise above' context bound and value laden every day language (Smith, 1983, p.7).

Qualitative researchers dismiss this notion that there needs to be a separation of facts and values. They take the position that social reality is mind-constructed and that truth is ultimately a matter of social and historical agreement. Qualitative researchers "stress the need for inquiry that takes into account the historical-ideological moment we live in and the influence it has on us" (Soltis. 1984, p.7). According to Dilthey, who was one of the first to question positivism (classical research), an alternative methodology for the social sciences was imperative.

He argued that whereas the physical sciences dealt with inanimate objects that could be seen as existing outside us, this was not the case for the cultural studies. Here the subject concerned the product of human minds and was therefore inseparably connected to our minds with all the attendant subjectivity, emotions, and values. In this sense interrelationship of investigator and what was being investigated was impossible to separate, and what existed in the social and human world was what we (investigators and laymen) thought existed. In the cultural sciences we were the subject and the object of inquiry, and the study of the social and human was the study of ourselves (a subject-subject relationship) (Smith, 1983, p.7).

This alternative approach, referred to as qualitative, established a new paradigm and fostered a compatible methodology for research. For this study, such a methodology was critical because it grounded the research problem in a holistic, value-context base.

#### A General Introduction To Qualitative Research

Qualitative research recognizes the importance of the field or natural setting of the study, consequently the term "qualitative research" evolved. However, because this term reflects an anthropological and sociological genesis, it is often referred to by educators as naturalistic,

that is occurring within a natural setting, for example the classroom. This type of naturalistic or field research is buttressed by such fundamental concepts as phenomenology, symbolic interactionism, and ethnography. Respectively, phenomenology deals with the study of phenomena and the corresponding significance which the participants attach to the phenomena and symbolic interactionism is largely the interpretation of social reality through shared or common interaction and experience. It is within this context that the related concept of ethnography or ethnographic research emerges.

The term derives from anthropology, and means literally a description of the way of life of a race or group of people. It is concerned with what people are, how they behave, how they interact together. It aims to uncover their beliefs, values, perspectives, motivations and how all these things develop or change over time or from situation to situation. It tries to do all this from within the group, and from within the perspective of the group's members. It is their meanings and interpretations that count (Woods, 1986, p.4).

Because "ethnography by its very definition is descriptive" (Woods, p.148) it demands that the researcher be involved within the natural setting of the study. This dictates a participatory role on behalf of the researcher. Ethnographers refer to this as being the participant-observer. Although it provides the researcher an inside track it also creates the possibility of ambivalence and distortion which must be consciously monitored by the researcher.

By participating, one both acts on, and is acted upon by the environment. But one must try to combine deep personal involvement and a measure of detachment. Without the latter, one runs the risk of 'going native'; that is identifying so strongly with members that defending their values comes to take precedence over actually studying them. Diligently keeping 'field notes and a generally reflective attitude which should alert one to shifts in one's own views, guard against this.

The extent of the commitment, the observer's reactions and changes, all become part of the account (Woods, p. 34).

Additionally, the participant-observer role may yield a variety of documentation beyond the field notes, such as policies, goals and objectives, memos, and illustrative materials such as brochures and booklets.

Another naturalistic tool related to the goals of field research is the use of informal interviews or as Woods (1986) would say, "I prefer to regard them as conversations or discussions, which dictate more of an open, democratic, two-way, informal, free-flowing process, and wherein people can be 'themselves' and not feel bound by roles" (p.67). Such a process of data collection is somewhat dependent upon the researcher's ability to create a climate of trust, ease, and comfort so that the above elements can characterize the quality of the interview. Although this study is not ethnographic, it did rely heavily on informal interviews. The need to transcend the research and form bonds of openness and honesty fostered a "joint pursuit of a common mission rising above personal egos" (p.63).

Working through the theory and the data nurtured the ability to critique and appreciate the importance of the process skills and the underlying features that characterize naturalistic research.

#### Features That Characterize Qualitative Research

According to Bogden and Biklen (1982), there are five features that characterize qualitative research. Of first importance is the setting, because it serves as the data base for the study. The researcher, therefore, becomes the chief agent or medium and enters the site as



the participant-observer. This facilitates the search for meaning and significance that is directly linked to a value / context relevance.

The second characteristic addresses the importance of meaning, or implicit meaning, that connotes values and beliefs, as well as cultural and philosophic assumptions. Researchers must be sensitive to and aware of the various ways that people assign meaning from their lived experiences.

The third characteristic is similar to symbolic interactionism whereby emphasis is placed on how people bargain for meaning through shared experience and social interaction. The awareness of this and the manner in which these behaviors, responses, and events under study develop and emerge is perceived and interpreted from the researcher's perspective.

The fourth characteristic advances the descriptive nature of field research. According to Geertz (1975), research of this type is "an elaborate venture in 'thick description'" (p.6). Detailed field notes, memos related to discussions, accounts of events, transcripts of interviews, documentation and other material cumulatively form the basis of the study's data. Consequently, the researcher can ill afford to minimize or negate any nuance of context within the study.

Last but not least is the use of inductive reasoning by the researcher to analyze the study's data. This approach runs counter to the classical approach to research whereby data is gathered to verify or negate a hypothesis. Predicting outcomes is not what inductive reasoning is about. In contrast, inductive reasoning employs the principle of emergent

theory or "grounded theory" (Glasser and Straus, 1967). Essentially this theory represents a process that involves the filtering up or percolating of particular data information that eventually integrates into common generalities or themes. This adds a very dynamic dimension to field research.

### Foreshadowing in Qualitative Research

Occasionally parallels are drawn between the artistic strengths of poets and qualitative researchers. Philips (1987), claims "that like poets, qualitative researchers appear to share similar qualities such as keen powers of observation, heightened self-awareness and realization of how their own personalities can shape their work, and a sensitive command of the language in which they are going to report their observations" (p.9). This underscores the creative aspect of qualitative researchers and reinforces the need for them to rely on and trust in their own experiences and observations.

Just as any good writer knows the inherent value of foreshadowing or prefiguring in the development of her work, so do field researchers. Its intention is to alert the reader and to establish a point of reference. It also plays an important role for researchers in the identification of the problem. As advanced by Malinowski (cited in Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983, p.28) qualitative research originates with a specific problem or "foreshadowed problems".

In this study the conflicts that emerged from my multiple perspectives of teacher/consultant/parent/trustee/faculty advisor have been identified and situated within the context of the tension between the separate

school system's ability to retain its distinctive mission and the implementation of Bill 30, An Act to amend the Education Act, 1986.

These "foreshadowed problems" were examined within the parameters of this study and the theory base that grounded it.

### **Description of the Research**

#### Setting

This study included three dissimilar school boards within the province of Ontario to facilitate a cross section of data, as well as reflect regional disparities (geographic location and population density). Such a cross section was intended to yield a diversity of data and identify the individual and collective impact that Bill 30 may be having on the ability of separate school boards in Ontario to retain their distinctive mission of Catholic education. To preserve the anonymity of these three boards, they will be referred to alphabetically as Board A, Board B, and Board C.

Board A is a Roman Catholic Separate School Board that is experiencing significant growth. It is located within the Greater Toronto Area (G. T. A.) and consists of less than fifty schools of which some are French speaking. The system's Board of Trustees consists of both an English and French Section and its rapidly growing student enrollment of between 20,000 to 25,000 students represents the total of both elementary and secondary panels. Its academic staff exceeds 1000 teachers, including a support staff of approximately twenty. They are specialized in the areas of religion, family life, primary education, junior /intermediate education, special education, computers, secondary education, physical

and health education, music, French language, and media-visual. There are eight Superintendents in addition to the Director of Education.

This board enjoyed a long and successful tradition of operating private high schools and relinquished this practice only with the advent of full funding and the implementation of Bill 30. Consequently, it provided important before and after insights and perceptions about changes to Catholic secondary education.

Board B is a Roman Catholic Separate School Board located within the northwestern region of Ontario. It consists of less than 10 schools and employs a small academic staff. The support staff is limited, specializing in areas of religion/family life and special education. Aside from the Director of Education, there is only a Business Supervisor.

The community in which this system is located is considerably removed from larger urban areas and could be described as being relatively isolated and resource dependent. However, the board's enrollment remains constant (some modest growth), with the total ranging from 1,500 to 3,000 students (including a substantial native component). This enrollment aggregate also reflects the system's small but encouraging secondary student growth rate. The system's Board of Trustees and Director of Education have negotiated with the Ministry of Education for a new secondary school that will become the first designated Catholic secondary school in the community. Previous to the implementation of Bill 30, this separate school system had no experience or tradition in the provision of Catholic secondary education.

Board C is a Roman Catholic Separate School Board located in northern

Ontario and consists of less than thirty schools. The Board of Trustees includes both French and English sections and the total enrollment ranges between 7,500 to 10,000 students, which represents both elementary and secondary panels. It employs an academic staff in excess of 500 and maintains a modest support staff that specializes in Christian living, elementary education, secondary education, French language, computers and technology. In addition to the Director of Education, there are four Superintendents.

Prior to the implementation of Bill 30, this board had entered into negotiations with the Bishop of the Diocese to extend Catholic secondary education from grade 10 to grade 13 (O.A.C.'s) under the auspices of a private Board of Governors. With the advent of full funding, Catholic education was extended and the need for private funding was eliminated. Since the extension of Catholic secondary school education, this board has realized a significant growth in secondary enrollment, although elementary growth remains static. Concomitantly, this growth has triggered a continuous flow of redundant public secondary school teachers from the coterminous board and so, Board C has consistently felt the impact of Bill 30's Section 136-1.

Informal discussions for entry were initiated with the three boards in April of 1991, approximately one month in advance of the data collection process. An informal approach was used to see if the interest that was anticipated would materialize and more importantly, to determine how elaborate the initiatives of access needed to be. Fortunately, networking as a trustee simplified the process considerably and afforded

almost immediate access to all three boards. Therefore, once direct contact was made, the procedures outlined by each Director of Education were carefully but expeditiously followed.

#### Gaining entry

"'Getting in' is a common problem and there is much good advice in the literature for researchers seeking entrance to an institution, on how to dress, how to behave, what to say (see for example, Hammersley, 1979). Basically, you have to sell yourself as a credible person doing a worthy project" (Woods, 1986, p.22-23).

In April of 1991, a Provincial Trustee's Conference in Toronto provided me with the perfect opportunity to seek out the Chairpersons of Boards A and B. In anticipation of this, copies of the study's proposal were made available to them and their support was engaged. Further, follow-up discussions were promised, specifically through personal telephone calls to their Directors of Education requesting permission for their boards to participate in the study.

Upon returning home from the conference, long distance telephone calls were made to boards A and B and discussions followed with each of their Directors. Naturally, mention was made of their Board Chairperson's support and following that, the discussion centered on the study and their board's participation. The formal request outlined the study's intent, the suggested time lines, the number of personnel to be interviewed as well as the promise of confidentiality, the use of informed consent forms which all subjects would be asked to sign, and the collection of board documentation, for example each board's

Mission Statement and its statement of Goals and Objectives. Their request that copies of pertinent data, including proposal and consent forms, be faxed was complied with and within one week of making contact with Boards A and B, permission was granted to conduct the research. Accordingly, a three day visitation time was mutually identified and a tentative schedule for taped interviews was established. May 27th to the 29th was confirmed with Board A and June 5th to the 7th with Board B.

The procedure for securing permission with Board C took a different course. Having personal contact with this board and administration, permission was sought directly with the Director of Education. He had pre-knowledge of my desire to engage this board in such a study and provided personal support and encouragement. The official policy requirement for research was completed and submitted for approval. Once this technicality had been dispensed with, permission was granted to conduct interviews and collect pertinent board documentation. This began in early May and continued into June.

Board C was the first board to be studied for two reasons. First, it provided immediate availability and second, a comfort level with the subjects afforded the opportunity to gain experience and insights into the interviewing process. This maximized the potential for an outcome of fluid and familiar discussions. It was a direct benefit that the participants were so receptive, accommodating, and helpful.

Within each board, a variety of subjects were interviewed and to preserve their anonymity, pseudonyms were employed, as illustrated in

Figure 2. These administrative and trustee subjects represented a cross section from both the system and school levels, as well as from the provincial level. In addition, the interviews were set up at convenient times to accommodate the working schedules of the subjects. Generally speaking, central administrative staff were interviewed at their offices and school personnel at their respective schools. This pattern was consistent with all three participating boards and afforded a better understanding of the size and physical parameters of each school board.

The actual interviews could be characterized as informal, friendly, and relaxed. Significant support for this study was experienced and fortunately this translated itself into a willingness on the part of the subjects to share open and frank responses about their perceptions of Bill 30's impact on the mission of their schools and system. Especially rewarding was the degree of candor and sincerity from the subjects. On the average, the interviews lasted about one hour or in some cases an hour and a half. No notes were taken throughout any of the taped interviews.

In addition to the three consenting school boards, Directors and or Presidents of three Provincial Catholic Educational Organizations were interviewed. Their interviews, as anticipated, revealed a more global than local response to the perceived tension between Bill 30 and the separate school system's ability to retain its distinctive mission.

The first individual (Solomon) interviewed, was associated with the office that co-ordinated the completion of secondary schools in Ontario. Consequently he served as an excellent resource subject for



Figure 2

SUBJECT CODE

#1	SOLOMON	- ADMINISTRATOR	- PROVINCIAL LEVEL
#2	PETER	- BISHOP	- PROVINCIAL LEVEL
#3	PHILIP	- ADMINISTRATOR	- SYSTEM LEVEL
#4	CHARLES	- ADMINISTRATOR	- SYSTEM LEVEL
#5	DANIEL	- ADMINISTRATOR	- SCHOOL / BASED LEVEL
#6	TIMOTHY	- ADMINISTRATOR	- SCHOOL / BASED LEVEL
#7	ANGELO	- ADMINISTRATOR	- SYSTEM LEVEL
#8	GABRIEL	- ADMINISTRATOR	- SCHOOL / BASED LEVEL
#9	CHRISTOPHER	- ADMINISTRATOR	- SYSTEM LEVEL
#10	LUCY	- TRUSTEE	- SYSTEM LEVEL
#11	JAMES	- TRUSTEE	- PROVINCIAL LEVEL
#12	MARK	- ADMINISTRATOR	- SYSTEM LEVEL
#13	ANDREW	- ADMINISTRATOR	- SYSTEM LEVEL
#14	ANTHONY	- ADMINISTRATOR	- SYSTEM LEVEL
#15	LUKE	- ADMINISTRATOR	- SCHOOL / BASED LEVEL
#16	Matthew	- ADMINISTRATOR	- SCHOOL / BASED LEVEL
#17	MARTIN	- ADMINISTRATOR	- SCHOOL / BASED LEVEL
#18	ADAM	- ADMINISTRATOR	- SYSTEM LEVEL
#19	AGNES	- TRUSTEE	- SYSTEM LEVEL
#20	VINCENT	- ADMINISTRATOR	- SCHOOL / BASED LEVEL
#21	JEREMY	- TRUSTEE	- SYSTEM LEVEL
#22	RUIH	- ADMINISTRATOR	- SCHOOL / BASED LEVEL
#23	JOSEPH	- ADMINISTRATOR	- SCHOOL / BASED LEVEL
#24	STEPHEN	- ADMINISTRATOR	- SYSTEM LEVEL

this study. His support was enlisted at a Trustees' Conference in Toronto from April 27th through the 29th, 1991. He generously consented to be interviewed and a mutually convenient time was agreed upon during the conference. Solomon's willingness to share his experiences, insights, perceptions and responses during the interview established a level of commitment, sincerity, and humility that permeated the entire data collection process.

The second individual (Peter) represented an ecclesiastical group. Peter was an acquaintance whose company had been enjoyed at both educational and social functions over a number of years. When contacted by telephone, he responded with immediate and enthusiastic support and consented to a taped interview. A convenient time and date was established for an interview that took place at his office on the morning of May 23rd, 1991. He had requested a copy of the study's proposal and this was delivered to him in advance of what turned out to be a valuable interview.

The third individual (James) was a Trustee and Regional Director with a Provincial Catholic Association. This individual was a former board Chairman who had experienced directly many of the challenges contained within Bill 30, for instance, the negotiation and transfer of a secondary school. When approached for a taped interview, he greeted the request with enthusiasm and support. The informal meeting took place at his house on the afternoon of June 13th, 1991 and it resulted in an enjoyable, comfortable and relaxed interview that was characterized by honesty and frankness.

## Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis

This particular section serves as an overview to the various data collection techniques that are generally employed in field research. It will also identify those techniques that played a significant role in this study.

### Interviews

Although observation is identified as being the purest form of ethnographic research, naturalistic researchers are relying more and more on interviews. According to Woods (1986), "often it is the only way of finding out what the perspectives of people are, and collecting information on certain issues or events, but it is also a means of 'making things happen' and stimulating the flow of data" (p.62). This was certainly the case with this study and the reason that interviews were employed as the chief means of generating data.

There are variations in interviews. On the one hand interviews can be very loose and unconstructed, while on the other they can be very prescriptive and interrogational. Obviously there was an intentional effort in this study to establish a healthy equilibrium between these two extremes. Even though the interviews were informal, flexible, and open-ended, there was an inherent structure that undergirded them. In actual fact, the interviews were driven by a list of critical questions that sought to elicit responses and emergent dialogue (Irwin, 1988). In the pre-planning stage and in anticipation of the the data collection, a host of open-ended interview questions and probes were prepared to facilitate the discussion and transfer of ideas, perceptions, experiences,

and information relative to specific concerns identified within the study. Appendix 1 illustrates this interview guide.

Interviews of this nature are best served by these kinds of lead questions or "triggers" because they tend to coax and extract natural responses from the subjects. Since the interviews are developed informally, the discussion is relaxed and receptive to finding common ground. However, once this ambiance has been established, lead or theme questions are introduced and specific requests to clarify and interpret are judiciously employed to ensure that the nuances of language do not misrepresent the respondents. The importance and value of these skills were incorporated into each of the interview sessions.

In total, twenty-four interviews were conducted for this study and they ranged in length from forty-five minutes to ninety minutes each. As previously mentioned, the subjects represented a cross-section of central and school staff administrators, as well as the chairpersons of each board, and representatives of provincial educational organizations and associations. In all cases the subjects freely consented to tape recorded interviews and signed the appropriate consent forms.

Subsequent references to interviews will be characterized by the following notations: the name (pseudonym) followed by Inter, proceeded by the number of the entry. For example, (James, Inter 1) refers to James, Interview #1.

### Documents

Several documents were gathered from each of the three boards. They included system as well as school based materials that provided

such information as the Board's Mission Statement and Philosophy of Education, its Statement of Goals and Objectives, system and school profile information, curriculum documents, high school course calendars and professional development materials on Catholicity and Religion. These materials were readily proffered by various personnel of the participating boards. The collected documents are germane to the understanding of Catholic education and posit its fundamental beliefs and objectives. In addition, they also reflect the uniqueness of each board and the manner in which each communicates this uniqueness to its public.

The content analysis of these documents focused on the search for themes and categories. Concerns addressed, motive, context, intended purpose and audience are all areas that required attention. As Woods (1986) clearly states, "the qualitative approach to official documents is quite distinctive, for while they might in themselves convey useful information, they always have to be contextualized within the circumstances of their construction" (p.90).

Subsequent references to documents will be characterized by a similar notation system as was outlined for the interviews. For example, (Doc 3, 5), refers to Document #3, page 5.

### Triangulation

Triangulation represents the need to cross validate and confirm information. Essentially it allows the researcher to corroborate the reliability of the study's findings. Further, triangulation serves as a cross-check to expose inconsistencies, thereby reinforcing the

reliability of the data base. Lacey (1976) "feels very strongly that the world under investigation seen through one method of collecting data becomes enormously distorted by the limitations of that data and the available method of analysis" (p.61). According to Woods, (1986), "The closer we can bind them together, therefore, through triangulation, escalation, interaction, or whatever, the stronger the eventual product" (p. 120).

Triangulation was practiced and sources were used solely or in combination. "Data triangulation refers to time, space, or person triangulation as they related to the study. Methodological triangulation was also used and refers to one method used on different occasions or different methods used on the same subject" (Irwin, 1988, p.70).

Triangulation, therefore, provides a binding and validating effect.

#### Data Analysis

Data analysis began to some extent during the data collection stage. This is stated tentatively because awakenings were gradual and oft times were just "gut feelings" and sense perceptions that did not take shape until extensive time was spent in the analysis of the data. Then, because of the conscious search, there surfaced repetitive words, phrases, assumptions, and ideas that became particularly significant. A good example would be the word "commitment". It was referred to repeatedly, but in many cases there was a distinct ambivalence in terms of what the respondents were intending it to mean. On the one hand it was referring to "personal conviction and witness" and on the other to "perpetuating a particular tradition". As the study evolved, however,

the correlation between this multifaceted concept of "commitment" and teaching in a Catholic school became a significant theme in understanding the distinct mission of separate schools.

Throughout the data collection, themes and sensitizers were coded. This obviously included the use of critical words, phrases, conceptual ideas, images and metaphors, and to some extent assumptions. Inevitably, categories emerged. This was facilitated by triangulation and comparison of data that culminated in the development of theoretical conceptions representative of the participants. Once these were identified, they were then compared to the theoretical framework that undergirds the provision of Catholic education.

#### Validity and Reliability

It is commonly agreed that internal validity is appreciably high for ethnographers primarily because the origin of the data collection is the setting, and as indicated before, the researcher acts as both the medium and the measure. Obviously when strong agreement exists between what you set out to measure and what you do measure, then one can draw the conclusion that the resulting internal validity is significant. However, the generalizability of one study to another does not reflect internal validity. This is what is known as external validity. In relation to this particular study, external validity can be confirmed only by other Catholic trustees and administrators who espouse beliefs and ideas that are compatible with those described. If reliability is sought, then this is proportionally dependent upon another researcher's ability to replicate the study and produce the

same results. To facilitate this, details of what was done have been recorded.

### Summary

This study was best suited to qualitative research because it offered a holistic, value-context base. In addition, the use of naturalistic research endorsed the relevance of the researcher's perspective which is so germane to the understanding of the problem(s). As well, the use of informal interviews and documents assisted in the generation of rich and detailed data. Consequently, an emergence of theory developed relative to the shared values, beliefs, assumptions, feelings, and perceptions of the subjects. Chapter 4 presents this material.



## CHAPTER IV

### THE THREE STAGES OF BILL 30 BASED ON THE VIEWS AND PERCEPTIONS OF THE SUBJECTS

#### Introduction

The content of the subjects' views and perceptions reveal that there has been a layered or tiered response to the implementation of Bill 30 by Catholic school boards in the province of Ontario. Firstly, there has been a period of transition and growth. Secondly, there has been an awakening or raised consciousness of mission. Thirdly, there has been the recognition of and concern for basic changes. These informed stages constitute the substance of this chapter.

#### Stage 1

##### Transition and Growth

This particular stage is a combination of phenomena that is best described by Solomon, a provincial administrator, as "the Novelty of Completion" (Inter 1). It entails a structure of closely related elements that surround the initial responses by Catholic educators to the implementation of Bill 30 and is characterized by an overall sense of unpreparedness and fiscal anxiety.

##### A State of Unreadiness

To begin, let's place this state of unreadiness in the originating context. Although many overtures for completion had been made to the Ontario Legislature over the years by a persistent Catholic community, the actual fulfillment of that long awaited goal came as a definite

surprise on June 12th, 1984. James, a trustee and provincial director, expresses it this way.

I guess because Bill 30 was a surprise, let's be honest it was a surprise. The Catholic boards were not prepared other than celebrating the victory and communicating the victory to the public (Inter 11).

This is aptly reinforced by Charles, a system based administrator who candidly reveals a similar sense of unreadiness.

I was absolutely shocked by the announcement of full funding and that was followed very quickly by a sense of elation. I didn't see any of the problems associated with it, I just saw it as very positive. It wasn't until some sober thoughts later that I started seeing some of the problems. Not until the Ministry Regulation came out regarding staff and the transfer of redundant teaching staff of the public board and Section 136-1a did I start to appreciate our lack of preparation. Then I had some pretty sober second thoughts (Inter 4; Mark, Inter 12; Adam, Inter 18).

As a consequence of this ill-preparedness, other elements seemed to unfold naturally as the logistics and pressures of implementing Bill 30 took precedence with Catholic boards across the province.

The negotiations of varying accommodations, the building accommodations, the hiring of enough teachers, the finding of leaders and putting them in place, I think all of that has sort of consumed the attention of boards and has made them very inward looking - looking after their own hurts as it were rather than pursuing the provincial ideal as it were - the faith ideal (Solomon, Inter 1; Christopher, Inter 9; Peter, Inter 2).

### Imitation and Replication

This rush of activity and pressure to access extension grants resulted in the tendency of Catholic school boards and Catholic teachers to look to the public secondary system as both a model and a source of replication and imitation. The following comments by Agnes, a trustee and Philip and Christopher, who are both administrators, clearly underscore this point.

I think we could have done some very different things. I understand the problem, the pressures and the gun that was to our head. We just had to get a roof over these kids' heads. We just had to find classes and teachers. It was like, here's the model and it worked for the public system. Let's go with it (Agnes, Inter 19).

I think we have had the opportunity to put into place a structure from scratch. I don't know whether it's human nature or the manner in which we adapt to changes but we tend to go back to something that is familiar. I would say that one of my greatest disappointments about Catholic secondary is the fact that we did not put into place alternative structures. Generally, I feel that what we did was adopt the model of secondary education in the public school system (Philip, Inter 3, Daniel, Inter 5).

I think that is probably one of the saddest outcomes of Bill 30 that we were not allowed to be as innovative and creative as we would have liked to have been and I lay that on the doorstep of the federations. Any time we attempted to do something differently they demanded the repetition of the public board's model. I think that's a tragedy. We could have done other things. I think we should have examined very closely what boards of education were saying about the pitfalls of their operation but we were not allowed to do that. In fact the marching song has been duplicate, duplicate, duplicate and so we have. Virtually we have the same kind of high schools and we have virtually the same kind of structures. For example, we tried to be different with the chairperson model but we are getting closer and closer to department heads with each contract year. The teaching federation wants the same as the public boards and we are moving closer to duplication. We are being driven by a federation that is driven by what they believe to be the only good thing and that is duplicate what already exists. I think that is really unfortunate (Christopher, Inter 9).

Another administrator put it this way.

We, our secondary people looked across the way, or at our coterminous board and how they were doing things. Unfortunately, because we were less than up, as Catholic secondary schools, or secondary schools period, we copied some of their mistakes. For example, we used the same formula, or almost the same formula as the coterminous board in regards to department heads, rather than being innovative and developing a different kind of structure. Instead we fell into the public board of education structure. That bothers me because we are paying a price for it now. We dug our own grave. We could have been on the threshold of something entirely innovative in how we organized our departments. Why did we have to go with just something by subject? Why couldn't we have had the arts as one and have one head? We could have concentrated on integration but once you get into that lock step

kind of structure, it is very difficult to get out of it. I guess we did look across the way and we did copy many of the things that they have. Unfortunately, we are stuck now, because it is in the collective agreement and I think that is a mistake (Mark, Inter 12).

There are, however, some moderate views that reflect a need for patience, and objectivity. These administrators are less inclined to see the dye as cast and are optimistic that the tendency toward imitation can be converted.

We have a unique chance in Catholic schools to be not only different in terms of our mission, but because we don't have the long history of fully composite secondary schools, we have the opportunity to launch into new directions in terms of technical education, business education, and particularly co-operative education. We are not bound by the traditions that our coterminous public boards are and in my view, it should be easier for Catholic secondary schools to implement change than public secondary schools because we are not encumbered by that history and the vested interests that hold notions about programs and positions within the public secondary schools. Coupled with that is, let's not blow the chance because we now have it, so let's take advantage of it. We really should not be looking at our public coterminous boards as the only model. I think we should look at what they do and pick out those things that we think are really desirable to replicate or immitate and launch into new directions based on sound research (Andrew, Inter 13; Philip, Inter 3; Ruth, Inter 22).

Solomon's comments are even more anticipatory.

The danger from the administrator/trustee point of view is not fully comprehending this response and sort of blaming and saying, "See what we have lost" and throw up our hands. I think that trustees and administrators need to try to step back a little bit from this and look at it objectively and admit that this is a phenomenon and something we must try and shape and gain over the years but it is going to take time. It is going to require a great deal of patience and effort and waiting and coaching to get this whole new cohort of students into the tradition and to get the teachers into a mindset which will let them build something new not just imitate. Emulation and rivalry with the public system will be over and we will be more confident in ourselves because we will be more settled (Inter 1).

## Teacher Militancy

Generally speaking, subjects tended to identify this entrenchment towards paralleling the public system primarily with the teachers and the federation. Concurrently, according to these subjects, there evolved a sense of teacher militancy or impatience that manifested itself in unexpected ways and added significantly to the challenges of implementing Bill 30. This element of teacher militancy is outlined by the following comments from system and school based administrators.

The division among teachers has really disappointed me. I just did not think it would be as bitter as it is. I can't really understand why that is, whether it is related to the separation of our federation into two bargaining units. That hurts a lot to see that (Matthew, Inter 16).

We went through an eighteen day strike last year and I know one of the issues that is very much a part in the thinking of teachers is, "If we are funded equally now, why are we not paid the same as the people up the street? Why are we paid less?". I know that is a very burning issue. We have a very militant teacher body now. That was a killer, especially for me (Anthony, Inter 14, Luke, Inter 15; Agnes, Inter 19).

Negotiations, and the issue of parity in salary with the coterminous board, has emerged as a particularly testy and divisive issue and one that appears to be universal among Catholic boards and teacher bargaining units. Some of this perceived teacher militancy has been explained in the following manner.

They did not have any experienced people who served on negotiating teams. So we were dealing, the board was dealing with a unit, a brand new unit who set out to prove themselves, that they were as capable as anyone else and nobody was going to put anything over on them. We had to face that across the negotiating table. It was black and white. "This is what we want and if we don't get it, well that is your problem." So that is what happened and negotiations broke down because you do not negotiate that way. So I think we are still paying that price with a new and inexperienced unit. It wants to prove itself with a gun-ho membership group

which says, "Now we are secondary and we are going to show you." When I meet with the elementary unit president, we can talk, we can dialogue, we can look at problems and work toward solution. When I meet with the president of the secondary unit, he says, "I will listen to what you have to say but I must go back to my executive and discuss it with them before I can come back and talk to you." I find that very frustrating and non productive but it is a reality I have to live with. We have stopped meeting. I don't have regular meetings with him anymore because in my view, it accomplishes nothing (Mark, Inter 12).

The following perspective, however, provides a different slant to the perceived militance of teachers since the implementation of full funding.

I think, on the whole, teachers do understand and many of them, thank God, do not pay much attention because they're so absorbed in teaching and I mean that in the best sense, but at the same time those of them who are knowledgeable and active politically don't see boards as their targets. They see the provincial government as their target and they push boards really to push the provincial government (Solomon, Inter 1).

#### Competitiveness

Allied to the above, including the aforementioned aspects of the Catholic system's general state of unreadiness, the tendency to replicate and imitate the public secondary system, and the emergence of teacher militancy, there is also the related phenomenon of competitiveness.

This is best described by the candid comments of the following subjects.

It keeps you on your toes. It keeps you aware of what is going on. The other aspect of it is that it is more cost effective (Jeremy, Inter 21).

Oh, there was always the competitiveness. I was a great recruiter in terms of getting our elementary students to come to our school. In some ways the competition is less in certain ways, at least in terms of accessing bodies. I think that is less. We are getting more and more students and we do less to get more, that is in terms of actual physical, hard recruitment (Anthony, Inter 14).

I think we have to avoid excessive competition. I do not think being the best at everything necessarily means we are fulfilling

our mission. When I worked at a foreign high school in Burma we had what was perceived as the number one school and without a doubt anyone who had any status or money sent their kids there. The reality was when the communists took over they said, " You people are not Christians. You are just another big corporation." We were the best at everything. We also had the most money in the bank and the biggest building in the city but when it came down to the crunch of how we were perceived by a competing body, they did not perceive us as Catholic first. They perceived us as something else. So being the best does not necessarily enhance our Catholicity (Daniel, Inter 5).

The teachers still sense that there is a competitiveness and that we are better. Rather than saying we are different, we keep insisting we are better and while in our hearts we might believe this is the better way to educate our children, I think we can not just keep jumping up and down shouting out, that we are better. I do not think that is going to cause positive change (Timothy, Inter 6).

I think since the completion there has been the danger in stating, "See we can do it better" and almost that we are judging by numbers. We are judging by can we hold more and not can we hold the right numbers for the right reasons and make a good job of doing that and maybe be content to be a bit smaller and be content to be not up to par on every single aspect of things, so I think there is a danger and I think in that sense our present crisis in finance could be a blessing because I detect a lot of the bureaucracy's being cut and that would be good. Bureaucracy tends to quantify and to set goals in terms of enrollments and so on and to back away from tough decisions and by tough decisions I mean decisions of principle (Solomon, Inter 1).

### Financial Woes

This reference to a financial crisis, introduces the final phenomenon within stage 1. It represents a significant aspect to the publicly funded extension of Catholic education and necessitates the differentiation between full funding and equal funding. Such is provided by the ensuing remarks.

I made the slip earlier and said that we got full funding. We did not get full funding. We got completion. We are not going to get full funding until we are on the exact same tax base as the public school system (Adam, Inter 18; Lucy, Intr 10; Agnes Inter 19; James, Inter 11).

Unless the government gave us equitable funding, we were going to have some problems at least to start off with. And of course that did materialize and we were not given equitable funding, we were not given in my view even full funding. We had no start up grants, and I guess one of the concerns that emerged in my mind in terms of fairness was that the public board was given compensating grants for loss of students but we were given nothing in the way of start up grants and therefore, there was an inequity right there from day one. We had to make some real sacrifices here until we got ourselves established (Christopher, Inter 9; Charles, Inter 4; Andrew, Inter 13).

Another administrator offered this analogy.

Well I put it in terms of buying your first car as opposed to buying your third car. When you buy your first car, you have all of it to pay for. The analogy is that the separate system had to gear up for a whole new secondary system. To that point in time we had an academic system which could be run very economically. We had to gear up for a whole panoply of programs and it was like buying a new car and there was no subsidy from anyone. It was all on credit and the credit cost us as well as the new car cost us and the income has not kept up with the size of the car we needed. We have ten kids now and we need a big station wagon and the chevette will not do us any longer. With that kind of analogy we had to provide for new programs, for a whole new cohort of students, find new teachers, become equipped, and all of that is like a penalty we are suffering from. I think time will help us but we are suffering from it (Solomon, Inter 1; Mark, Inter 12; Stephen, Inter 24).

This financial anxiety promotes frustration that is compounded because the general public, including the Catholic clientele that the Catholic school system serves, appears to have a misunderstanding about what full funding actually means and why financial restrictions still seem to plague Catholic school boards. This is aptly revealed by the following remarks.

They definitely do not understand the difference. We have held a number of evenings where we have talked about budgets and financing of education. We tried to get it across to them as simply as possible. Their perception is that you got full funding so you have the same dollars that the public system has. Where before they were a little bit more understanding, that if their children



were in portables, or if their school was crowded, they were much more understanding than they are now because they say, "You have got full funding. You should be able to provide everything." They are not as willing to put up with inconvenience as they were prior to Bill 30 (Agnes, Inter 19, James, Inter 11).

No, I do not think the average taxpayer understands full funding. I do not think the average taxpayer understands the formula, over the ceiling or under the ceiling. I do not think the average taxpayer understands basically very much on that aspect. All they can see is what it is costing them on their tax bill (Jeremy, Inter 21).

What was happening was, kids who before had gone out knocking on doors in the community and saying, " Listen we are having a walk-a-thon for our school. Will you please sponsor me?" were getting the doors slammed in their faces. The kids did not want to do it anymore and the parents did not want their children exposed to this kind of treatment. People would say, "What the hell is the matter with you greedy people? You have got full funding now. Why are you still coming around begging?" Some of our kids had some very unpleasant encounters. So we canceled it a few years ago because parents would not support it. They were not comfortable with their children going to their relatives and asking for a handout. We did it for years and years when we thought it was necessary, but now we do not think it is necessary anymore because we have got full funding. So we went from survival fundraising to zero fundraising which means that now we have a cash shortage in some of our athletic programs, and it is very hard to start rolling that rock up the mountain again (Martin, Inter 17).

Although many respondents have indicated that Bill 30 has brought financial difficulties to the separate school system, there has been the repetitive response that time is in their favour and that financial restraints will be eased. This can be attributed to subsequent enabling legislation that accesses Catholic Boards to the general pooling of provincial tax dollars.

I do not think that Bill 30 has had anything to do with funding or relieving the problem, but the legislation that seems to be following it in, like pooling, yes that is creating a situation that should be more able to provide things that the public boards are providing as a matter of habit (Stephen, Inter 24; Christopher, Inter 9; Peter, Inter 2).

Finally, it must be mentioned that the increased concern for the

cost of education, the increased levy of tax dollars at the local level, and the existence of two publicly funded school systems in the province has manifested a call for Confederate School Boards, which is another name for umbrella school boards. This issue, though not new, exacerbates the financial woes and anxiety brought on by Bill 30 and demands constant justification from separate school board supporters. The following comments reflect the frank and honest vexations of trustee/chairpersons and administrators who are sincerely concerned about this issue.

That is what we are out there justifying now. "Why do you need two systems?" It is easier for me to justify it in a growing region like ours, because neither one of our boards are large spending boards. We do not have a lot of excess superintendents or anything else. We are pretty lean, which is true of most Catholic boards. So I say we could not reduce the number of superintendents if we combined. We would still require them and we would still need the director and an assistant director. So you are not cutting any bodies there and you are still going to need the same teaching staff. All of our schools are overcrowded in both systems, so you would not have any vacant buildings sitting there. There really would not be a cost savings. In fact our board educates our students (as do most Catholic boards) for less money than the public system does. This call for Confederate Boards is because of the whole concept of tax increases, and the Fair Tax Hearings that are happening and taxpayers groups that are forming. So that issue has come wide open again but it has a little bit of a different dimension now, because previously, it was talked about on the basis of, "Do the Catholics have a right to it?" But now it is "Can this province, or can this region afford two systems?" Our coterminous board is supporting this concept of Confederate Boards at their next annual meeting (Agnes, Inter 19; Christopher, Inter 9; Mark, Inter 12; Lucy, Inter 10).

### Summary of Stage 1

Collectively, these perceptions and views are a montage of the significant phenomena that constitute Stage 1 and provide foundation for the next stage. This second stage is best described as an "Awakening" or "Consciousness of Mission".

## STAGE 2

### A Consciousness of Mission

#### The Awakening

Prior to Bill 30, there appeared to exist a complacency about the mission and philosophy of separate schools. A shared belief in Catholic education by the major stakeholders (home, school, and parish), had become implicit and at times had failed to sustain its share of attention relative to other compelling priorities such as programming and funding. This general acceptance and understanding of mission was deemed "a basic fundamental" and like most institutionalized traditions, it received laudatory but only periodic attention and focus. However, this somewhat passive approach to maintaining and nurturing the Catholic educational raison d'etre was confronted squarely by the introduction of full funding and the passing of Bill 30. Consequently, this somewhat unconscious awareness was "re-awakened" and the challenge to Catholic education became self-evident. The following subjects' remarks illustrate this quite clearly.

We have been challenged directly in terms of our purpose. We have tended to take for granted the existence of separate schools. We have never really been forced to think out what that really means. We have not really had to defend publicly or regularly what we are all about and I think over the years, I include myself in this, that many of us who work in separate schools never really conscientiously or consciously thought about our mission, in how we should be different from a public school. We always had the trappings, the crucifix and the symbols. We always had the religious education program, be it the old catechism or the new, but I do not think that we rose to the high level of consciousness that I think we are at now and I believe Bill 30 has brought it all about. It started I think particularly with the public hearings that were conducted across the province, first by the Planning and Implementation Commission and then by the Legislative Standing Committee. These challenged us relative to the things we have

been saying we are all about; what we stand for; what does it mean to have a Catholic ambience in a school; and what do we mean by religious education across the curriculum. Why can't we just have religious education confined to a thirty minute period and have it tacked onto the day in a public school within one publicly funded school system (Christopher, Inter 9; Charles, Inter 4; Adam, Inter 18)?

You could actually make a very good argument for saying that full funding has reinforced the need in the Catholic community for safeguarding the spiritual dimension of the system because I think before Bill Davis' announcement, according to my recollection there was less activity in terms of mission statements and in terms of the debate that we are now involved in. That creates a turmoil but it also creates growth (Solomon, Inter 1).

There is also a questioning attitude in relation to what existed before full funding became a reality.

I am not sure about the mission that was there before. I think the delusionment that some people / clergy share comes from an understanding of exclusivity. I did not see any great mission. I did see a great school but as far as being a great mission school no, I don't think so. I think it was just a place for Catholics who could afford to send their kids to an exclusive school. It certainly supported the Catholic faith but I don't think the mission was there (Matthew, Inter 16; Mark, Inter 12).

I think about our *raison d'etre* if you like, because ten years ago no one would have asked me this. Ten years ago I was working in a Catholic elementary school and everyone was happy. They all knew who we were and we thought we knew who we were. Of course now we are having to do some soul searching and ask ourselves questions (Timothy, Inter 6).

Others were incapable of defining what formerly imbued the schools, but they seem to feel it was not synonymous with mission.

It's becoming more and more important especially since I've been here at the board office. I don't know if I ever read our Mission Statement up to about three years ago. I am being quite honest. I don't think a mission statement was something that was in the business. It was more the culture of the building. You did not read something on the wall. It was something that was there. It was almost tangible, like the nature of the school (Anthony, Inter 14; Martin, Inter 17).

Bill 30 has definitely awakened the separate school system of Ontario.

It has prompted public scrutiny and political questioning. As well, the implementation and processing of Bill 30 inherently posed challenges relative to the raison d'etre of Catholic education. A complacent attitude could no longer prevail. The views and perceptions of these trustees and administrators aptly reinforce this.

I think some of the things we've said are contradictory and I suppose in retrospect were silly, simply because we hadn't thought out what we were all about. I think that was the beginning, and I think also the fears that were expressed by people at the time, that to get full funding was the end of separate schools and the first step towards a one school system, caused us to be very conscious of that danger. Therefore, I think we have taken some steps throughout the province, not just here locally, to safeguard what we've got and to really work at obtaining a better understanding of what we are all about (Christopher, Inter 9; Philip, Inter 3).

Well I think the biggest challenge is to ensure that our Catholic schools are Catholic (Daniel, Inter 5; Mark, Inter 12).

Well it is so easy to say that we have to keep the Catholicity alive in our schools. It almost sounds trite in that we have heard it so often that it is like, what does that mean? It is really the essence of why we are here, and why I am a trustee. It is our reason for existing and that is going to be the tough thing (Agnes, Inter 19; Lucy, Inter 10).

I think what Bill 30 has done is cause us to really reflect and justify, because we are drawing from public money. It has caused us to reflect on what we stand for and the way we demonstrate that at the classroom level (Philip, Inter 3; Ruth, Inter 22; Angelo, Inter 7).

It's critical, very very important, absolutely critical. See that goes with the notion that if we are being publicly funded, if we can't show that we are schools with a difference, then why don't we just have one system. It doesn't mean that Catholic schools are better. I don't think we should engage in criticism of the public system but rather argue that we have a different mission. I think that our ratepayers, and indeed the public out there that pays taxes, has to see, even if they are non Catholic, that the Catholic system is trying to articulate a philosophy that is congruent with their beliefs about themselves, and about society, and I think it's important that we as a Catholic school system promote our Catholic faith within the curriculum in an integrated fashion. If we don't do that, and if we don't articulate that to the public,

then I think we should really question what makes us different (Andrew, Inter 13; Peter, Inter 2).

I think the whole system is examining that issue of Catholicity and so is the whole community. But we have paid attention to it and I think it is very much in our minds now and very much in the public mind now. Because of Bill 30, the Catholic school system is no longer that funny little school system that exists down the street that nobody cares about. It is now a major contender and as a consequence is under tremendous pressure not to be there and I think people are asking the questions, "What is the purpose of the Catholic school, why are we here, what do we do? We have to know the answer to these questions (Charles, Inter 4).

### Mission Focus and Development

The illustrative comments above underpin the triggering effect of Bill 30 on the issue of Catholicity within the separate school community. Although the integration of faith and life has always been perceived as the primary and pre-eminent basis for operating Catholic schools, they have rarely felt so challenged to justify how in fact their schools translate that into a discernible difference. Both on a philosophical and practical level, there has evolved a deliberate focus on the mission of Catholic schools within the local and provincial educational communities. Their attention to mission has subsequently led to the importance and recognition of Mission Statements by Catholic boards and affiliated associations, and indicates a movement from conscious acknowledgment and awareness to active and proactive response. The ensuing frank comments reveal a variety of views in this area of mission development.

I think after completion was announced there was a great flurry of Mission Statements and I think that there were some very good ones written but many of them did not get to the practical level like a good Mission Statement should. It should not only give you the essence of the ideal but it should also say that, this is how we are going to try to do it (Solomon, Inter 1).

I tend to think that your philosophy or mission is as a rudder on a ship or a rudder on a boat. Although you have a fine boat and it can float and move easily, without the rudder you don't have a sense of direction. So one's philosophy / mission when it is well thought through really is the underpinning. It gives you the direction and it gives you the basis upon which everything else emanates (Daniel, Inter 5; Philip, Inter 3).

Very important because it gives you something to focus on. We do have a very good Mission Statement and we have given a framed copy to each school. There was a ceremony and we presented it. We articulate that at every opportunity, for example when we have an orientation day. There is that mechanism by which we get our message out there, but it is something you have to do all the time. It's not something that you can let your guard down on. It should always be the number one goal that you have (Mark, Inter 12; Philip, Inter 3; Adam, Inter 18).

Our board has to do some work in that area. There is no question that they have to get the people involved, including parents and everybody, because we went through the process of completion so quickly and it caught everybody so much by surprise. What we've got to do now is sit down and evaluate exactly why we are still here. I do not think we have a Mission Statement that everyone has participated in. We have our own school Mission Statement, but it is more of a philosophy that has been inherited (Joseph, Inter 23).

To some degree both need to be involved. The provincial part of it is asking ourselves crucial questions, "Do we know who we are and what our task is? If we have that, can we articulate it and can it be simply written? Can it be lived out? Now that has to be brought down to the local level. It is essential to have a common vision. There must be input into the Mission Statement (Angelo, Inter 7; Gabriel, Inter 8; Luke, 15).

If in fact, all have been partners in the development, then each group should work towards ensuring that the Mission Statement is evident and that you could walk into any school and see it in action. The teachers have to have a hand in it, to help craft it so that they would want to make it a viable entity (Lucy, Inter 10).

But is this really the case? Many subjects feel that this much needed shared involvement is lacking or is perceived as lacking. Furthermore, the degree of input and involvement is crucial to the understanding and commitment to mission.

I would venture to say that if I were to ask the teachers here, and I know this to be true because I happened to be listening to someone the other day, they are not aware of the fact that they have a Mission Statement that they worked out several years ago. The trustees participated and it's quite a good Mission Statement too. Part of the problem is that it is good to have one, in fact it is very important to have one but to keep that in front of your people and to have them emotionally committed to it on a regular basis, is not an easy task (Stephen, Inter 24).

One of the problems is that there is not a lot of broad input into such things. They are usually by a kind of inter-committee core which usually consists of administration and principals or the board of trustees. The Mission Statement somehow comes out of an inner core (Charles, Inter 4).

That is the importance of sitting down and having meaningful dialogue and planning with the various groups, such as trustees, principals, teachers, and supervisory officers. There is a need to go over their Mission Statement to see if that is really congruent with this year's aims and objectives in the short term and then in the long term. It is important that we check each other out, because we have different engines that drive us, and if we don't talk to each other about this, like This Moment of Promise talks about, and the fact that the Blishen Report has suggested, at least from their research, that there are different views about what Catholic schools are all about (Andrew, Inter 13).

On our Faith Development day last fall, we spent the day talking about our Mission Statement and what we were doing. I think it is important to talk about it and I think it changes and views change on how it can be translated into action. I don't particularly care for written statements because I think they become irrelevant to the community as the community keeps changing. I think it is very important that we have time, maybe once a year to sit down and discuss what we are about as a group of teachers, particularly in relation to the faith dimension. I think that there is a great danger in coming up with a Mission Statement, and having it nicely printed up, but if it doesn't mean anything. What do you think that Mission Statement out there on the wall means to the teachers? I don't think there are ten people in the school that could tell you where it was. See that is not important. What is important is the community as it keeps changing, talking about why they are there and especially the kids. So it is very important but I have the idea that if you help write it, it has more direct value. They are the ones who get the direct benefit. If you do not have some input into it, then it does not mean anything (Matthew, Inter 16; Luke, Inter 15; Anthony, Inter 14).

Now as far as the person, the chaplain or whatever person, sure



that is going to help. As long as they do not give that person the responsibility for making the school a Catholic school. The schools are not Catholic because they have a Religious Education Co-ordinator. It is important that every member makes that school a Catholic school. If that doesn't happen, it's not going to be. That is why that mission, that participation in making the mission, the carrying out of the mission has to be by everyone, or it is not going to work. (Ruth, Inter 22; Martin, Inter 17; Angelo, Inter 7; Timothy, Inter 6).

Although there is a lack of consensus, especially about the "who" and the "how" and the "what" relative to the articulation and processing of mission, there is solidarity regarding its importance and significance to Catholic educators and ultimately Catholic education. As one subject shared, "This is Spirit driven, if we don't screw it up" (Angelo, Inter 7). Another subject simply stated.

There has to be trust. There has to be ongoing dialogue and there has to be a common sense of purpose. I think that occurs through constant dialogue and interaction in a manner in which trust underpins the entire process. I think we get that based on who we are and what we believe (Philip, Inter 3; Andrew, Inter 13).

### Summary of Stage 2

This awakened consciousness of mission characterizes Stage 2 and parallels this phenomena with the advent of Bill 30 and its ongoing implementation of full funding in the separate schools of Ontario. The views and perceptions expressed by the various subjects reveal this renewed focus and awareness on Catholicity and the distinctive mission of Catholic schools and indicate quite clearly that such a task is not without its challenges. This becomes even more apparent in Stage 3, which illustrates how Bill 30 is testing the basic means for providing Catholic education.

### STAGE 3

#### Bill 30 Tests the Basic Model for Providing Catholic Education

Traditionally, separate schools have relied on three basic means of providing Catholic education. Stage 3 provides an informed look at Bill 30's impact on this delivery model by examining:

- 1) The practice of **providing qualified teachers, supervisory officers, and other personnel** who are committed to building a Christian community in the school system.
- 2) The practice of **developing each school as a Christian community** in all of its academic and non-academic activities.
- 3) The practice of **providing academic curricula, including formal religious instruction**, in which Catholic faith and life are integrated.

#### Providing Qualified Staff

##### Catholic Teachers

Hiring Catholic teachers / staff has always been a fundamental principle of the Separate School System of Ontario (Common School Act, 1843), and the Catholic teacher has traditionally been an integral component in the provision of Catholic education. This is strongly reinforced and eloquently expressed by an overwhelming majority of the subjects.

I think the case for having Catholic teachers teaching in Catholic schools is a compelling case. The whole business of teaching the teachable moment, that being, the Catholic philosophy brought to bear on such things as the environment, the whole idea of stewardship and charity. It's not that other people do not possess them but there is a Catholic point of view on them and it has to be absorbed by students all day not just in batches (Solomon, Inter 1; Stephen, Inter 24; Christopher, Inter 9; Peter, Inter 2).

If we want Catholicity and not simply Christian values, then I think it is critical that we have Catholic teachers teaching in our Catholic schools (Timothy, Inter 6).

I'm not saying that Catholic teachers are better than non-Catholic

teachers. That is out because we have some wonderful non-Catholics in our system, but if we are going to keep our identity as Catholics, I think it is critical that we hire people who are able to transmit the faith (Ruth, Inter 22; Anthony, Inter 14; Martin, Inter 17).

It is very important that we be allowed to hire Catholic teachers. It strikes me that the whole logic of having a Catholic school system falls down when people charged most closely with its implementation, the classroom teacher, could be non-Catholic. It's very difficult for someone to talk the talk, if they haven't walked the walk. What I mean by that is that they are practising Catholics themselves (Andrew, Inter 13).

You can get a person raised in a non-Catholic Church who conducts himself / herself in a very Christian fashion. But that is different from being a committed Catholic who has lived the traditions. It has been internalized. It's part of that Catholic view point. It's not just a matter of theology. It is also a matter of practices. There is a rubric associated with that and an accompanying view of the world and how that teacher sees the world (Charles, Inter 4).

For me it's absolutely crucial. If we lose the right to hire Catholic teachers, I'm not saying that it is going to be the downfall of our system, but it is going to weaken it, especially at the elementary level, where it is very much that classroom teacher that is providing the faith dimension to that curriculum in the classroom. That's where I have my biggest concern, at the elementary level. It could water it down (Agnes, Inter 19; Stephen, Inter 24).

How would I put it. We have an immersion school. It would not enter my head to hire non-French speaking teachers, and put them in the classroom and think that we were filling the needs of those immersion students. I feel the same way, maybe more so, about taking non-Catholic teachers and putting them in our classrooms with our kids and thinking we are fulfilling our mission (Stephen, Inter 24).

In fact, some subjects believe that Catholic teachers are so intrinsic to the provision of Catholic education, that they essentially represent the cornerstone of the system.

If you are going to be a Catholic leader and teacher, then that's what you are. To me the most important, absolutely essential thing, if we lose the teachers, then I will be despondent, I'll retire (Matthew, Inter 16).

It is extremely important. As soon as you lose that right to staff

your school with Catholic teachers, then you lose your purpose for existence (Joseph, Inter 23; Gabriel, Inter 8).

I really believe that is number one. If we can't hire Catholic teachers, we are sunk. I really believe that (Anthony, Inter 14).

If we lose that right, we will lose our Catholic system within five years (Lucy, Inter 10; Luke, Inter 15).

It is so important that if we do without that, get rid of the separate school system (Ruth, Inter 22).

I think it is strictly going to be the will of the Catholic community and I say that, because unless we have the whole Catholic community on board with this issue of maintaining the right to hire Catholic teachers, we are going to fail (Adam, Inter 18).

### Non-Catholic Teachers

Although discretionary hiring of non-Catholics was practised by separate school boards prior to the implementation of full funding, Roman Catholic school boards have hired non-Catholic teachers since 1984, (depending on local circumstances) to ensure that dislocated or redundant public secondary teachers were not disadvantaged by the extension of Catholic secondary schools. Their increasing presence in Catholic schools, coupled with the growing apprehension of Section 136-1a, specifically calls into question separate school denominational rights and privilege to hire Catholic teachers to provide Catholic education in Catholic schools. Because this is very germane to the mission of Catholic schools, the subjects interviewed had much to say relative to non-Catholic teachers. Their remarks are both introspective and frank.

I think in terms of social justice, the spirit of Regulation 71 (governs the transfer of redundant public secondary staff) is fair. People shouldn't lose their jobs because of separate school extension. Indeed, if we need staff and they have surplus we should be working to see that people are treated fairly. My preference would be

of course that people would be volunteering to come to us, and not forced to come to us. I think by and large that has been the case. There have been very few that I am aware of who have come against their will or with feelings of opposition. In fact I would say by far the majority have come with enthusiasm and that has been good for us. Obviously I have a concern at the number of non-Catholics that are coming across. Simply because that number over the years tends to increase and the proportion in our high schools is getting high. What's the breaking point? I do not have any idea. I guess it says to us that we have to work extra hard at making sure the non-Catholic staff that do come, not only understand our differences, but also commit to our philosophy (Christopher, Inter 9).

Redundant teachers in the public board, who can be proven redundant by way of Bill 30, well there is a Christian Catholic duty to provide for those people. They were displaced or lost their positions because of full funding. If that can be demonstrated through the formula, then I think we have an obligation to hire these people until that process is completed. With respect to what do you do when these fine individuals come to teach with you, I think it is important to do a strong teacher induction program. It is important that they understand what the board's Mission Statement and Philosophy is, and understand that liturgical sacramental life is part of the school life and be supportive of that. I think it is very important that we not try to convert them. I do not see that as part of our role. Rather our role is to have them at least support what it is that we are trying to do in our Catholic school system, so we need a very strong induction program. It can't be a one shot deal. It can't be just sitting down with them for one or two sessions. It has to be planned and formalized. I think each school principal who has non-Catholics on staff, needs to provide ongoing time with these people, providing them with the support that a principal can with respect to the fact that they are non-Catholics teaching in a Catholic school environment (Andrew, Inter 13).

We have to really have some strategy and programs in place to look after those non-Catholic teachers who perhaps are not all that committed. To help them it is important that they understand what we are about and to solicit some level of commitment from that individual. That is something I have searched for this year, but I am not satisfied with what I have been able to do. We have done a few things but I think it has to be done in a more systematic manner. Perhaps from board level down, we have to reach out to these people because very often they want to be reached out to. That is one of the things that I found in my own personal contacts with non-Catholic teachers. They don't know much about what the Catholic high school is about, but they have come because they wouldn't have a job if they didn't. When you talk to them

it is very edifying and surprising to see how much they can offer and will offer in the proper manner (Daniel, Inter 5).

We do expect all of our teachers who are new to the system to have Religious Education Part 1. That is a basic requirement and it is compulsory on Catholics and non-Catholics. We get them to sign a document before they sign the contracts to say that they are required to take this course. If I have any non-Catholics, I say look, the only reason we are asking you to do this is so you will better understand what we are all about. I think for your own success in the school system that you would want to do that. They generally agree. We've only had one or two instances where they fought it (Adam, Inter 18; Mark, Inter 12).

We still are not providing enough answers to the questions that these transferred people have. I think that many of them came with pretty good intentions. You will always have some who didn't and who are contrary and don't see a difference and don't want to see a difference and are waiting for the day when all of us are married into one system. I think the majority of them came over expecting a difference and we unfortunately did not provide answers for them except the experience. Thank God, the people I've talked to have experienced a different dimension, in spite of our lack of support (Angelo, Inter 7; James, Inter 11; Peter, Inter 2).

The people coming in as a result of full funding probably have a heightened knowledge and commitment to their responsibilities in this unfamiliar environment. They know that they are kind of from the outside coming in and they are generally committed to respect the values of the Catholic system. I think that you would probably have people who were more careful to commit (Stephen, Inter 24; Peter, Inter 2).

In my area where we had growth, there wasn't any problem and the commitment was written off a couple of years ago and we only absorbed a total of twenty or thirty public secondary school teachers into a system of almost four thousand teachers. It was negligible because both boards were growing. Some boards, however, had to absorb and are still absorbing quite a few teachers. The first negative impact was on their internal operation. They couldn't transfer people and they couldn't hire until they cleared up who was redundant and who wasn't. Some boards suffered from that for a couple of years until they managed to smooth out the process with their coterminous board. Also I think, some boards have suffered from the point of view that they had to absorb quite a number of people who went there not particularly willingly, and therefore, had no great sympathy for the system. They demonstrated their lack of sympathy by, for example, trying to bring in other bodies to represent them rather than the regular O.E.C.T.A. or A.E.F.O.

On the whole, however, boards have absorbed the teachers and they have been treated fairly and the system is not damaged at this point (Solomon, Inter 1).

But there have been sacrifices and there are concerns, especially about balancing the numbers and maintaining the philosophy and mission of separate schools.

One of the things about our teachers and the public teachers coming over is a lot of our Catholic teachers are hurting. There is a lot of pain and anguish still going on. The sense is that they were kicked out, that they weren't good enough. In fact, they will tell you that they were sold out by an agreement that was short sighted. Their perception is that the people who did the work are not getting the rewards. I know some people who had fourteen years experience and more, who felt that people with four years experience with the public system took their jobs at the high schools. I guess the perception shouldn't be that it was their job but that was the perception and they fail to see the justice in that. And in some cases they were replaced by non-Catholics, so there are some real wounds there. A lot of them took that very personally. I think that those people have to have some opportunities that help them rebuild their self-esteem. For them they sense it as a demotion because they had worked so hard towards Catholic secondary education and they thought that they really earned it and they genuinely thought that they were the best people for the job. They may well have been but the agreement resulting from full funding prevented it (Timothy, Inter 6).

I think transfers from the coterminous board are having a tremendous effect on our high schools and I think it is having an effect on our teachers, and the Catholic teachers group as well. (I pick up by echo). But I think it is short term pain that you know, five years after their coming over, I would hope that they would be completely integrated into the system and very supportive of it. Not only will they be more committed but the Catholics in the group would be more committed (Peter, Inter 2; Christopher, Inter 9).

I would be very worried if the numbers upset the balance so to speak. If you have too many non-Catholic teachers or shall we say teachers who are non-supportive of the Catholic school, then I think it is going to be a very difficult road to do what the Catholic school is supposed to be doing. In my case we have less than twenty percent non-Catholic on staff and to me that is a concern (Daniel, Inter 5; Angelo, Inter 8; Joseph, Inter 23; Charles, Inter 4).

If we are not careful, we could get a high percentage of people in some of our Catholic high schools who are not Catholic. My position all along has been that if you don't understand the story, you're not going to understand the tradition, the history, as I call it, of Catholic education, of being Catholic and being raised in the Catholic tradition. Consequently, there is going to be difficulty respecting those rights (Adam, Inter 18; Philip, Inter 3).

I can see a day in the future when as a result of that kind of legislation our school(s) might be filled with non-Catholic teachers. It is most difficult for somebody who comes in, who believes in abortion, divorce, and evolution as opposed to creation. This is not consistent with what we believe as Catholics. They might be very good people but I would have a difficult time accepting how they would be able to act as models or to give advice to kids concerning what our Catholic beliefs and philosophy are (Timothy, Inter 6; Luke, Inter 15; Matthew, Inter 16; Adam, Inter 18).

The big danger is and this has been under discussion at the schools, that when the staff is comprised of a large number of non-Catholics, the Catholic community in order to be welcoming and ecumenical starts to water down its own practice. So if you have a religious service in the school, in order to get everybody participating you make adjustments or accommodations. So in essence it is a kind of quasi Catholic United church watered down kind of exercise that is designed to appeal to everybody. The concern on the part of some is that we are diluting our Catholicism. Rather than having a mass and the Eucharist in which everyone can't participate, they will have some other form that everyone can participate in and I think that there is a real danger in that (Charles, Inter 4; Christopher, Inter 9).

Something like half of our teachers in the secondary panel have come now from the public school board. It is much more acute here and it has to be addressed (Peter, Inter 2).

I think it is slowing some developments in the Catholic system down but as long as it is not forever, I think the system can recover. It is the difference between a cold and cancer (Solomon, Inter 1).

I don't think the presence of non-Catholic teachers in the system is going to destroy the system. I can't think of one who came over here saying, "I'm going to be an infiltrator. I'm going to be a cancer and destroy this organization from within." That just is not the case. About half our staff are transferees, which means that twenty to thirty percent of our secondary staff is non-Catholic. A lot of the non-Catholic teachers that we brought over are very strong adherents to their own church whatever it happens to be,



and they very much support the Christian dimension of the school (Charles, Inter 4; Andrew, Inter 13; Vincent, Inter 20; Ruth, Inter 22; Gabriel).

### Lukewarm Faith

This image of a cold as opposed to cancer, relative to the hiring of non-Catholic teachers, is strongly supported by the vast majority of subjects interviewed. Although the issue is obviously a serious one for Catholic boards and the Catholic educational community, as evidenced by the preceding remarks, subjects straightforwardly reveal that there exists another compelling challenge that inherently possesses the capability to diminish and erode the Catholic school system. This problem resides within the Catholic educational community itself. The following comments candidly portray this.

I think we have to work more with our own Catholic teachers. That is where I would be worried. Our own Catholic teachers, where are they in their own faith and fidelity to the system (Luke, Inter 15)?

I think that a committed Catholic teacher is the ideal, but I think from my own experience that the worst drag on the Catholic school system is the Catholic teacher who has lost the faith. Being a Catholic in name is not enough, like being baptized or having been part of a parish at one time. To be Catholic means to be committed and actively practicing the faith. If they don't have faith to share they are certainly a detriment to the school system (Peter, 2; Mark, Inter 12; Ruth, Inter 22; Lucy, Inter 10).

I think the teacher is key but there are some who are lukewarm. They are Catholic teachers and they have their pastoral reference and they perhaps went to a Catholic elementary school and they were baptized but it does not amount to a roll of sticks to them. If there is a staff prayer meeting on Friday, that is of no importance to them, and I am not being judgmental. That is a statement of fact. We are an invitational community but the Catholic teachers who teach in a Catholic school need to be committed Catholics. They have to witness their faith (Martin, Inter 17; Mark, Inter 12; Andrew, 13; Lucy, Inter 10).

We're role models and we have a variety, a spectrum within the

Catholic community. We have a Catholic on paper, and we have a Catholic who is very committed. I think as Catholic teachers, we really have to go back to our roots. I think that until we do that, our system is not going to get stronger, rather it is going to get weaker. As Catholics we have to live and practice our faith. There is a small minority that do, and the rest, well it's just a job (Gabriel, Inter 8; Timothy, Inter 6).

I see how hard it is now with the tremendous expansion that we have experienced staffing our schools with Catholic teachers. (Last year we hired over 200 teachers and was that a challenge). There is an apparent laxness in the practice of Catholicism and I am a person that believes that people do experience a crisis in faith, but it's difficult enough to preserve that Catholic dimension with our own Catholic teachers. Given the problems we have with the Catholic church right now and with our own Catholic teachers, we have a lot of challenges just there, not including a significant number of non-Catholic teachers (Matthew, Inter 16; Adam, Inter 18; Angelo, Inter 7; Philip, Inter 3).

There is a perception that our schools should be different, that we should be different. As a Catholic teacher, we have to be examples of what we say we are. If we, the Catholic teachers can't demonstrate that, then it becomes a real question of integrity (Timothy, Inter 6; Charles, Inter 4; Christopher, Inter 9).

There are some who take the view that non-Catholic teachers are going to destroy our system. That is that cancer image again. I don't believe that because some of those teachers are more supportive than some of our own. I think the danger is that the system might lose its desire to be. If it doesn't matter to you anymore, if you don't have that sense of integrity in what you do and what you represent, then it will cease to be. Yes, I am concerned about the number of non-Catholic teachers but I am also concerned about our Catholic teachers and the "quality of teachers (Charles, Inter 4; Stephen, Inter 24; Christopher, Inter 9; James, Inter 11; Solomon, Inter 1; Peter, Inter 2).

#### Section 136-1a

The Separate School System of Ontario is not only coping with these very real concerns but it is also preparing to deal with Section 136-1a, which states:

For the purpose of maintaining the distinctiveness of separate schools, the Roman Catholic school board may require as a condition of employment that teachers hired by the board after the ten year period mentioned in Section 136-1 (6) agree to respect the philosophy

and tradition of Roman Catholic separate schools in the performance of their duties.

The ensuing comments talk about the overwhelming, but not unanimous support to challenge the constitutionality of Section 136-1a, and the subsequent determination to secure the viability of Catholic education and its mission in the event that this challenge is unsuccessful. It is noteworthy to affirm that every subject interviewed vehemently supported the repeal of Section 136-1a.

I think that the challenge to Section 136-1a is essential. I feel that in order to understand and promote the vision of the Catholic system, you have to have people who are part of that vision, who understand it, articulate it, and live it. I think the challenge to 136-1a is the most significant challenge that faces Catholic education today (Philip, Inter 3; Angelo, Inter 7).

I had a colleague who once told me that there are some fights that are worth showing up for. It strikes me that this one is. I think we should challenge 136-1a to find out once and for all whether we have the right to hire Catholic teachers. The whole thing changes if we lose that right. I believe it's important that we allowed to discriminate on religious grounds. That doesn't preclude, however, non-Catholic children attending our schools if they so wish, and it may also not preclude in some instances hiring non-Catholic teachers. By and large we should be able to discriminate and hire Catholic teachers. After all, if we got a lot of non-Catholics teaching in our system, in time I'm wondering if our mission would get eroded (Andrew, Inter 13; James, Inter 11).

Well I do. Actually I am pretty disturbed that we aren't going ahead with it but I guess the powers that be see a bigger picture relative to the Constitution and its survival with Quebec. I'm not convinced in my mind that we stop at this stage of the game and yet the others are saying we must stop because we have this bigger picture, that being to protect the Constitution, Section 93, in any new Constitution that materializes. But in the meantime, my worry is that will drag on and we are going to pass the deadline of 1995. We'll lose and we'll no longer have the right to prefer Catholic teachers. We may lose by default if we are not careful (Christopher, Inter 9; Peter, Inter 2).

Yes I do personally. I think it is very dangerous to leave it in. I think that if we don't do anything we are giving the impression

that maybe we don't care, or that we don't care very much. I think it is going to be very difficult to keep our Catholic secondary schools Catholic in the future. We need all the help that we can get. One of the things that would help us greatly would be to have 136-1a withdrawn or removed (Mark, Inter 12; Joseph, Inter 23; Agnes, Inter 19).

I think litigation may well be the way to go in the long run but I don't think it is the first way to go. I think we should try political means and other means, creative means as they say. Personally, I'm concerned about 136-1a but I am not devastated by it. Had I felt that there wasn't potential for preserving the system, my advice at the time would have been, "Don't take the deal". I think we can flourish as a system under 136-1a. If we have to live with 136-1a, it won't be cancer - it won't kill the system but I think it could be permanently living in Ontario in the month of March or April, when you are prone to colds and the climate doesn't help you. It's something that we would need to take great care in guarding, that we were always establishing measures and guidelines for people to operate within. The system would have to take great precautions (Solomon, Inter 1; Peter, Inter 2).

There are capable people working on the best way to solve our problem with Section 136-1a, because it is so important that we have a majority of Catholic teachers teaching in Catholic schools. The other aspect is that a co-ordinated process, and This Moment of Promise is part of that process, will make our schools so uniquely Catholic that others are not going to be interested in applying to teach in them. I think that the Institute for Catholic Education (I.C.E.) is focusing on that, as is the Completion Office For Separate Schools (C.O.S.S.) (Peter, Inter 2).

We don't have O.E.C.T.A. on our side and this really upsets me because as a former member of that association and its executive, I think they wimped out on the future of our Catholic schools. They don't hesitate at all, and their argument is that the boards have hired these teachers and then they become O.E.C.T.A. members and they have to protect them and their right to promotion. What I disagree with is that they come to negotiations with a rationale but they won't use that same rationale and reasoning when it comes to Section 136-1a (Adam, Inter 18).

Their response to 136-1a is such a let down. O.E.C.T.A. has become teacher welfare. It's their whole consciousness (Angelo, Inter 7, Gabriel, Inter 8, James, Inter 11).

I'll be very blunt. I think O.E.C.T.A., the Ontario English Catholic Teacher's Association has become more of a union and less of a Catholic organization. Are they a union, where they have

to protect all their members, or are they concerned about the Catholic dimension of their association? In fairness to them, I think it's a struggle that they are really wrestling with but all said and done they are more of a union. Unfortunately, they are not a significant partner in the challenge against Section 136-1a because they have to represent all of their members including those that are not Catholic. It's my understanding that they are going to stand in the sidelines on 136-1a. One would assume that a Catholic organization would want to protect the fact that we are Catholic. It is disappointing (Andrew, Inter 13, Anthony, Inter 14).

When people first hear of O.E.C.T.A.'s response to challenging 136-1a, they are stunned (Matthew, Inter 16; Joseph, Inter 23).

Yes. I would say that one thing that really disturbs me is that O.E.C.T.A. will not be supporting the Catholic educational community in its challenge against 136-1a. That is very disappointing (Philip, Inter 3; Ruth, Inter 22; Agnes, Inter 19).

#### Promotion of Non-Catholics

There is little doubt that the separate school community is deeply concerned about the impending permanent loss of their coveted practice to hire Catholic teachers. Although there is a disunified front, there is an expressed intention and tenacious commitment to challenge Section 136-1a's constitutionality. The gravity of their dilemma, however, is magnified by the inclusive understanding within Section 136-1a, subsections (2) and (3) which state:

(2) Subject to subsection (1), and despite section 23 of the Human Rights Code, 1981, section 4 of the said Code applies to ensure that such teachers employed by a Roman Catholic school board will enjoy equal opportunity in respect of their employment, advancement and promotion by the board.

(3) If it is finally determined by a court that subsection (1) or (2) prejudicially affects a right or privilege with respect to denominational schools guaranteed by the Constitution of Canada, subsections (1) and (2) are repealed, it being the intention of the Legislature that the remaining provisions of the Act are separate from and independent of the said subsections (Bill 30, 1986).

By their own admission, there is much at stake here for the Separate

School System of Ontario. Their requirement to hire redundant public secondary school teachers since the implementation of Bill 30, and their confessed anxiety about Section 136-1a have been discussed relative to the mission and philosophy of separate schools, but the advancement and promotion of non-Catholic staff into positions of leadership and responsibility has not. Because leadership in the separate school system has always been synonymous with Catholic leadership, this aspect of Bill 30 is very disconcerting and unsettling. The following comments illustrate the gravity of this concern.

The leadership of a system will set the tone of a system. Therefore, if you have a Catholic system, by definition you want to have people who are not only friendly to that system, but also exemplars who can live it, breathe it, and emanate everything that system represents. That is even harder to find in someone who is not Catholic, so therefore, even if you had no policy very few non-Catholic teachers would be promoted just by the criteria you have to promote your system. It seems to me a sensible safeguard to expect your leadership to be Catholic, that is if you want a Catholic system. I'm in favour of a promotion policy that openly states that (Solomon, Inter 1; Mark, Inter 12; Christopher, Inter 9; Philip, Inter 3).

That is our *raison d'être*. It's the cornerstone. We are a Catholic school system. You can't have Catholic leadership if the person is not Catholic. It just doesn't make sense (Adam, Inter 18, Lucy, Inter 10; Joseph, Inter 23; Timothy, Inter 6; Matthew, Inter 16).

People in positions of responsibility hold those positions in trust. It's their duty to set the standard for other employees, to provide direction, to mentor, to coach, to model and witness. If they are not Catholic themselves, I see a great difficulty in having a sense of congruence and harmony with the mission of Catholic schools. I view the issue of non-Catholics in leadership positions as a very, very serious issue. If you extend it by logic, presumably there would be no cap on the numbers. So does that mean in the future, if you had one director and five supervisory officers, all six could be non-Catholic, or among your principals you would have a number of non-Catholics? How would there be a shared collegial understanding and commitment to what Catholic schools are all about? If the courts should uphold the view that we must take non-Catholics, not only in teaching positions, but

also in leadership positions, that is going to be a weighty challenge for the Catholic educational community to implement (Andrew, Inter 13; Stephen, Inter 24; Martin, Inter 17; Joseph, Inter 23).

Well, my own view is that they not be promoted beyond chairperson (department head) because I firmly believe that you can not prophesy what you can not see. Non-Catholics can not be tuned in to and committed to the philosophy like Catholics. I understand that there is a requirement in Bill 30 but I am torn. I mean I see the legal responsibility for fair play, but I have a moral responsibility also to our school system and I guess in that context I just can not see a non-Catholic in a strong leadership position fulfilling the role in the same manner as a Catholic (Christopher, Inter 9; Mark, Inter 12; Andrew, Inter 13; Philip, Inter 3; Gabriel, Inter 8; Lucy, Inter 10).

There are a number of precedents in our board who are in department head positions. The fact that they have been recognized and put in those positions is a tribute to the contributions that they have made to our schools, not just in terms of curriculum and that sort of thing, but in fact contributing to the philosophy of our schools. I really believe, however, that vice-principalships and principalships and positions above that have to be reserved for committed Catholics. I just do not see how you could have a Catholic school lead by a non-Catholic (Martin, Inter 17; Anthony, Inter 14; Luke, Inter 15; Matthew, Inter 16; Charles, Inter 4; Daniel, Inter 5; Agnes, Inter 19).

How can you be a Catholic leader in a Catholic school when you are not Catholic (Adam, Inter 18, Ruth, Inter 22; Peter, Inter 2)?

It is noteworthy to mention that since the implementation of Bill 30, Catholic educators, both at the local and provincial levels, have directed significant attention to improving leadership training for Catholic aspirants, particularly in the areas of faith leadership and faith development. Formally, there has been a government approved Catholic Supervisory Officer's course that will provide program training for certification.

This completes the findings relative to Bill 30's ability to test the practice of providing qualified staff who are committed to the separate school system. The findings relative to the practice of developing each school as a Christian community follows.

**Developing Each School as  
a Christian Community**

Christian Community

According to its philosophy and mission, the separate school system seeks to develop a Christian community which is permeated by the gospel values. Traditionally this has been provided through the practice of developing each school as a Christian community in all its academic and non-academic activities. The following subjects' comments elaborate on what Christian community means and illustrate its importance within the fabric of the school setting.

Basically, its a Christian community. A community of staff and students that show care and concern for one another. It must also extend beyond that community because if it stays just inside that community it weakens. It must have an outreach (Ruth, Inter 22; Matthew, Inter 16; Angelo, Inter 7).

Well I think we are using the word communion to deal with that now. It's relationship with one another and relationship with Jesus Christ and bringing the two of them together. It means relating in a caring way, according to the love of Christ, the truth of Christ, and the forgiveness of Christ (Peter, Inter 2; Charles, Inter 4).

Well I'd look at it from a couple of perspectives. I guess first of all I understand it as an extension of our mission and philosophy, that is to spread the gospel message within the Catholic tradition. To me that means fundamentally, academic excellence and the dealing of subject matter within the context of our faith and values. The other dimension of community is the students, staff, meaning the total staff, and the parents and clergy. I see that group as a faith community because the commonality is our faith, particularly, mass and the Eucharist. That should be the focal



point within the community (Christopher, Inter 9; Andrew, Inter 13; Lucy, Inter 10).

It means that people will agree that there is a tradition that is worth serious consideration and they'll give it that serious consideration, recognizing that interpretations of the tradition may differ somewhat. Though there are differences, they will try to work through and debate those differences and they will operate with the bible in one hand and the newspaper in the other (Solomon, Inter 1; Angelo, Inter 7).

The center of a Catholic school should be Christ and his gospel, so the degree to which that Catholic school can embrace that gospel and espouse it and bring it into the larger community, will separate it and establish it as a Christian community of fellowship (Stephen, Inter 24; Timothy, Inter 6; James, Inter 11).

It has to do with the way we live, the mundane aspects of our life as well. If our school is going to be a sincere attempt to live the gospel together as a Christian community, it has to pervade all our decision making processes. As an alternative to the public school, we can't just be different because we have symbols around the school and because we have religious celebrations. It has to pervade our staff meetings, department meetings, our interaction with the students, and all our activities so that the kids can understand the importance of community (Martin, Inter 17; Gabriel, Inter 8; Matthew, Inter 16; Philip, Inter 3).

This development of Christian community is supported by an ambiance that entails the visible signs and symbols of Catholic heritage. The following subjects comment on the importance of these externals, relative to the development of Christian community within Catholic schools.

Their views are particularly straightforward.

Those to me are vehicles to communicate with God. They are signs and symbols that remind us of God's presence in our community, but they do not make God present. To see a crucifix in a school does not make it Catholic. To see bibles stacked up doesn't make it Catholic, but if we see a people trying to use those symbols, within the context of ritual and prayer, and make it meaningful and authentic, then I would say, yes, those signs, those symbols are important because they are external signs of what is really within. Teaching our kids to pray is much more than teaching them formal prayers (Ruth, Inter 22; Peter, Inter 2; Anthony, Inter 14).

The kids often ask why we have a chapel and I tell them that it's because we can go and pray and talk to God and that it is part of our tradition. The icons and things like a crucifix are symbols of what our faith is about, who we are as believers, and what our faith should mean to us (Timothy, Inter 6; Joseph, Inter 23; James, Inter 11; Philip, Inter 3).

Those externals are part and parcel of what we are all about. So yes, our Catholic symbols and icons help to give the ambiance and create the environment. They are extremely conducive to the passing down of our Catholic tradition and the building of community within the school (Daniel, Inter 5; Charles, Inter 4; Agnes, Inter 19).

I think that the icons and the symbols are important, but don't make more out of them than what they really are. When you walk into a Catholic school, it should be visibly Catholic, with an ambiance and an environment that is readily identifiable, for example, the crucifix and pictures. However, we have to get beyond that level, and hopefully we are achieving that. Then it becomes a lived experience for that school community. That is what we really have to aim for. That is more difficult to measure (Andrew, Inter 13; Mark, Inter 12).

The chapel is very important to me. The other symbols, not so much. Certainly I believe that if we are not going to live what we preach, then I want to take them all down and stop playing games because we have to have credibility with these young people. If they ever feel that we are teaching them one thing in religion class and treating them differently, whether it is in detention room or in the classroom or on the playing field, cause kids have a nose for that kind of contradictory behavior. If we are not going to practice what we preach, then let's take all of the symbols down so that we are not being phony ( Martin, Inter 17; Matthew, Inter 16; Angelo, Inter 7).

I think there are important and unimportant externals. The unimportant externals to me are things like the uniform but many times the uniform can embody the code which embodies the values so by extension it becomes important. I think there are some other externals that are very important, like the liturgy, but you only appreciate liturgy as you mature. I think it's one of those things that you build into your life and it becomes for you a channel, a real channel for contemplation, reflection, and the values that go with them. Prayer itself is the same kind of thing. Just the idea of prayer is that you are not the ultimate and I think many of the externals encourage the development of community (Solomon, Inter 1; Luke, Inter 15; Adam, Inter 18).

Community is what we are all about but sometimes I feel especially

in the high schools, wouldn't it be nice if our community still included our parents and the Catholic community more than it does. Even the church more than it does, because I think those are areas that we are weak in (Timothy, Inter 6; Daniel, Inter 5).

### A Shifting Situation

But there appears to be a shifting situation. The previous private Catholic secondary schools were somewhat elitist and insular. They enjoyed a significant level of support from the clergy and parents predominantly because they were private, and so dependent on the Catholic community for fundraising support. Full funding, however, has removed Catholic secondary schools from this exclusiveness and created a shifting situation.

Bill 30 has already challenged our community and has changed the nature of the system. It really has and quite fundamentally. The whole thinking of the system and who will be in the system and how they will fit into the system (Solomon, Inter 1; Peter, Inter 2; Christopher, Inter 9).

The subsequent comments clearly indicate that Catholic secondary schools are not only dealing with a less active and supportive Catholic public, but they are also coping with challenges within the church and society in general.

I've talked to people who have come out of the private tradition. I know it was difficult but they had to let it go. Now that we have the funding, parents are so removed. They don't seem to be concerned. There's no more input into the system and there's not very much help or support. You've got the money now, so you guys do the job (Gabriel, Inter 8; Agnes, Inter 19; Charles, Inter 4).

I have a feeling that if the Catholic community of thirty years ago had this opportunity, it would be much easier for them to take the money and realize the benefits of that money in establishing or meeting its mission than it is now, when we've got such a diversity of opinion with respect to what the mission is (Stephen, Inter 24).

That we have many more students attending our Catholic secondary schools than could under the old system is good because we are reaching the Catholic community better. But there is always bittersweet because we don't have that same commitment from our Catholic community that we had when our schools were private. When the parents had a direct input or say on how the private school was run, and they put their own money on the line. They had a vested interest in what was happening and we had very dedicated parents (Mark, Inter 12; Luke, Inter 15; Martin, Inter, 17; Andrew, Inter 13; Anthony, Inter 14).

Many Catholic educators have perceived a change and they are struggling like the rest of us to understand the nature of the change, so that the school now is not the private high school. It's a vastly different thing but I think some of it is a shifting reality within the church, within the school, and within society. The famous triad of home, school, and church is not very apparent. The homes have less and less influence because of the economic factors that take the parent(s) away from the home. The church has less influence because of a personnel crisis. There are simply not enough priests, and also because of the lack of practice, the diminution of practice and more is thrown back to the school. That's almost a reinforcement of the need for the schools. What the long term goal would be is to try and get the people back in touch with the church, and back in touch with the parish (Solomon, Inter 1; Christopher, Inter 9; Ruth, Inter 22; Philip, Inter 3).

A lot of people have kind of a supermarket approach to Catholicism now. They choose off the shelf what they think constitutes Catholicism for them. The fact that they and their families don't go to church doesn't mean a thing in terms of whether they are Catholic or not (Charles, Inter 4; Jeremy, Inter 21).

Parents don't really feel that they have to make any real commitment and this is at the elementary level as well. They don't feel that they have to worry about taking their children to mass or sacramental preparation. They expect the Catholic school to be responsible for everything (Agnes, Inter 19; Ruth, Inter 22).

Because families are not going to church, I think the school becomes church and parish. That's the place that they learn their faith and they practice their faith. It is also where they celebrate their faith in liturgies and paraliturgie (Adam, Inter 18; Matthew, Inter 16; Joseph, Inter 23; Andrew, inter 13; Luke, Inter 15; Martin, Inter 17).

### Open Access Students

Another influence within this shifting community is the educating

of a whole cross-section of students. The former private high schools, as previously mentioned, were inclined to be elitist and academic and the majority of its Catholic students were at the advanced level. As Anthony states, "It was more academic and there was very much more an academic flavour to our schools" (Inter, 14). Now with full funding, their clientele is considerably different and their secondary school program offerings are similar to and competitive with their coterminous public board's composite high schools.

In addition to this enlarged student base, Bill 30 not only mandates the hiring of non-Catholic teachers (Section 136-1a), but it also includes "open access" (Section 136-o), which states:

(1) A person who is qualified to be a resident pupil in respect of a secondary school operated by a public board is entitled to be a pupil in a secondary school operated by a Roman Catholic school board if the area of jurisdiction of the public board is in whole or in part the same as the area of jurisdiction of the Roman Catholic school board (Ontario Legislature, Bill 30, 1986).

Open access, therefore, has the resulting effect of further enlarging the student enrollment base in Catholic secondary schools to non-Catholic students. The following frank comments present the subjects' views and perceptions about the added influence of open access students, relative to nurturing the development of Christian community in Catholic secondary schools.

I think generally speaking the issues are basically the same. How do we maintain our Catholic community and *raison d'etre* in our Catholic high schools? How do we maintain that in light of open access and having to take redundant public school teachers? That's the key challenge that faces every Catholic school board in this province (Adam, Inter 18; Andrew, Inter 13).

We have always had the right to choose and retain staff on the basis of their Catholicity. When it comes to students, we have

always served a very distinct defined group of clients, those being Catholic students related to Catholic ratepayers. That is no longer true. Open access has eroded that, so that our student base is not as focused. This is also true of our teachers but maybe then it calls the Catholic component of the school to become a missionary component. (Charles, Inter 4; Daniel, Inter 5; Lucy, Inter 10; Philip, Inter 3).

I think open access is having a lot of unfortunate consequences in terms of rivalry between systems, in terms of unsettledness in not being able to predict where people will be going. It could be more rational and clean cut. I don't see it as having a big impact on the Catholicity of our schools though. From the reports I've heard many of those students take the religion courses and participate in the celebrations and liturgies and whatever else is asked and I think the small number who don't, don't significantly influence the others (Solomon, Inter, 1; Peter, Inter 2; Christopher, Inter 9; Stephen, Inter 24).

As evidenced, there are some challenging aspects to open access. However, there appears to be a lot of good will to make this aspect of full funding as positive and amenable as possible. Certain expectations seem to be unfolding that result in open access being less intrusive in the Catholic communities of secondary schools. The ensuing reflections of a number of subjects aptly demonstrate this.

My expectations are that open access students would participate respectfully and be able to accept that even though they are not Catholic, they are members of the school and part of the community (Timothy, Inter 6; Luke, Inter 15; Vincent, Inter 20; Angelo, Inter 7).

To preserve the Catholicity of our schools, we have to be prepared to expect this of our open access students. Look, if you decide to come to this particular school community, the celebration of our faith is an integral part of our school life. For example when we go to mass we all go. That means every teacher and every student goes. My personal feeling is that if somebody is not there, the community is diminished to that extent. (Martin, Inter 17; Ruth, Inter 22; Gabriel, Inter 8).

The non-Catholic students in the school are supporting us very visibly. It's absolutely amazing and very gratifying (Joseph, Inter 23; Vincent, inter 20; Stephen, Inter 24).

Our liturgical assemblies are full. The non-Catholic students attend. They respectfully participate in the faith life of the school and that includes opening exercises, prayers, and so on. I have had no problems with that and I think it is a real credit to the staff and students of this school (Daniel, Inter 5; Timothy, Inter 6; Charles, Inter 4).

There is a lack of consensus, however, about whether the right of open access students to be exempt from mandatory religious education courses creates or contributes to a divisiveness within the school community. Although this will be discussed more thoroughly in the final section of this chapter, there are some comments that are particularly relevant to open access and its effect on the development of Christian community.

I don't think we should be forcing non-Catholic students to take religious education. That is not what we are all about. However if they wish of their own accord to participate, so be it. When it comes to the rest of the school's activities, the ambiance, the liturgical celebrations, they are going to participate just like any other member of that school community (Christopher, Inter 9; Charles, Inter 4; Lucy, Inter 10; Philip, Inter 3; Stephen, inter 24; Jeremy, Inter 21).

Then there is the perspective that these students should be expected to take these courses.

My personal feeling is that if they come to this school, they're going to come and participate in the full life of the school. I expect them to sign up for religious education classes, and I expect them to contribute to their classes. I expect them to go on retreat with the rest of the students. I also expect them to attend school celebrations but I try to make all of this very invitational. I want them to be comfortable here and to enjoy that dimension of the school. I would really have some difficulty if they felt put upon or if they felt uncomfortable, because all of that is such a central element to each of our schools. I want the people who join our community to find that attractive (Martin, Inter 17; Mark, Inter 12; Adam, Inter 18; Agnes, Inter 19; Luke, Inter 15).

This completes the findings relative to full funding's impact on

the ability of separate schools to develop and nurture a Christian community. The final section of this chapter will deal with Bill 30's ability to test the practice of providing academic curricula, including formal religious instruction.

**Providing Academic Curricula  
Including  
Formal Religious Instruction**

Integration

The Separate School System of Ontario has always maintained that, "A Catholic school is not a public school which offers a religious education course. It is a school which incorporates the gospel values and Catholic traditions and practices in all of its curriculum and school life. This thrust is the responsibility of the whole staff and it must find expression in the whole school community" (Ontario Catholic Supervisory Officers' Association, 1991, p. 2). The following subjects' views and comments reinforce this pervasive understanding of curriculum and underscore its importance to the mission of Catholic education.

We are a school with a difference. The very nature of curriculum is woven into the entire fabric of the school day (Philip, Inter 3; Angelo, Inter 7; Vincent, Inter 20; Lucy, Inter 10).

A person can go astray here by thinking that you should find every opportunity in subject areas to throw in, you know, a triangle becomes the trinity or whatever. That is not what we mean but there are issues that need to be dealt with from a Catholic perspective and therefore, in curriculum we need to integrate those Catholic principles into such areas as, English, History, Economics, and of course Religious Education, to name only some ways that this integration takes place (Stephen, Inter 24; Jeremy, Inter 21; Anthony, Inter 14).

I would say in our religious education program the issue of social justice is an integral component, but it would also be in History



or Law because of the integration of values. I would hope and expect that the Catholic teacher is looking at current issues and having the students think about Christian justice or the lack of it in the way people deal with the issues and problems of our modern world (Daniel, Inter 5; Timothy, Inter 6; Gabriel, Inter 8; James, Inter 11).

This is a document called, Catholicity in the Curriculum. It is at final printing right now. We had a committee of supervisory officers who developed it, so that it could be piloted with a variety of boards and units could be evolved from the models to demonstrate the natural incorporation of Catholic values into the curriculum (Adam, Inter 18; Andrew, Inter 13).

Our curriculum department has consciously addressed religious education across the curriculum. Subjects like Literature, Social Sciences, and History will consciously be taught with values that reflect our Catholic tradition (Christopher, Inter 9; Peter, Inter 2).

The religion program is important but it is not the be all and the end all. It has to go well beyond that. Our Catholic values have to extend into all aspects of the school community, like the curriculum, the celebrations, our play activities (Ruth, Inter 22; Joseph, Inter 23; Anthony, Inter 14).

Let me give you an example. We just currently put into place an O.A.C. Economics course and it is based on ministry guidelines. It's consistent with the academic requirements for an O.A.C. credit and it also has built into it issues of social justice relative to such aspects as unemployment, supply and demand, government responses and policy shifts. Now there is a nice clean way of dealing with it purely from an economical point of view but we take it a step forward. We probe the consistency of that with the values inherent in social justice, so the students are provided with a different perspective. They are getting all the content information but throughout the course, there is also value formation (Philip, Inter 3; Angelo, Inter 7).

Our Catholic values are not an overlay in the curriculum. They are woven in like the yeast in the bread (Charles, Inter 4; Matthew, Inter 16; Agnes, Inter 19; Earl, Inter 12;).

It is so much more than a subject, but we need resources to make sure that it is not just a subject. We've got to support things like retreats and other special experiences (Luke, Inter 15; Matthew, Inter 16).

Our values have to pervade the school. They can not be restricted to the religious education curriculum. They must be an integral

part of curriculum in general, whether it be Law, Economics, or Physical Education (Martin, Inter 17).

I believe in the kind of Christian values that we try to transmit to our students. I believe in the power of prayer, and the power of being able to transmit that kind of attitude, that kind of inward strength, that kind of belief in self-worth. So it is important to bring that to our students throughout the day. (Ruth, Inter 22; Solomon, Inter 1; Peter, Inter 2).

### Teacher as Agent

This understanding of an integrated curriculum is critical to the mission of Catholic schools. However, to achieve this transmission of the values and practices of Catholic tradition, the subjects unanimously believe that the teacher is the important agent and witness to the integration of faith and life in the school. The ensuing comments illustrate this material aspect relative to curriculum. Further, these views demonstrate additional support for the separate school system's preference to hire Catholic teachers.

I mean being present as a mature witnessing Catholic to those students in that community, whether you are dealing with them in the classroom, in the halls, the cafeteria, or the football field. It also means being present in the liturgies at the school and using the chapel, so that the students can see that it has value for you too. You see the math teacher can do all that, which is quite different from just teaching math (Charles, Inter 4; Solomon, Inter 1; Christopher, Inter 9; Kevin, Inter 3).

In what ways does the Catholicity permeate and integrate the curriculum? I think it starts with the teacher, I really do. If that teacher demonstrates sensitivity, care, compassion, and tolerance and represents a faith model for those students, then they can buy into and take ownership for their own faith. I fundamentally believe that. (Andrew, Inter 13; Matthew, Inter 16; Timothy, Inter 6; Gabriel, Inter 8).

I think it's the person at the front of the classroom that is bringing the Catholic values to the curriculum. It is not the document. That is where I see it happening, because your curriculum documents are not that different from the ones used in public schools. It's the person teaching those documents that makes the difference

(Agnes, Inter 19; Ruth, Inter 22; Gabriel, Inter 8; Luke, Inter 15).

It's a question of encouraging and reminding everyone in the school, from the principal on down, to set a positive example and role model in the day to day practise of our values, so that the students can't say that there is a double standard. We really try to be conscious of how we witness our faith (Vincent, Inter 20; Joseph, Inter 23).

The teacher is the important role model but not only through words but also through deeds. If you don't have that model, a good healthy model up there before the children, then I think we are compromising our mission. I don't think we can just by words or program transmit our values to the children (Christopher, Inter 9; Daniel, Inter 5).

I have to start with the teachers. The teacher has to have a concept of what Catholic education means, understand the synthesis of faith and culture, and be prepared to share this with the students by word and example. I think the students are very adept at knowing whether the teacher is just teaching a lesson or whether the teacher is really committed to these ideals and values (Peter, Inter 2; James, Inter 11).

#### Exemption of Religious Education Credits

"In the development of a curriculum for Catholic schools, particular intentional learning experiences will seek to communicate the substance of our Catholic faith in terms of our scriptures, our liturgical and sacramental life, our doctrinal self understanding and our moral attitudes and activities. This will be particularly true in formal religious education courses" (O.C.S.O.A., 1991, p. 5). This document clearly establishes the content material in formal religious education courses and it also reinforces the belief that mandatory courses at the elementary level and compulsory credit courses at the secondary level are an integral component of the academic curricula within the Catholic school system. Consequently, all students must participate in regular religious education classes and relative to secondary education they must take compulsory

credit courses.

However, as a result of Bill 30, Section 136-o (5) addresses exemption from religious education courses for open access students. This particular subsection states:

- (5) Upon written application, a Roman Catholic school board shall exempt a person who is qualified to be a resident pupil in respect of a secondary school operated by a public board from programs and courses of study in religious education if,
- (a) the person is enrolled in a program that is not otherwise available to the person in a secondary school operated by a public board within the area of jurisdiction of the Roman Catholic school board;
  - (b) it is impractical by reason of distance or terrain or by reason of physical handicap, mental handicap or multi-handicap for the person to attend a secondary school operated by a public board;
  - (c) the person is enrolled in an instructional unit of the Roman Catholic school board under Part XI (Ontario Legislature, Bill 30, 1986).

The following comments reveal how the subjects view this aspect of Bill 30 with respect to their compulsory religious education credits and their basic understanding of an integrated curriculum.

I think we can potentially lose some control over programming and consequent to that lose some control over the purpose of the school system. It does have a down side because if you are non-Catholic you do not have to take those courses, yet the Catholic students are compelled to do something that other students are not. This creates a double standard (Charles, Inter 4; Angelo, Inter 7).

The biggest problem is that they are excused from religion classes. There are approximately 80 of them. Then our students (Catholic students) begin to question and play games, like not attending class. They figure well, if my friend is not going, why do I have to go? It does create problems (Gabriel, Inter 8; Adam, Inter 18; Martin, Inter 17).

Well I think if you had a high number of open access pupils coming into a secondary school, knowing that they have the right not to take religious education courses, then you have two sets of students in your school, operating under different sets of expectations regarding their commitment to the mission of Catholic schools

(Andrew, Inter 13; Earl, Inter 12).

As evidenced, the subjects are concerned about the exemption qualification for non-Catholic students. However, they are very definitive about compulsory religion courses for their Catholic clientele and are unanimously opposed to exemptions for Catholic students.

No exemptions. We have had three requests but I have held firm and they have taken the course. I think it must be because that is what we are all about. If they do not want to be part of that then they shouldn't be in the school. You don't come part way, it's 100% all the way, so I have no compunctions about saying no. I think the Minister of Education's letter confirms what I have believed all along that we are doing the right thing (Christopher, Inter 9; Lucy, Inter 10).

I believe the religious education component of the program has to be compulsory for Catholic students. That is a fundamental aspect to the mission of our schools (Charles, Inter 4; James, Inter 11; Ruth, Inter 22; Timothy, Inter 6).

I would draw the hard line on exemptions for Catholic students. I think if we don't do that, then we end up with the situation that anybody can opt out of the programs that are designed to build the very essence of the Catholic school system (Philip, Inter 3; Joseph, Inter 23; Anthony, Inter 14).

There is very little resistance in our school by Catholic or non-Catholic students relative to taking the religion courses and that tells me that if that expectation is put very firmly, the students and the parents will support it. I think if you are too accomodating, you are inviting problems (Daniel, Inter 5; Gabriel, Inter 8).

Sure that cuts some of their elective choices, but they are coming to a Catholic school. If they don't like it under open access, Catholic students can go elsewhere. I think the fact that we teach very strong religious education programs in grades 9, 10, 11, and 12, is important, because it provides the students with the opportunity to talk about significant issues in a Catholic context (Andrew, Inter 13; Agnes, Inter 19; Luke, Inter 15; Matthew, Inter 16).

### Summary

This completes the findings relative to Bill 30's impact on the

ability of separate schools to provide academic curricula including formal religious instruction. It also concludes chapter 4, which has brought forth the findings of the study. Chapter 5 will interpret this data and put it into perspective, relative to the research questions.

## CHAPTER V

### Bill 30's Impact on the Mission of Separate Schools:

#### A Discussion of the Findings

##### Introduction

##### Reararticulation of the Problem

This study found an abundant accumulation of rich material, which like most qualitative studies, exceeded the limits of facile management. The task of organizing and interpreting the data, however, was guided by the research question and accompanying subsidiary questions that this study was initiated to resolve. The primary question centered on: **What are the perceptions of Catholic Administrators and Trustees about the impact of Bill 30 on the ability of Separate School Boards in Ontario to retain what they see as their distinctive mission of Catholic education?**

The subsidiary questions focused on the three basic means (C.O.S.S., 1988) that have been identified with the provision of Catholic education.

- 1) What impact is Bill 30 having on the practice of providing qualified teachers, supervisory officers, and other personnel who are committed to building a Christian community in the school system?
- 2) What impact is Bill 30 having on the practice of developing each school as a Christian community in all of its academic and non-academic activities?
- 3) What impact is Bill 30 having on the practice of providing

academic curricula, including formal religious instruction, in which Catholic faith and life are integrated?

These threshold questions and others are answered in a discussion of the findings. Additionally, some references to the literature are provided as they relate to the study's findings and subsequent conclusions.

### **A Discussion of the Findings**

#### **Safeguarding the Distinctive Mission**

This study was concerned with the perceived impact of Bill 30 on the distinctive mission of separate schools in Ontario. Throughout the study careful efforts have been made to illustrate, through reference sources and subject perception, what this distinctive mission means relative to Catholic education. According to the Sacred Congregation For Catholic Education, 1988:

What makes the Catholic school distinctive is its religious dimension, and that this is to be found in a) the educational climate, b) the personal development of each student, c) the relationship established between culture and the Gospel, d) the illumination of all knowledge with the light of faith (p.3).

Although full funding is the first legislation or enacted bill in Ontario that specifically acknowledges as a principle of public policy that separate schools do possess a "distinctiveness", Bill 30 has proven to be, ironically, a critical instrument and agent of change for separate schools throughout the province. Fundamental characteristics basic to the delivery of Catholic education have been affected and its impact on separate schools, both positive and negative, cannot be denied.

Initially, as identified within this study, the response or reception to Bill 30 was one of welcome relief and heartfelt joy. However, as



subjects have related, the euphoria surrounding the announcement of full funding was immediately followed by an urgency to deal with the logistics and physical demands and pressures of coping with the implementation of Bill 30. Consequently, a series of "growing pains" have characterized Catholic education since the inception of full funding. Their admitted lack of planned readiness, the subsequent replication of their secondary schools from the public secondary school model, the decidedly militant posture of the Catholic teacher federation, the "new kids on the block" competitiveness with their coterminous public boards, and the totally unexpected financial woes which marred their expansion and completion demonstrate that full funding has not come without bruises and scars to separate schools.

The cumulative impact of these phenomena, coupled with the growing tide of public debate and political inquiry, resulted virtually in reawakening the Catholic educational community from their concentrated focus on "bricks and mortar" to a heightened awareness or reassertion of Catholic mission and identity. This challenge to their purpose came in the form of public hearings that were conducted across the province. The first wave came with the Planning and Implementation Committee, followed second by the Legislative Standing Committee. As a result of receiving public dollars for the completion of their Catholic system, separate schools have been compelled to defend their mission and to demonstrate how this mission is distinctly different from that of a public school. Although the integration of faith and life has always been perceived as the primary and pre-eminent basis for operating Catholic

schools, the separate school system of Ontario has rarely felt so challenged to justify how in fact its schools translate that distinctive philosophy into a discernible and recognizable difference.

This need to clarify and articulate the mission of separate schools, both within and without, has resulted in a flurry of mission statements and an intense re-examination of the purpose of Catholic schools. The task, however, is complex because the dynamics of input, involvement, and participation (revealed by the subjects as prerequisites to personalizing and internalizing this sense of mission and identity) are lacking or are perceived as lacking. A shared common dialogue needs to emerge at the local school level to complement the provincial initiatives such as the Blishen Report (1990) and The Ontario Conference of Catholic Bishops' This Moment Of Promise (1989). Unless significant opportunities and resources are provided particularly at the grassroots (school) level, which essentially constitutes a percolating up process as opposed to a filtering down one, there is strong feeling that much of the attention being directed towards mission statements will be dissipated.

Perhaps the Catholic educational community of Ontario can look to their counterpart in Alberta for some collaboration and support regarding this onerous and challenging task. According to Richard Laplante in his article, Catholic Schools Are A Uniquely Positive Heritage (1988), "a renewed total Catholic school culture has been evolving within Alberta's Catholic schools" and that this focus "has spawned an intensive period of mission statement building and renewal at the local school district

level" p.28). Since Alberta's Catholic School System has been fully funded much longer than Ontario's, much may be profited from their study and heightened sense of mission and identity.

Conclusively, one of the major effects of Bill 30 and the completion of separate schools in Ontario, has been that the Catholic educational community of Ontario is in total agreement that safeguarding the spiritual dimension and mission of its school system is of paramount importance. Some work has begun, but it bears repeating that this study's findings indicate that there remains much to accomplish relative to the ongoing task of building and maintaining the distinctive mission of Catholic publicly funded schools. Though the Ontario Conference of Catholic Bishops expressed in 1984 that, "There is, in principle, little or no difference between a Catholic school funded publicly and a Catholic school funded privately, as far as Catholicity is concerned" (p.3), this study's findings demonstrate clearly that the consciousness of mission that presently absorbs the Catholic educational community of Ontario has heightened the issue of Catholicity for separate schools.

#### The Basic Model For Providing Catholic Education

The conceptual lens for this study was based on a set of means that foster and provide Catholic education. Traditionally, these have been:

- 1) The practice of providing qualified teachers, supervisory officers, and other personnel who are committed to building a Christian community in the school.
- 2) The practice of developing each school as a Christian community in all its academic and non-academic activities.
- 3) The practice of providing academic curricula, including formal religious instruction, in which Catholic faith and life are integrated (C.O.S.S., 1988, p.1-3).

Until Bill 30 or the complete public funding of the separate school system of Ontario, these basic means were identified implicitly with the delivery and provision of Catholic education. There was a historical and constitutional context which supported this delivery model and the cumulative effect resulted in a pervasive association between these three basic means (committed qualified teachers, Christian community, and a curriculum that integrates faith and life) and Catholic education. However, they were never substantively challenged or tested relative to their intrinsic importance and validity regarding the provision of Catholic education and the preservation of the distinctive character and mission of Catholic education until full funding or the completion of separate schools (Bill 30).

#### Providing Committed Qualified Staff

This study's findings firmly support that Catholic teachers and Catholic supervisory staff are the foundational building block of Catholic education. Unanimously, the subjects agreed that the role of the Catholic teacher is pre-eminent and that the whole logic of maintaining a Catholic school system falters when the individuals charged most closely with its implementation, the classroom teachers, lack the Catholic point of view and the Catholic tradition and practice. Additionally, the subjects confirmed that Catholic teachers, by virtue of their vocation or position of trust, share a symbiotic relationship with Catholic schools. These findings enforce anew the Sacred Congregation For Catholic Education (1982) which declared without hesitation that, "by their witness and behaviour, teachers are of the first importance to impart a distinctive

character to Catholic schools" (p.40).

However, findings also support that teachers who are lukewarm in their faith are on the rise and that this phenomena has the potential to diminish the significant importance of teachers relative to the distinctive mission and integrity of Catholic education. In a larger context, this faltering faith characterizes the Catholic church in general, as well as other organized traditional churches, and a finding congruent with those of similar current studies. Kenneth Westhues, in his article Catholic Separate Schools: An Ambiguous Legacy (1985) calls it "secularization or the lessening of the importance of religion in the lives of most citizens" (p.55) and cites Alberta sociologist Reginald Bibby, who, "on the basis of repeated national studies concluded that religion is simply no longer on the minds of about half of all adults in this country" (p.55). This influence of secularization or "lessening of the faith" within separate schools has been identified as a significant challenge and one which directly affects the faith and fidelity of Catholic teachers, students, and parents to the mission of separate schools.

The findings of this study also point out that since the implementation of full funding, there is an increased presence of non-Catholic teachers within Catholic secondary schools and potentially Catholic elementary schools if the Catholic educational community of Ontario is unsuccessful in repealing Section 136-1a from Bill 30. The preferred practice of hiring Catholic teachers will be lost by separate schools and, although they will be accorded the right to expect newly hired teachers "to respect the philosophy and traditions of Roman Catholic

separate schools in the performance of their duties", this is far different from the ideal of hiring committed Catholic teachers to teach in Catholic schools.

The findings indicate that non-Catholic teachers are not in themselves a menace or threat to the mission of separate schools. But their increased presence, especially in boards where the transfer of redundant non-Catholic public secondary school teachers is a significant ratio within their high school(s), is proving challenging to maintaining the dimension of Catholicity. However, the inability of the subjects to quantify when that increased presence could become a distinct liability to the mission of their separate schools remains unresolved. At the moment, the only explicit reference that has been made to numbers is from the Ontario Conference of Catholic Bishops in their Pupil and Teacher Access to New Catholic Secondary Schools Pastoral Guideline (1984) which states that "Because of the extra effort that would be required to maintain the religious permeation of the school community, Catholic teachers should constitute not less than ninety percent of academic staff" (p.6). Such a guide has been exceeded by some boards in the province simply because the impact of Section 136-1 of Bill 30 has impacted more dramatically than they anticipated.

The analogy used by Solomon and others, that non-Catholic teachers are not a cancer to separate schools, bears repeating because the image expresses vividly the gravity of the issue relative to the mission and distinctive character of Catholic schools. The findings also support that significant induction programs and other specific mechanisms need

to be put into place by Catholic school boards to ensure that all new teachers, particularly non-Catholic teachers, understand and respect the philosophy, mission, and sacramental life of the Catholic school.

The related issue of the promotion of non-Catholic staff to positions of responsibility contained within the parameters of Section 136-1a has emerged as a very serious issue. The findings confirm that this particular issue strikes literally at the heart of Catholic education. The fervent belief is that positions of responsibility must be held by thoroughly committed Catholics. There is no compromising inclination regarding this issue other than the tacit agreement that non-Catholics could hold positions of responsibility up to but not beyond that of department head and that board policies should openly state that, recognizing of course the possibility of legal challenge, subject to the constitutionality of Section 136-1a.

The conspicuous absence of support from the Ontario English Catholic Teacher's Association regarding Section 136-1a is a source of divisiveness in the Catholic educational community. Because this Association now represents non-Catholics as well as Catholics, the complexity of their membership has virtually muted their voice on the issue of supporting the repeal of Section 136-1a. It further illustrates the not so subtle and benign impact that Bill 30 is having on the ability of the separate school system to protect its integrity and mission. A fragmented Catholic community may well serve to promote outside influences which call for the consolidation and confederation of school boards in the province of Ontario.

## Christian Community

According to Martin Royackers in his article, The Purpose Of A Separate Catholic School Has Not Been Fully Thought Out (1988), "Catholic education must now be justified by appeal to specific ideals and values that confer some sort of distinctive identity on a Catholic school" (p.23). Separate schools have always maintained that their distinctiveness is nurtured by developing each school as a Christian community in all of its academic and non-academic activities.

The findings of this study indicate that the cumulative affect of specific legislative demands within Bill 30 (non-Catholic teachers, open access students and religious exemption) is requiring Catholic boards to be more aware of the meaning and importance of Christian community in each of their schools. The unifying force that characterizes the community must be faithfulness to the Gospel values. Catholic boards are also seeing the need to provide clear direction relative to the participation of all staff and students in the faith life of the school. Catholic boards are also identifying the need to be more attentive to the appropriate symbols that sign the exterior and interior of their schools; (ambiance such as crucifixes and chapels are important, but they can only be external signs of an interior reality). Catholic boards are also recognizing that they must be encouraging and supportive of activities, celebrations, and professional development that build and sustain Christian community within their schools and within their system. Consequently, Catholic schools are discovering that they must be much more conscious about the significance of Christian community within



the fabric of the Catholic school setting.

Fundamentally, Catholic boards are seeing that Bill 30 is reshaping their community by changing the nature of the Catholic system. Formerly, private Catholic high schools had the reputation of being somewhat elitist and academic in nature. Now that the separate school system is publicly funded, it serves a considerably expanded clientele. No longer is it exclusively Catholic in the traditional sense. By contrast, it includes Catholic and non-Catholic staff and a student body of which some members are open access students. The overriding expectation of course is that these non-Catholic teachers and students respect and participate in the faith life of the school (with the exception of receiving the sacraments) and the findings of this study support that they are doing just that.

The study also reveals that one of the most important elements of building and maintaining a Christian community within the Catholic school is the Catholic teacher. The Sacred Congregation For Catholic Education (1988), declares that the "Prime responsibility for creating this unique Christian school climate rests with the teachers, as individuals and as a community" (p.13). Strong agreement is found in this study to support this principle.

### Curricula

Catholic schools have coined the phrase, "Schools with a difference". This means that a conscious and deliberate effort is made by Catholic schools to incorporate and to integrate the Gospel values into all of its curriculum, which includes formal religious courses that are taught

to communicate the teachings and substance of the Catholic faith. To repeat one subject, "Our Catholic values are not an overlay in the curriculum. They are woven in like the yeast in the bread". This parallels the church's teaching, which states that: "The special character of the Catholic school and the underlying reason for its existence, the reason why Catholic parents should prefer it, is precisely the quality of the religious instruction integrated into the overall education of the students" (The Sacred Congregation For Catholic Education, 1988, p.33).

There is no question in the findings of this study that this pervasive understanding of curriculum is critical to the identity and distinctive mission of separate schools. There were, however, two salient issues that predominated in the findings. First, the role of the teacher is absolutely essential in both witness and behaviour to the integration of faith and life in the Catholic school. Overwhelmingly, the teacher was identified as a critical agent relative to transmitting the integration of faith and life in the school. As one subject stated, "I think it's the person at the front of the classroom that is bringing the Catholic values to the curriculum" and another said, "It's the person teaching those documents that makes the difference".

Second, the mandatory religious education courses must be just that. Although Bill 30 has legislated into place religious education credit exemption for open access students, (who represent presently minimal numbers), Catholic students cannot be exempt from mandatory religious education credits because these credits are an integral component

of the academic curriculum within the Catholic school system. Little if any support has been found to suggest that these compulsory religious education courses have been devalued or undermined. Although some instances were cited regarding requests for exemptions by Catholic students, the prevailing response has been to deny such requests and hold firm. Recent responses from the Minister of Education, on this very issue have given full sanction to separate school boards to deny requests for exemptions by Catholic students. Concurrently, findings indicate that even though two sets of expectations may reside in the same school for one student body, that being Catholic and non-Catholic students, the situation is ameliorated by the clear expectation that every student and teacher respect and participate in the faith life of the school community, be it prayer, paraliturgical, or liturgical celebration.

#### Bill 30: More Blessing than Curse

Literally, Bill 30 has brought completion for the separate school community of Ontario and fulfilled the long awaited dream of complete education from Junior Kindergarten to Ontario Academic Courses and on into Continuing Education. It also has brought to separate schools facilities, programs, and services which would not have come to these boards without completion. In fact, Bill 30 has been responsible for revitalizing the separate school system's awareness of its own mission and identity relative to its ability to distinguish itself not only from the public school system but also in terms of its evangelical role within the church. It is hoped that this re-examination of mission

will help to change the impression that Catholic schools are becoming homogenized and "progressively less distinguishable from other schools" (Westhues, 1985, p.60).

It is also true, however, that these blessings have been mixed with sacrifices. The increased accountability, visibility, and vulnerability that now characterizes Catholic education in the province of Ontario is a legacy of full funding, and the potential loss of control over staffing may prove to be its most precious casualty. Efforts to remove Section 136-1a, however, are forthcoming and Catholic boards appear to be confident that their constitutional rights will be upheld in a court of law.

Although this study is only a snapshot of the unfolding drama between Catholic school boards and Bill 30, it has clearly demonstrated that Bill 30 is testing the ability of separate schools relative to their mission and identity. But there is a definite difference between test and diminish. Overall, full funding has benefited the separate school system of Ontario. For lack of a better analogy, it has matured the separate school system, albeit abruptly, and changed the system's nature but not its integrity..

### **Conclusion**

The findings demonstrate that Bill 30 has impacted on all of the three basic providers of Catholic education. The significant corollary to this, however, is that the collective strength of these interdependent means has ensured control over staff, community, and curriculum despite the challenges contained within Bill 30. Though the nature of the separate

school system of Ontario has changed, the basic model of providing for Catholic education has been validated and, moreover, the distinctive character and mission of separate schools is being strengthened because the Catholic educational community of Ontario is seeing how fragile it really is.

The final chapter presents my reflections of the research, and an application of the findings that lead to conclusions and implications for theory, practice, and research.

## CHAPTER VI

### Reflections and Implications for Theory, Practice, and Research

#### Introduction

Although this research study has emphasized the significant relationship between the three basic means of providing Catholic education and the distinctive mission of separate schools, it has also demonstrated quite clearly, that Bill 30 is influencing and impacting upon each of these basic providers. Consequently, a compelling re-examination of mission is characterizing Catholic boards and Catholic educational organizations in the province of Ontario.

Since the preceding chapter discussed the major findings and presented the answers to the research questions, as well as the conclusions, this final chapter will present both my personal reflections on the research, and some important implications for theory, practice, and further research.

#### Reflections on the Research

##### Reflections on the Research Study

In the first chapter of this thesis, I stated my personal ground and qualifications for developing this research. My experiences as a teacher and consultant, parent and separate school board trustee, and sessional lecturer and faculty advisor, have provided a wide variety of personal, professional, and political opportunities to participate in Catholic education and to deepen my commitment to the philosophy and mission of separate schools. When the long awaited completion of

separate schools was announced so unexpectedly in 1984, there came with it the challenging task of implementation that included such aspects, as the transfer of facilities and staff, programming expansion, and greater Ministry of Education control through policy formulation and funding. Since I participated in many of these decisions and changes, I was confronted often with the need to reconcile questions and doubts about the true blessings of full funding, even though I knew that Bill 30 was responsible for the unrivaled expansion and growth of Catholic education in my own locality, as well as throughout the province of Ontario.

This research study has identified and clarified many of these concerns. It has also contextualized full funding within the parameters of the faith and culture of the separate school system, and related its specific impact on each of the three basic providers of Catholic education. As a result, the challenges that face Ontario's completed Catholic school system are no longer just vague perceptions or personal doubts. They are consensual realities that characterize Catholic education in the aftermath of Bill 30.

#### Reflections on the Research Process

This study surprised me in several ways. First, I was heartened and relieved by the positive support I received for this study. However, I was overwhelmed also, by the wealth of information that the interviews yielded. The subjects, with the exception of one or two, were very candid and forthcoming and consequently, the average interview transcript was approximately twenty-five to thirty typed pages. As a result, I

had a massive amount of information to organize, analyze, and interpret.

Second, I was surprised genuinely, by the hospitality and receptivity of the boards I visited. They not only accommodated my requests for interview schedules and policy documents, but also they provided opportunities for school visits, tours of new schools, and luncheons, which overall, provided a greater appreciation of each of the respective boards. Moreover, it helped to provide a meaningful context of the impact of full funding in each of the school communities.

Finally, I was surprised by the quality and intensity of the interviews. Although I had prepared by reading and studying qualitative research, (Woods, 1986; Guba and Lincoln, 1985; Bogdan and Biklan, 1982), particularly sections devoted to observation and interviews, I was amazed at the level of skills required, the interaction of personalities, and the active listening and subtle prompting that characterize effective interviews. Also, because each visit was only of three day's duration and the actual interviews consumed such a substantial part of each day I would have to say, in retrospect, that there was a definite limitation of time during the data collection process. Although it was not a restrictive factor, the accelerated pace did tend to be onerous and fatiguing. It was, nonetheless, very rewarding.

With respect to the methodology employed, I am convinced that the qualitative method enhanced the collection of rich data or as Geertz (1975, p. 6) would say, "this elaborate venture in 'thick description'". The findings presented in this study reveal the subjects' perceptions, ideas, detailed description, and a wealth of information that comment



on and illustrate clearly their desire to safeguard the spiritual dimension of separate schools, relative to the specific challenges imposed by Bill 30.

### **Implications for Theory, Practice, and Research**

#### Preface

Although Bill 30 has proven to be an overall blessing to Catholic schools, there are four major challenges confronting the separate school system of Ontario. They are: a) preserving the mission of Catholic schools to ensure that what differentiates them is not their historical and constitutional rights, but their unique expression of the Gospel message based on Catholic teachings and traditions; b) preserving the three basic providers of Catholic education, particularly the right to hire Catholic teachers, to ensure that their collective interdependence can sustain and nurture the distinctive character and mission of separate schools; c) preserving Catholic leadership in positions of responsibility to ensure that leadership in Catholic schools is not a reward or merit for service and experience, but a vocation aspired to by capable and thoroughly committed Catholics; d) developing positive and cooperative relations between Separate School Boards and their Teacher Affiliates to ensure that power and influential force (material values) do not supersede fairness, mutual respect, and an abiding commitment to Catholic social justice (Christian values). Addressing these challenges as a collective and cohesive community will do much to safeguard the spiritual dimension and integrity of publicly funded separate schools.

### Implications for Theory

This study presents an important implication for theory. Bill 30 has established the provision for transferring non-Catholic teachers and other staff made redundant by the extension of full funding to separate schools. Furthermore, Section 136-1a (1995) threatens to remove permanently from Catholic boards the right to prefer the hiring of Catholic teachers. The findings from this research study support that this increased presence of non-Catholic teachers is not in itself a menace or threat to the mission of Catholic schools, primarily because of the expectation that they will "respect the philosophy and traditions of Roman Catholic separate schools in the performance of their duties". But this posits a fundamental question. What is the qualitative difference between "respecting the philosophy and traditions" and "living and practising them", and what will be the long term effect(s) on the mission of separate schools if qualitative differences do exist? Theoretical study should explore this important relationship because it may influence the ability of separate schools to safeguard their spiritual dimension, mission, and ministry.

### Implications for Practice

This study presents also several implications for practice. The following considerations, therefore, identify those areas of suggested practice, and illustrate their significance, relative to building and maintaining the distinctive mission of separate schools.

First, this study suggests that there are some boards that have received a significant ratio of teachers under Bill 30's Section

136-1, which is governed by either Regulation 71 or other local agreements. To accommodate the transfer of these public secondary school teachers, these boards have had to transfer their own teachers from secondary to intermediate grades, or hold the line and suspend the hiring of additional Catholic secondary staff. As a consequence, disenchantment and cynicism has manifested itself within pockets of teachers who feel frustrated and overlooked within these boards. Although time will help to alleviate this problem of morale, positive initiatives involving communication and dialogue are needed to expedite the healing process.

Second, this study suggests that the adversarial atmosphere that surrounds school board and teacher federation relations should dissolve into more positive cooperation and dialogue. Otherwise, the splintering into factions will only intensify. This can already be demonstrated by the fact that almost all Roman Catholic boards are now dealing with an elementary panel and a secondary panel of the Ontario English Catholic Teacher Association. Perhaps primary emphasis can be directed to common purposes and shared goals (mission building and the Gospel message), not separation and alienation.

Third, even though boards are experiencing severe fiscal restraints, this study supports the need to invest dollars in the professional and spiritual development of teachers, which also includes faith leadership and structured leadership training. Perhaps this can be rationalized as "intellectual and spiritual capital" that will lead to strengthening the foundational framework of mission building.

Fourth, this study suggests that the Catholic educational community

of Ontario recognize the crucial importance of being persistent in its efforts to preserve the right to hire Catholic teachers for Catholic schools. It would not want to sacrifice this right by default or indifference. Perhaps consultation and consensus amongst all the concerned parties will lead to the successful protection of this threatened right.

Finally, this study suggests that Catholic school boards should be vigilant about monitoring the longitudinal impact of Bill 30, particularly in relation to Bill 30's ongoing influence on the basic providers of Catholic education, and ultimately, the distinctive integrity and mission of Catholic schools.

#### Implications for Further Research

This study, which has investigated Bill 30's impact on the mission of separate schools, provides a valuable insight into the complex nature that characterizes the spiritual dimension of Catholic schools. The findings support that the dramatic intervention of Bill 30, which has transformed the Separate School System of Ontario, is challenging Catholic education. Consequently, Catholic education has become refocused and revitalized relative to its distinctive mission and ministry. Furthermore, this renewed development in mission building parallels a similar renewal being experienced by Alberta's Catholic schools called Blueprints.

"Blueprints is both a plan and a process. As a plan, it is an attempt to identify more fully and update the mission and ministry of Alberta's Catholic schools. As a process, Blueprints is an intense people-building enterprise" (Laplante, 1988, p.28). Since both of these school systems share common challenges, implications for research become increasingly

valuable, especially in relation to preserving the identity of publicly funded Catholic schools with their renewed Catholic school mission and ministry. Furthermore, such research could contribute significantly to the knowledge base concerning Catholic school theory and practice.

### **The Research Questions Revisited**

#### In Answer to the Research Questions

This study has answered the research question: What are the perceptions of Catholic Administrators and Trustees about Bill 30's impact on the ability of Separate School Boards in Ontario to retain what they see as their distinctive mission of Catholic education? The findings provide clear support that the mission of Catholic schools has been renewed because of the impact of full funding. Concomitantly, answers to the subsidiary questions have also been provided, namely;

1. What impact is Bill 30 having on the practice of providing qualified teachers, supervisory officers, and other personnel who are committed to building a Christian community in the school system? Even though, for a ten year period (1985-1995), some restrictions have been placed on Roman Catholic school boards relative to the hiring of committed Catholic teachers, the findings indicate that the system has not been damaged.

2. What impact is Bill 30 having on the practice of developing each school as a Christian community in all of its academic and non-academic activities? Although there has been an increased presence of non-Catholic teachers and students, their respect for and their participation in the faith life of the school does not appear to be

diminishing the development of Christian community.

3. What impact is Bill 30 having on the practice of providing academic curricula, including formal religious instruction, in which Catholic faith and life are integrated? Notwithstanding the right of non-Catholic students to be exempt from mandatory religious education courses, the academic and religious integrity of Catholic schools has not been compromised.

Since this aspect of Bill 30 has emerged as a critical issue, particularly in reference to the mission of Catholic schools, it too has been identified and articulated within the context of a subsidiary question.

4. What impact is Bill 30 having on the practice of promoting non-Catholics to positions of responsibility. Section 136-1a, which comes into effect in 1995 if not successfully challenged and defeated, addresses the right of promotion for non-Catholic teachers teaching for Catholic school boards. This study strongly supports that positions of responsibility should not be available for non-Catholic teachers beyond department head. Leadership positions must be available only to Catholics, and more specifically to thoroughly committed Catholics. There must be a personal belief in both the traditions and practice of separate schools if Catholic leadership is to be authentic and effective.

#### **In Conclusion**

This study has answered several important questions relative to Bill 30's impact on the distinctive character of separate schools.

It has reinforced and validated the significance of the three basic providers of Catholic education. It has illustrated too, that the mixed blessings of Bill 30 have reawakened the separate schools of Ontario and led to a re-examination of mission and ministry.

Bill 30 has changed the nature of the system. It has expanded it and transformed it. The increased visibility, accountability, and vulnerability that now characterizes Catholic education in the province of Ontario have caused separate schools to articulate, to clarify, and to defend their purpose for being. Surely, this must be counted as one of Bill 30's best blessings. "Sometimes the Lord takes us into troubled waters, not to drown us but to cleanse us".

## REFERENCES



## References

- Alberta Catholic School Trustees Association. (1985). Visions for the Catholic School Vol. 1. Edmonton: University of Alberta.
- Blishen, B. (1990). Catholic Education In The Separate School System Of Ontario. Toronto: Institute For Catholic Education.
- Bibby, R. W. (1990). Mosaic Madness. Toronto: Stoddart Publishing Co. Limited.
- Bibby, R. W. (1987). Fragmented Gods: the Poverty and Potential of Religion in Canada. Toronto: Irwin Publishing.
- Bogdan, R. C. & Biklen, S. K. (1982). Qualitative Research For Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods. Toronto: Allyn an Bacon.
- Boich, J. (1985). The new political realities in education in Ontario. Reporter, 10(8), pp.30-37.
- Cavalluzo, P. (1985). The Premier's statement of intent. Reporter, Commemorative Issue, pp.45.
- Completion Office - Separate Schools. (1988). Catholic Education and Separate School Boards in Ontario. Toronto: Catholic Education Foundation of Ontario.
- Coo, S. (1985). OECTA's 40-year battle for funding. Reporter, Commemorative Issue, pp.16-23.
- Coo, S. (1984). The First Forty Years; O.E.C.T.A. 1944-1984. Toronto: T. H. Best Printing Company Limited.
- Dixon, R. M. (1976). "The Ontario Separate School System and Section 93 of the British North America Act". Doctoral Dissertation, University of Toronto: T. H. Best Printing Co. Limited.
- Geertz, C. (1975). The Interpretation of Cultures. London: Hutchinson.
- Glasser, B. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine.
- Guba, E. & Lincoln, E. (1982) Educational Communication and Technology, A Journal of Theory, Research, and Development, 30(4), pp. 233-257.
- Hammersley, M. & Atkinson, P. (1983). Ethnography: Principles in practice. London: Tavistock.

- Hammersley, M. (1979) 'Data collection in ethnographic research', block 4, part 3 of courses DE304, Research Methods in Education and the Social Sciences, Melton Keynes, Open University Press.
- Hargreaves, A. & Earl, L. (1990). Rights Of Passage: A Review Of Selected Research About Schooling In The Transition Years. Toronto: Ministry of Education.
- Hickcox, E. (1984). It's tough to ask the questions: tackling the separate school funding initiative. Orbit, 15(4), pp.3-4.
- Hickcox, E. (1985). Tackling the separate school funding initiative: an absence of dialogue. Orbit, 16(2), pp.3-4.
- Holmes, M. (1984). Funding Catholic Schools. Field Development Newsletter Toronto: Department of Educational Administration, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Irwin, R. L. (1988). The Practical Knowledge of a Fine Arts Supervisor in Educational Change: A Case Study. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of British Columbia.
- Jamison, C. (1985). Why Davis acted on completion Now. Reporter, Commemorative Issue, pp.8-14.
- Lacey, C. (1976). 'Problems of sociological fieldwork: A review of the methodology of "Hightown Grammar"', in Hammersley, M. and Woods, P. (eds), The Process of Schooling, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Laplante, R. (1988). Catholic Education Is A Uniquely Positive Heritage That Deserves More Recognition. Compass, October, pp.23-29.
- Laplante, R. (1985). Do You Mean What We Mean? A Catholic School Lexicon. Edmonton: University of Alberta.
- Leddy, M.J. & Bishop DeRoo, R. & Roche, D. (1992). In the Eye of the Catholic Storm. Toronto: Harper Collins Publishers Ltd.
- McConnell, H. & Pyra, J. (1990). The Impact of Some Aspects of the Constitution and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms on Education. Journal of Education and Law, 2(1), pp.1-48.
- Mulligan, J. T. (1990). Evangelization and the Catholic High School. Ottawa: Novalis.
- Nelligan, B. E. (1983). The School Curriculum - The Catholic Difference. The Catholic Trustee, September. pp.12-20.

- O'Brien, G. S. (1990). Leadership In Catholic Education. Thunder Bay, Ontario: Lakehead Separate School Board.
- Ontario Catholic Supervisory Officers Association. (1991). Catholicity in the Curriculum - Curriculum Design Model Secondary Schools. Toronto: Published by OCSOA.
- Ontario Conference of Catholic Bishops. (1989). This Moment of Promise: A Pastoral Letter on Catholic Education in Ontario. Toronto: Published by the Ontario Conference of Catholic Bishops.
- Ontario Conference of Catholic Bishops. (1984). Pupil and Teacher Access to New Catholic Secondary Schools: Pastoral Guideline. Toronto: Published by the Ontario Conference of Catholic Bishops.
- Ontario Legislature, (1986). An Act to amend the Education Act, Bill 30. Toronto: Ministry of the Attorney General.
- Ontario Separate School Trustees Association. (1987). Bill 30 - The Supreme Court of Canada Judgement. The Catholic Trustee, September special insert.
- Ontario Separate School Trustees Association. (1988). Papal Address to the Bishops of Ontario on Catholic Schools. The Catholic Trustee, April, pp.3 & 24.
- Pacquette, J. (1990). Rewriting the Social Contract of Ontario's Education. Journal of Education and Law, 5(1), pp.241-264.
- Patton, M. Q. (1988). How to Use Qualitative Methods in Evaluation. London: Sage Publications.
- Philips, D. C. (1987) Validity in Qualitative Research Why the Worry About Warrant Will Not Wane. Journal of Education and Urban Society, 20(1), Nov., pp.9-24.
- Powney, J. & Watts, M. (1987). Interviewing In Educational Research. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Limited.
- Reilly, T. (1988). Encouraging Catholic Leadership. The Catholic Trustee, 27(1), pp.2-3.
- Royackers, M. (1988). The Purpose of a Separate Catholic School System Has Not Been Fully Thought Out. Compass, October, pp.23-29.
- Sacred Congregation For Catholic Education. (1988). The Religious Dimension Of Education In A Catholic School. Rome: Vatican Polyglot Press.
- Sacred Congregation For Catholic Education. (1982). Lay Catholics In Schools: Witness To Faith. Rome: Vatican Polyglot Press.

- Sacred Congregation For Catholic Education. (1977). The Catholic School. Rome: Vatican Polyglot Press.
- Second Vatican Council. (1965). "Declaration on Christian Education". The Documents of Vatican 11, Guild Press ("Vatican 11").
- Smith, J. K. (1983). Quantitative Versus Qualitative Research: An Attempt to Clarify the Issue. Educational Researcher, 12, pp.6-13.
- Soltis, J.F. (1984). On the Nature of Educational Research. Educational Researcher, 2, pp.5-11.
- Stamp, R. M. (1985) The Historical Background to Separate Schools In Ontario. Toronto: Queen's Printer for Ontario.
- Stortz, G. J. (1985). Separate But Never Equal: The Catholic Schools of Ontario in Historical Perspective. Grail, 1(1), pp.65-72.
- The Basilian Fathers. (1987). Catholic Elementary and Secondary Education in Ontario - A Position Paper. Toronto: Printed by the Basilian Fathers.
- Walker, F. (1964). Catholic Education and Politics in Ontario. Toronto: Nelson.
- Westhues, K. (1985). Catholic Separate Schools: An Ambiguous Legacy. Grail, 1(1), pp.51-64.
- Woods, Peter. (1986). Inside Schools. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul Incorporation.

## Appendix 1

(This inventory of questions is a proposed guide for interview purposes. It is not intended to be systematic or prescriptive.)

### General Overview Questions

(1) Do you think that full funding is a blessing or a curse? Explain.

(2) Comment please on why you personally believe it is necessary to have publicly funded separate schools?

(3) Would you comment on your board's Philosophy of Education and your board's Mission Statement? What is the relationship between this philosophy and the board's stated goals and objectives? What role do the trustees, administrators and teachers play in the transmission of this philosophy?

(4) What were your reactions and feelings to the announcement of full funding?

(5) What impact has Bill 30 had on your board's philosophy, structure, or goals and objectives?

(6) What issues have proven most challenging to your board (locally) regarding the implementation of Bill 30? What issues do you feel have emerged provincially? If there is a variance can you explain why?

(7) Has Bill 30 brought prosperity to the separate school system / your system / your school? Comment? Why does the Catholic community differentiate between full funding and equitable funding?

### **Teacher Related Questions**

(1) Prior to the announcement of full funding, did your board hire non Catholic teachers? Approximately how many? Would you share your comments on this practice. What was your reaction to Bill 30's mandate to hire public school secondary teachers. Explain?

(2) How many teachers are employed by this board? How many teachers are employed at the secondary level? Comment on the growth in staff, both elementary and secondary, since full funding in 1984.

(3) How many secondary schools are there in the system now? How many were there before the announcement of full funding? Were facility transfer(s) negotiated. Comment on this process please.

(4) What specific changes did Bill 30 initiate in your system?

(5) In what year did your board apply to the Planning and Implementation Committee for approval to provide full secondary programming? How many teachers were hired from the coterminous board in the first year? Second year? etc. Is this transfer of staff still continuing? Will 1995 be the closing year?

(6) What method is used by your board annually to calculate the transfer of public secondary staff made redundant by Catholic secondary completion? Has this been the only method used?

(7) How many transferred public secondary school teachers are now employed by this board? Has their increased numbers created any concerns?

(8) What policy or practice governs their distribution into the schools? Have any of these teachers been placed in the elementary panel? If so, why?

(9) Are the non-Catholic teachers expected to participate in the spiritual culture of the school? How successful has this been?

(10) How do you explain to them the philosophical difference between a public school and a Catholic school?

(11) What guidance or in service is provided to assist them in their growth as a teacher in a Catholic school? What action is taken (at the school level, at the system level) if they refuse to participate in these expectations?

(12) Do you think this aspect of Bill 30 (teacher transfer) is having a demonstrable or measurable influence on the Catholicity of the schools

and of the system? Explain.

(13) What are your personal feelings and concerns about Section 136L-a? Do you support legal recourse to sever this section of the Education Act? Why do you believe that the right to hire Catholic teachers is crucial to the provision of Catholic education?

(14) What are your fears for Catholic education if the right to hire Catholic teachers is permanently removed?

#### **Community Related questions**

(1) What do you understand Christian Catholic community to mean? Identify characteristics of community. Can it be effectively promoted and fostered by non-Catholic teachers and students? Explain?

(2) What is the role of a Catholic school today? Has this role changed? What values must it teach? How are these values different from those in a public school?

(3) How many Open Access students are in your secondary school(s)? How do these students affect the climate in the school? Do they in any way hinder the development of a Christian Catholic culture within the school? If so how?

(4) What specific aspects of Catholic tradition and practice foster



the building of Christian community within separate secondary schools?  
How does the increased numbers of non-Catholic teachers and students  
affect these traditions and practices?

(5) Do you believe that Catholic secondary schools have become too  
competitive with public secondary schools and consequently, have diminished  
or lost their sense of mission? What are other factors which mitigate  
against the building of community within a Catholic secondary school?

(6) What kind of expansion has your board experienced since full funding?  
Has this expansion brought increased bureaucratic (centralized) growth?  
What impact is this having on your system's sense of community?

### **Curricula Related Questions**

(1) How many requests for exemption from religious education has your  
school/ board received?

(2) Have any of these requests come from Catholic students? Have they  
been granted? Why or why not?

(3) Have these requests increased with the increased number of Open  
Access students? Exactly how many Open Access students are there in  
your school? Is this an area that concerns you? Explain,

(4) How many religious education credit courses are compulsory (only

two permitted)? If it is more than two, what ministry courses are the others tied to? What is the general reception of students toward these courses? Has the increased presence of non Catholic exempted students influenced the merits of these courses?

(5) How is the separate school philosophy of curriculum formed into academic subjects like English, History, Mathematics, and Science? Is there any sensitivity about this permeation of Catholic values, especially since some of the teachers and students are not Catholic? If so, what impact is this having at the school level? at the system level?

(6) How do prayer, liturgical celebrations, symbols, chapel, chaplain, and retreats play a significant role in Catholic school education? Why do you think they are perceived as an integral component of the learning program? What has been the response of non-Catholic teachers and students? What other ways can a Catholic high school promote Catholic education?

(7) What legitimacy is there to the concern that full funding has exchanged financial viability for instability within the separate school system?

(8) What curricula safeguards are necessary to ensure that separate schools do not lose their distinctive Catholic mission?

## APPENDIX 2

### INTERVIEW #13: ANDREW

ANDREW, the threshold question, where I begin, full funding, Bill 30, blessing or curse?

ANDREW Both, it's a blessing and a curse. It's a blessing in that in the separate schools we'll be adequately funded, and we'll also be recognized to be significant players, partners in the education process of public funding of education in Ontario, along with our co-terminus public boards. Now we're not really fully funded yet, until we access all of the assessment, that will come within five, six years. That's certainly a blessing, and we can provide then for our ratepayers in terms of resources and facilities, stronger programs. That's the up side, and also pay our employees appropriately and whatever. I remember earlier in my career, when I worked for private high school, we had to struggle financially. It's also a curse, is that the word you used? Maybe that's a strong word, but it does have it's down side. In my view, the down side is that we may lose some of that tradition. A lot of Catholic schools were founded on by religious orders, who stepped into the breach to assist with the funding, as well as the running of the schools, teaching in the schools. They did that for less salary, out of commitment to Catholic education. Parents had a commitment to Catholic education in that they paid tuition fees. There was a collegial spirit with ratepayers, teacher, and clergy working together, to use fundraising schemes to finance Catholic schools,

and that really created team and unity. We talk about the triad of church, school, family, and we may be losing some of that now, I'm not saying we're losing that because of funding. We're losing it because of a lot of other reasons as well. My concern is that that brought us together, it was a way coalesce around an issue, which was let's pay for our Catholic high schools. It created a lot of comradery and whatever. You also had a lot of commitment on the part of the teachers, the clergy, and the pupils who attended those school, because when we didn't have the funding, and we had to pay, there was a recognition that we had to make sacrifice to attend Catholic schools, and to support Catholic schools. So in that sense, we may lose some of that. So we could lose some of our tradition and we could lose some of spirit of togetherness. I guess I would sum up by saying that the danger of full funding as well is that we'll become ho hum blase about Catholic education and it's another public education system, and the expectation on the part of everyone, ratepayers, teachers, and pupils will be - we want exactly what's in the public system, and we might lose some of our heritage, and that would be a shame.

Do you remember where you were, what you were doing when the announcement came down?

ANDREW At that time I was principal at ..... High School, that was June 1984, as I remember and slated to go to the ministry. I had just been seconded to go to the ministry. So yes I do remember where I was at that time.

Do you remember your feelings, your reactions? Do you remember having feelings of elation, or contrary feelings?

ANDREW First of all, I was really surprised, that was my first reaction, it was a real surprise, it sort of came as a real thunderbolt. I don't recall a great deal of lead up to that, it was a very sudden announcement. I guess like everyone else, I was really really surprised that Bill Davis had decided that the time had come. A lot of people speculated that he was leaving and he always felt badly about it. The only one that could really tell you that would be Bill Davis, if you interviewed him. My first reaction was surprise and secondly, pleasure, I was very happy to see, because I was then in the public system, but I had just come from being a vice-principal in a large Catholic high school, so I knew what the impact of all that would be on that environment. I thought, in terms of the previous question, all the positive things I thought of. I think it's only afterwards that we thought of the more negative things.

When you had a chance, as an administrator to deal with the challenges of Bill 30, were you surprised that they were as numerous as they were?

ANDREW I guess the thing that hit me the most was the legal ramifications of it all. It became a very legal issue and that's what hit me the most. I recall then where I was involved with most of the implementation, was when I went to Thunder Bay, as supervisory officer, and getting involved there. My memory was that our concerns were in that jurisdiction, about transferred teachers, about facilities, about funding and it became a real question of what were the legal rights and entitlements, and how was the money going to be carved up between the two boards. It became quite a challenging and exciting project as well, that excited me. I thought

that was kind of a challenge, a stimulating challenge, it's new ground. So I guess the real thing was how legal it became.

When you're confronted by people,

ANDREW, about a publicly funded Catholic school system, what do you say?

ANDREW I don't have any trouble with that question, I really don't. Maybe it's because I'm a student of history, and I'm a student of political science, and my answer always is that it was enshrined in the Constitutional agreement, the Constitutional Compact of Confederation, and quite clearly the Supreme Court Justices thought that way too. The Ontario Court of appeal, my memory was, was two to one in the first challenge to the Constitutionality of Bill 30, extension of public funding to Catholic schools, and it was for grades 11, 12, and 13 only, but then the issue became Catholic schools generally. But really the whole issue was funding for grades 11, 12, 13, and the Supreme Court of Canada, ruled nine/nothing, I mean that's a knockout blow. I would say, I gained a lot of confidence and assurance from that ruling, that they saw it so clearly. How many Supreme Court rulings do we see that are nine/nothing? So quite clearly it was enshrined in the Canadian Constitution, so Canadian Ontario Catholic ratepayers really had that right for a long time. So I don't have a problem with it, in terms of Constitutional history I don't, and as a practising Roman Catholic, I feel very good about that as well, because that was the, not only do we have two founding languages, English and French, but to some degree we had a strong strong Catholic tradition when Canada was founded. I don't have any

difficulties in defending the decision. I also believe that it's important to note that not only was the Supreme Court ruling nine/nothing, but also the fact that the all three parties in Ontario supported it, the NDP did, the Liberal party, and the last party to support it was the Conservative party of Bill Davis that made the announcement, so we had all parties' support. Even when the vote was in the legislature, it seems to me that there was only one negative vote that I can remember, now again I'm doing this by memory. So no, all those reasons would tell me, plus the growing number of Catholics, it's interesting, at Confederation there were a lot of Catholics, but there's been a tremendous Catholic influx of immigrants into Canada, particularly into Ontario, who will derive benefits from this. I guess the last part of my answer would be, would I derive satisfaction, and I think in the city of Thunder Bay when I give my example. In the city of Thunder Bay, Bill 30 was probably good for the taxpayers of that city in that all of the high schools are now being used to their capacity, and they've been shared through a process where the two schools were shared, where the two schools were transferred over, which probably would have had to been closed anyway by the public board. So who wins there, all the taxpayers win. In rural settings, I think it's a much more difficult issue, as we've seen in ethics. We had one high school in the community, and I think it's probably become somewhat divisive in this community, but in large urban settings. Here in Durham, where I work now, it's such tremendous growth with both boards, that it hasn't been a matter of sharing or transferring schools, or teachers, or any of that issue. It's been a matter of both boards dealing with the growth.

ANDREW first, Catholic system, how important is it to have a well articulate mission statement, specific goals and objectives, and a defined philosophy of education?

ANDREW It's critical, very very important, absolutely critical. See that goes with the notion that if we're being publicly funded, if we can't show that we're schools with a difference, then why don't we just have one system, because we're publicly funded anyway. It doesn't mean that Catholic schools are better, sometimes in my career, I've had bread placed on my table from working with the public system, I don't think we should every criticize the public system, but rather argue that we have a different mission. I think that our ratepayers, and indeed the public out there that pay taxes, have to see, even if they're non-Catholic, that the Catholic system is trying to articulate a philosophy that is congruant with their beliefs about themselves, and about society, and I think it's important that we as Catholic school system, promote our Catholic faith within the curriculum in an integrated fashion. If we don't do that, and if we don't articulate that to our publics, then I think we should really question why we are a school with a difference.

What roles do, the different stakeholders have in the transmission of that philosophy - youth ministrators, the teachers, the trustees, what are their roles, as you see them?

ANDREW First of all, I'm not sure the roles are distinct. I think they each have different things to implement. It has to be first of all a shared philosophy. All the stakeholders have to have ownership for whatever the mission statement is, because everyone has their part to



play in it. Trustees establish the broad strokes of policy, provide direction and orientation to the schools, it's up to the supervisory officers to implement those policies in the schools, and it's up to the principals, and the principal's a very key player, because they're school based administration, they're very critical, have to share that vision. They're the ones where the teachers will key, I guess supervisory officers will key off their trustees, the principals will key off the supervisory officers, and the teachers will develop their attitudes to some degree from the person they work most closely with, which is the school principal. It's important that those significant stakeholders understand what our mission is, and are able to articulate it quite clearly.

Do you think that the average trustee, teacher, administrator can articulate what's meant by schools with a difference?

ANDREW       What's interesting is, I know with the recent Blisson report pointed that out, we all view the world through our own lenses, through our own glasses. I suppose trustees view the world from the area of policy, the area of responding to demands from ratepayers and the electorate, that's the world they live in, to some degree. Superintendents, supervisory officers, tend to be administratively and task orientated, so I think that each one of those groups might view it just a little bit differently. That's why it's so important, I think, to have meaningful dialogue with those groups frequently, sitting down as a planning group, with representatives from trustees, principals, supervisory officers and going over their mission statement, then seeing if that's congruent with this year's aims and objectives in the short term, and then in the long term,

what are the five year aims and objectives. It's important that we check each other out, because we have different engines that drive us, and if we don't talk to each other about this, like this moment of promise talks about as well, and the fact that the Blisson report has suggested, at least in that research, that there are some differences of what Catholic schools are all about. I think it's important to dialogue frequently. It doesn't mean any one group is wrong, it means let's compare notes, let's talk about it, and let's establish what it is that we can agree on, then let's put that into action in our Catholic schools.

What do you think are the major challenges that have grown out of Bill 30 for Catholic education?

ANDREW Never as before do we have to sit down and look at our mission statement, it's more important to us now, so that we are articulating a vision of our faith. We have to look at the realities that the children are living in, the social ills problems. We have to look at what it is we want to do, the legislative responsibilities that we have with respect to education, and our financial resources to do it, and make wise decisions about how we're going to spend their money. I think we also have to provide a quality program, we have to provide the very same program, in terms of the three R's that our co-terminus public boards do. We have to at the same time, integrate within that our Catholic philosophy. It's so so important that our teachers who are coming to our boards have that message, that they're not just applying to another public board, that they're applying to a Catholic school board, and that they want to teach at that Catholic school board because of conviction, because they're making a conscious choice to

teach for a Catholic school board, and what that involves, and that it has a different mission than teaching for a co-terminus public board. Again I'll go back to the point I made before, it does not mean that we are better. We have a unique opportunity to do something different.

ANDREW, in the past Catholic boards hired non-Catholic teachers out of need. Bill 30 superimposes on that, and goes beyond the need. How important is it to you that Catholic school boards have the right to discriminate in their hiring practices to ensure that Catholic teachers are teaching in Catholic schools?

ANDREW Well I guess it seems to me that the answer to your question is, it's very important that we be allowed to discriminate. It strikes me that the whole logic of having a Catholic schools system falls down when people charged most closely with it's implementation, the classroom teacher, could be non-Catholic. It's very difficult for someone to talk the talk if they haven't walked the walk. What I mean by that is that they are practising Catholics themselves. I think it's an alarming issue and one we're going to have to look at very closely. I had a colleague who once said there are some fights that are worth showing up for. It strikes me that this is one that is, I think we should challenge 136 L.A. to see that we have the right to hire Catholics, because we are a denominational system, albeit a publicly funded one. The hold thing would break down if we had to take non-Catholics. I think it's important that we be allowed to discriminate on religious grounds. That doesn't preclude however, non-Catholic children from attending our schools if they so wish, and it may not also preclude in some instances of being able to hire some non-Catholics to teach. By and large

we should be able to discriminate and hire Catholics to teach in Catholic school systems. After all, if we got a lot of non-Catholics teaching in our system, in time I'm wondering whether our mission would get eroded. At the very delivery level we have people teaching who may not share that vision, because they weren't raised with it.

If you were part of a system that was taking on non-Catholic teachers on an annual basis to meet the requirements of Bill 30, would one, numbers bother you, and two, what initiatives would you like to see in place to help address the non-Catholic teacher within the Catholic school?

ANDREW In a jurisdiction like ..... where by law that had to occur because of redundant teachers in the public board, that could be shown to be redundant by way of Bill 30, there's sort of a Christian Catholic duty to provide for those people, because they were displaced or lost their positions because of the extension of funding. If that can be shown through the formula, then I think we have an obligation to hire these people until that process is finished. With respect to your previous question, although after that's all occurred, you should be allowed to discriminate. With respect to what do you do when these fine individuals come over to teach with you, I think it's important to do a strong teacher induction program. It's important that they understand what the board's mission statement is, accept the philosophy of the board, understand that liturgical sacramental life is part of what goes on in school hours, be supportive of that. I think it's very important that we not try to convert them, I don't see that that's our role, but our role it to have them at least support what it is that we're trying to do in our

Catholic school system, so we need a very strong induction program. It can't be a one shot deal. It can't be something when they come over, you sit down for one or two days, it has to be something that I think each school principal who has non-Catholics with his or her staff, would spend time with these people on an on going basis, to check out their comfort level, and to provide them with the support that a principal can provide, with respect to the fact that they're non-Catholics teaching in a Catholic school environment, where there's an expectation that our mission statement is front and centre. I think the principal, with central support, would be a key player in this process.

ANDREW, how do you feel about the potential promotion of non-Catholic teachers in the Catholic school system. Certainly Bill 30, has, not withstanding the clause, and if 136 L.A. is not struck down, then I would imagine that that not withstanding would also apply. What is your feeling about promotion?

ANDREW That's also an issue that goes back to the question that you asked before about having many non-Catholic teachers in your classrooms. I saw that as a serious issue for Catholic schools, because if that issue was allowed to continue, I question whether we would be able to effectively implement our mission. By extension, I would say that that is even more true with respect to positions of responsibility, because people in positions of responsibility, hold positions in trust. It's their duty to set the standard for other employees, to provide direction, mentoring, coaching, modelling, leadership for these employees, and if they're non-Catholic themselves, I see then a difficulty in having a sense of congruence with the mission of Catholic schools. I guess the one

comment to you is that, I'm not saying that Catholics are better than non-Catholics. You and I both know that that isn't the case, well both one person is better than another. I'm coming from the point of having a strong experiential, knowledge based in the faith tradition of the church. It has to be a lived experience in order for either a leader or a teacher to maybe really fit in. Although I recognize there are fine, outstanding non-Catholic individuals, who probably in some instances could do better jobs than Catholics. All things said and done, all would expect that someone coming through the lived experience would be in a better position. To specifically answer your question, I would view the issue of non-Catholics in leadership positions, as a very very serious issue that we will have to deal with. If you extend it by logic, presumably there would be no cap on the numbers that you could have. So does that mean down the road that if you had one director and five supervisory officers, all six of them could be non-Catholic? If that was the case, how would there be a shared collegial understanding of what Catholic schools are all about. Boy this is an issue that we're really going to have to address.

In the next four years according to provincial \_\_\_\_\_, they're talking about the potential watershed of leadership positions in the province. Does that, given the present climate, and given the challenges of Bill 30, does the leadership question become a much more significant question to you?

ANDREW Absolutely, because you see, these issues are unresolved, so when we're choosing future leaders in our Catholic system, future leaders are going to have to deal with these issues that are still unresolved, 136 L.A. is not resolved, except that we

might be lead to believe that we have to take non-Catholics. Then we're going to have to wrestle with the notion, can we then promote, should non-Catholics, if they can teach for us, why can't they be leaders for us? So future leaders in the separate school system are going to have to come to grips with that issue. I am aware that our board for example is going to try to put a process in place where by non-Catholics will not be able to assume leadership positions within their board. Now there may be a legal challenge to that by OECTA or a teacher exercising heir individual concerns, or a citizen. So how is that all going to play out? That goes back to one of my responses very early in this interview, where you asked me what I thought about Bill 30 and the extension of funding, and I mentioned to you that it's become quite a legal issue, and really this is an example of that. I would think that the future leaders are going to have to think through what their position might be in different case scenarios. If the courts oppose the notion that Catholic school boards can discriminate, well then you have to have a position on that. What if the courts uphold the view that we must take non-Catholics, not only in teaching positions, but in leadership positions, that is going to be a real challenge for the future Catholic leaders to implement that policy.

How important do you think it is to identify inservice, and monies for inservice in the next few years?

ANDREW Well, it's very very important, but it tends to be an area that gets cut in tough times. It's not to say that it isn't important, it's very important, but when you consider that eighty-five percent of a school board's budget is already committed money, committed funds that are used to pay employees, and that

you have about fifteen percent left to play with, discretionary money, of which maybe five to six percent of that money maybe targetted funding, where you have to spend the money on a specific project, it doesn't leave administrators and trustees a great deal of leeway in tough economic times to put money into inservice and professional development, and they're probably two of our highest needs. I would say that anywhere trustees and administration can find money for inservice and professional development, but the one caution that I would give is it has to be planned inservice with planned outcomes. It's got to be money well spent, and it has to be accounted for. If we're going to say that we're going to put so much money into professional development for teachers, then what is the plan for that? How is the money going to be spent, and what are the attended outcomes for that plan? How will that be evaluated, so that we can get some sense that we're not just saying that we spend money on teacher inservice and professional development, without a good tracking mechanism to determine well is that money being effectively spent? I do think that it's very important, but I think the aims and objectives of a program have to be clearly articulated with a plan and strong intended outcomes.

**ANDREW**, the teachers federation, what role, can you comment on their role since Bill 30? Have you been pleased with their responses? Have you been concerned? Can you just generally comment?

**ANDREW** I'll be very blunt, I think OECTA, the Ontario English Catholic Teachers' Association has become more of a union and less of a Catholic organization because they've had to struggle with what really are they. Are they a union, where they have to



protect all their members, or are they a Catholic organization? In fairness to them, I think it's a struggle that they are really wrestling with. I think all said and done, they are more of a union than a Catholic organization by the nature of what it is that they do. Unfortunately they may not become the significant partner in terms of enterprises as much as we would like, because they have to respect all of their members, so they have to respect the rights of their non-Catholic members, as they should I suppose. I think OECTA has really been placed in a dilemma. For example, it's my understanding that they're going to stand in the sidelines with respect to 136 L.A., a challenge to that. One would assume that a Catholic organization would want to protect the fact that we're Catholic, for all of the reasons I've stated personally in this interview, but they're trapped. They can't do that because they have non-Catholic members now. I guess a union's objective is to protect them. I really think they're caught up in it. I guess the other thing that bothers me is that in the collective bargaining process, they still ask for parity with their co-terminus public boards, when they know that the board has less ability than the neighbour to pay it. When there is a time that we can demonstrate that we are equally, and totally equally funded, maybe that case can be made. They're making the case now, and they want everything that the current public system has now, before we have the same funding level that they have, not only the same funding level at this time. Remember the public boards have had that extra funding for a long time, and have been able to put that money into reserves. That disappoints me, maybe I'm asking too much of them. It's a teacher welfare organization, and then as I reflect on the comments I've just made, maybe I'm being harsh, but I guess I am somewhat

disappointed. Maybe I should understand that that's the times that we live in.

Do you think as a result of Bill 30, rather than being innovated in the secondary programming area and the extension secondary grades, because of expansion, because of the pressing needs, Catholic school boards tend to imitate the co-terminus in the delivery of education, as opposed to being innovative in the delivery of education? Can you comment on that?

ANDREW We have a unique chance in Catholic schools to be not only different in terms of our mission statement, but because we don't have the long history of composite, fully composite secondary schools, we have the opportunity to launch into new directions in terms of technological education, business education, adult education, particularly this co-operative education at the secondary level. We're not bound by the traditions that our co-terminus public boards are, and in my view, it should be easier for Catholic secondary schools to implement change, than public secondary schools because we're not encumbered by that history, and vested interests that hold notions about programs and positions within the public secondary schools. Coupled with that is, let's not blow the chance, because we now have it, let's take advantage of it, and we really shouldn't be looking at our co-terminus public boards for the model as the way to go. I think we should take a look at what they do, pick out those things that we think are really desirable to replicate or imitate, and launch into some new directions after some sound research in terms of other programs, because we also have very young staff by and large in our Catholic secondary schools. They're going to be young for only a short period of time. If

we don't do it within the next ten years, we may never do it. I think in some instances there's a tendency to want to imitate and I really hope that Catholic school boards put up that red caution light, again not to be critical of the public system, but rather to say that we have an unique chance, we have a wonderful opportunity to do some significant things in terms of program, and facilities, and delivery of programs in our schools, and why don't we take that chance and analyze it and look to see what we can do different to meet the needs of the nineties and the next century.

Do you think the increased open access students in the Catholic high school has had any impact?

ANDREW I don't think so, at least I don't have the sense it does, although Thunder Bay jurisdiction may be in a better position to comment on that now, because of the number of open access students. I think here in Durham, I'm not sure of the statistics, I don't think they're very high, infact I would suggest they're quiet low, I'm not aware of it having a tremendous impact, at least here.

If you were working on a very small board, would in your mind, it might play a larger role, an impact in a much different way?

ANDREW Well I would think if you had a high number of open access pupils, coming into a secondary school, knowing that they have the right not to take religious education programs, then you have two sets of students in your school, operating under different sets of expectations with respects to religious education programs, and maybe their commitment to the mission of Catholic schools. So I would think that that would

require a principal and a board to want to have to develop some pretty innovative strategies for dealing with that situation, so that you don't get two classes of students in our schools. I recognize you have to waive the religious ed. requirements for the students, but then they should be caught up in the life of the school everywhere else. Presumably they've chosen to come to the Catholic school as a conscious choice, one would assume that there is a near by public high school that they could have gone to. Hopefully that means they buy into the mission of that particular school.

Every school has a culture, we've talked about that, it has a sense of community, but when you talk about Catholic community in a Catholic school, how is that different to you?

ANDREW It's an interesting question, a Catholic community in a Catholic school, how is that different..... Well, that is a very difficult question because I suppose sometimes if you walk into a Catholic high school, you say to yourself, what is it that I see here that makes this place different? The first thing that you might see is uniforms, but is that what makes the school different? I would think not, that might be part, but not a significant part. I would want to see when I went into a school, that is a Catholic community, a place where I see people who care about each other, who share, who treat each other with respect, who treat property with respect, who are allowed to voice their views on subjects in an acceptable way, who are given the opportunity to think critically about issues about themselves, others, their environment. Now that's pretty idealistic stuff that I'm talking about, but I think that's the kind of environment, where the faith life of the school is in evidence too, where

liturgy is promoted. You and I know that the only church that many of our students, and I would probably have to say the majority of them, is that their church experience is the school, it's no longer their parish church. Many of our children, students do not go to church, nor do their families, yet they still seem to choose Catholic schools. In many instances, and I think this moment of promise talked about that too, the school has become to some degree the church. Well the school isn't the church, but it can provide some wonderful faith experiences for kids, where there's retreats, where there's a liturgy program, where there's chaplaincy, where there's a fine quality education, where respect and value for human beings is dealt with in the sense that we're all here to serve the Lord.

How important are external signs, the symbols and the icons?

ANDREW I think that the icons and the symbols are important, but don't make more out of them than what they really are. When you walk into a Catholic school, it should be visibly Catholic, with an ambience, with an environment that's readily identifiable, this is a Catholic school; the crucifix, the celebration of the resurrection, chapels, chaplaincy, pastoral teams, pictures of our faith, of the things that we commonly believe should be around the school and in evidence. I think they are very important, you should know that this is a Catholic school the minute that you walk into it. Then when you get below that level, which is the symbols, hopefully, if we're really achieving what we want, after talking to the people that go there and assessing that community, then we see that it's a lived experience in terms of the Catholic school. That's what we really have to aim for.

That's a little more difficult to measure.

The concept of compulsory Christian Living or religious education courses, from your experience, are they received positively by the students and by the staff?

ANDREW I would say in communities where there's a long tradition of Catholic high schools, they are. I would think in communities which are just starting Catholic secondary education, that's going to be a tougher struggle. But again to quote the expression I used a little while ago, that's a fight we have to show up for, because if we're Catholic schools, in my personal view, there should be compulsory courses for credit. I think that if we're a Catholic school system, that's one of the visible, tangible ways that we demonstrate that, because if we give on that issue, what's next? What's the next issue we give on? Why should we apologize? We have the right to do that, and we should do it. Yes, students could argue back that cuts out some of my choices, right, but you're coming to a Catholic school, under open access you can go else where. I think the fact that we teach very strong Christian Living, religious education programs in grades 9, 10, 11, and 12, is important, because it gives the kids the opportunity to talk about very important issues in a Catholic context.

What's the role then ANDREW, of the Catholic school in the 1990's?

ANDREW Catholic school in the 1990's.....Well, I've always liked that aim in education, that we have to teach our students to be able to relate to themselves, to others, to their environment, to their world, and

to their God. I suppose if you could give an aim and be able to think critically about themselves, and be good independent problem solvers, they're lofty goals. I think that's what a Catholic school should be all about. I think it should also be invitational and warm, and it should be a place where students want to be. We should visibly demonstrate the faith life that we want, and try and encourage students to participate in the sacramental life of the church. I think that we've got to watch that we don't come on too strong. It has to be, in my view, to borrow a marketing term, a softer sell. We sell by example, we sell by making the activity invitational. We sell by making the students take ownership for what's going on, helping them plan the experiences that they're going to share in. I think that's what's important. I don't think the students of the next century are interested in the weighty theological issues of the day. I think they're more concerned with getting along with their neighbour, sharing this planet with other people, and we have a wonderful faith which can give us a lot of direction in that area. That's my way of thinking what a Catholic school should be about.

...A lot of food for thought there. Are there any issues that we haven't mentioned yet, that you would like to go back and recapture, or recommment on before I proceed with the last couple of questions?

ANDREW Well, I think we've covered most of the major issues with respect to Bill 30, other than saying Lil that I really worry we might....funding may become an idol or an icon for us, it may seduce us to some degree. We get this money, and build wonderful plants, whatever, and suddenly discovering it is like walking into a room full of toys when you've been

poverty. I worry that we might lose sight of the forest for the trees. I guess I have covered that, but I guess that worries me. A lot of people came through this tradition of not having a lot, and sacrificing so much. We might lose all of that, and I'm not saying right now, but if that gets eroded, little by little each year, over a fifteen year period when you're asking these very same questions, or some is asking these same questions, I hope we don't have a different system that I would like to see, but I fear we may if we're not careful. Money wasn't the solution to everything, because along with the money, is a sense of responsibility to keep all of the great things that we had and have.

Our system, the separate school system, has always prided itself on the philosophy of curriculum, it's a pervasive philosophy, in that it begins the day and it ends the day. Talk to me about Catholic math, Catholic science, because there are people who say, what's the difference?

ANDREW It's a fair question, in what ways does Catholicity permeate the curriculum, integrate the curriculum. I think it starts with the teacher, I think that's the first thing that it starts with. If that teacher demonstrates sensitivity, care, warmth towards others, tolerance, is a faith model for the students, and starts the class off each day with a prayer or a reflection, that students can buy into and take ownership for by sharing that around. I think teacher should start their own class with a prayer, and that might be seven or eight a day, or four a day, fine. That demonstrates to the students right off of the bat, yes this is math class, but this is a Catholic school, and we're asking the Lord Jesus to assist us as we go through this. The teaching strategy that the teacher uses, again, treating



each person with respect and care, and empathy, praise, all those kinds of things that Jesus teaches us, if the teacher acts that way. That's the most important thing in curriculum, is the delivery of the program. In a Catholic school that can be pretty evident. I'm saying non-Catholics can do all those things too, but it's particularly important that we do them. I think that's one way that you can integrate in curriculum. In some subjects, it's possible to integrate so called Catholic themes into the curriculum, you certainly can do that in history where it's appropriate, in geography when you look at the Holy Land, or history if you looked at to some degree the history of the church. If you were doing a course on world religions, you certainly could be looking at Catholicism. I would argue in the very disciplines, it it possible at times to work in some Catholic themes. In science you can look at to some degree, let's say creationism is a Catholic theme, but it's possible to have a discussion of that, the origin of the world, etc. So I think wherever appropriate, you try and work that in. I guess fundamentally I really believe it rests with the teacher.

Father Mulligan talks about the need to evangelize and the fact that a Catholic school has to be counter-cultural. Do you think that that is something that has become more and more the responsibility of Catholic schools in the 1990's? Or was it always?

ANDREW I think it's more and more, as I indicated in an earlier response, more and more I think the church experience for students, if there's any church experience at all for our Catholic kids, it will be in schools and not the churches themselves. There's many reasons for that,

certainly our aging clergy and the issue of married vs. non-married clergy, those kinds of things I think are difficult issues that have to be resolved in a different forum, but I think Catholic schools to some degree have become the church, and where students are getting a knowledge more than grade 8 is going to be in the Catholic secondary schools, it's not going to be in the churches.

Are there certain safeguards ANDREW , in your mind that are absolutely necessary for separate school boards to have, to retain that philosophy of curriculum?

ANDREW Well I'll go back to it's so critical of the people we hire. The safeguards, I would think, starts with your hiring. You have to sit down and hire committed people, because the more you look at it, the research tell us, the most significant relationship in schools is the relationship between the individual teacher and the student. We could create all kinds of wonderful paper documents, and they are good, but I think money would be wisely invested in hiring sound people. So have a good either teacher induction process, training process, inservice that you mentioned earlier, get the kind of people in our schools to effect that mission statement. I think that's the safeguard in who we hire. We have to resolve these issues like 136 L.A. and whether non-Catholics can hold leadership.

Do you support legal redress, to appeal 136 L.A.?

ANDREW Who appeals it? We appeal it? Yes, I do, absolutely. As I indicated earlier, I think we have to get that issue resolved. My preference would be that we have Catholic teachers and Catholic

administrators. We have to get that issue resolved, so let's appeal it and find out what the answer is, and go on from there. If the answer is yes, then fine, we carry on. If it's no, then we have a whole new set of problems that we've already described in this interview that we're going to have to work on, and that's going to require some pretty interesting leadership to do that.

Do you think the bishops of Ontario have tended to side step the issue of the non-Catholic teachers in Catholic high schools?

ANDREW This is a hard one for me, obviously I'm not privy to the inner counsels of the bishops' OCCBB. You hear stories that they were worried that maybe we shouldn't rock the boat. That was before the Constitutional issue was resolved. I have a feeling that the bishops are very concerned about now that we have funding that they want it to be a Catholic environment. I would think that they would be supportive of the issue of fighting 136 L.A.

Twice you've resorted to this Moment of Promise. Are you impressed with that particular pastoral document?

ANDREW Yes, I thought that was an exceedingly well crafted, thought provoking document. There's a lot in there for people, it's an excellent vehicle for boards to use to promote dialogue with the significant stakeholders in the board. I think it's a wonderful start. We need to do more of that kind of thing, but I think that was a wonderful start of the process, well worth reading. You know we were talking about teacher inductions, it would be worth while for every teacher to read that and to reflect on it. One thing that I haven't mentioned in this interview so

far is teacher education. Do you have a question on that? [No, just follow through] Well I'm of the view that what we might to consider is some teacher pre-service courses at the faculties, so that teachers who are in their teacher training, would like to apply to Catholic school boards, they should have an opportunity to take a course within the faculty of education dealing with the practices and philosophies and mission statements of Catholic school boards. Then they would have a sense of what they're applying to. I would call that a pre-service course, I think that's the term we would use. Then I'm of the view, and I'll say it, should be required to take religious education part I, the OECTA/OSSTA course as a condition of employment because I've only got part one myself, but it was a wonderful course, and it really deepens people's faith, or at least exposes them more, but also gives them a sense of assurance, it really helps their comfort level as they go in to work in Catholic schools. I think religious education part I should be a prerequisite for all teachers, and I really think it's a wonderful course, and excellent for teacher induction. Then I would argue for leadership, that the specialist is a prerequisite, and I would mandate it, I would absolutely mandate it. If we believe in it, we've got to make the hard decisions, and if a person wants to be a leader in the Catholic school system, I think they should have the religious education specialist. I think we have to create more teacher inservice programs with the faculties of education, let them know that at least thirty percent of the students in this province are going to Catholic schools, and if they are, then let's provide courses that are congruent with the mission statements of these schools. I don't think the faculties are doing very much with it because they have vested interests, and my guess it that it's going to take some

time to turn them around. I sound a little hard on this issue, but that's my feeling.

No, I think it's legitimate. Anything else you want to say before we tie things up? I think you've put your points out very clearly, and I think you've dealt with the issues head on.

ANDREW            Good.    We'll I've enjoyed that, thank-you.