

Play not Pay: Analysis and Commentary by celos.ca

Increase high quality recreation programming and increase access:

January 2008

Advance local community centre endeavors to be unique and represent their diverse local communities. Staff who are encouraged to take ownership and be creative provide better programming.

Re-evaluate the effect of higher user fees 1 year after implementation and reconsider. Normally, higher fees means lower registration. The user fee increases might lower registration, which is not the aim of the document.

Funnel increased fees into front line not more policy bureaucrats, we need equipment like basketballs, fixing benches, paints and supplies and providing good quality instruction.

Increase the welcome policy allotments, they are far too low and will result in 2 tiered programming. Now people under welcome policy may go to specialized camps alongside those paying more money. A diverse group of people in a class or camp is a benefit to the whole community. The new plan based on dollars means that people will be more likely to spend less on the cheaper camps and classes.

Encourage centers to outreach to their local communities using smaller brochures, not just the enormous fun guide. Decrease centralization: the fun guide is published months in advance making it difficult for frontline staff to make adjustments to programming. People like a balance of consistency across the city but also accessibility and uniqueness. Let each community centre or supervisor cluster make their own mini-local- fun guides brochures with programming that is unique to the unique neighborhoods of the city.

Release more details on the mandatory programs: most people are not convinced this will actually happen, it will be very expensive (4 new supervisors plus 12 new FT positions....will the TDSB pay for the programming?) How big will the classes be? Why are they teaching only skating, some children are interested in other sports. Have the Arena's agreed? How much will it cost to use them?

Re evaluate the evaluation plan: The evaluation section on page 21 is about the division not whether or NOT citizens like the plan.

More explanation of the research that went into the plan: Where is the study referred to on page 26, can the public see a copy? Why stop at 50% cost recovery. There should more rationale then simply comparing with other municipalities. Toronto is unique, our property taxes are lower than Burlington, why should we use Burlington as a model for recreation? Why are there no comparisons in the paper to local community services. Many of the competing services and programs in Toronto are free but the report only compares only to municipalities.

Do not close priority centers. Re-evaluate them, if there are some that should be de-prioritized then do so but some ought to be added to the priority list. Why de-classify the priority centres that are 'working'? Parkdale and a few others are working well and serving the needs of their local communities. Why 'fix' what isn't broken?

Save money when smart savings are suggested: Did the city pay for the use of the everyone gets to play slogan, what is the significance of the slogan? Was a retainer paid to former city staff person Claire Tucker-Reid or her organization?