



PHOTO CREDIT: PHOTO BY MAX FISCHER ON PEXELS

## ►► Public Money, Private Priorities: Impact of Education Policy Shifts on Democracy, Equity, and Local Governance in Saskatchewan

By: Michelle Bussière-Prytula, JS GS Associate Professor, University of Saskatchewan and Arisha Jamil Ahmad, Legislative Auditor, Provincial Auditor of Saskatchewan.

June 24, 2025

### ►► Introduction

***What happens when a public system no longer answers to the public it serves?***

In a democracy, governments are granted power not to dominate, but to protect the rights, interests, and welfare of the people<sup>1</sup>. That power must be exercised transparently, responsibly, and within constitutional limits. In Canada, these expectations are foundational. Public institutions are expected to remain accountable to citizens, and services such as education must be governed with oversight, equity, and public input.

This paper identifies a significant policy problem: a pattern of provincial decisions that concentrate power, reduce local accountability, and undermine the democratic governance of education in Saskatchewan.

Historically, Saskatchewan's public education system (meaning the current 27 public and separate school divisions in the province)

reflected these democratic values<sup>2,3</sup>. Provincial education was built on community voice, transparency, and local accountability. For generations, communities shaped their schools through elected governance and local decision-making, operationalizing the concept of *good governance*<sup>4</sup>, and reflecting a broad consensus that education is a shared civic responsibility.

In recent years, however, a series of provincial policy changes have shifted control away from local school boards and toward centralized authority. School divisions have lost fiscal tools once used to respond to community needs. Education property taxes no longer flow directly to school divisions but instead to the province's General Revenue Fund, creating confusion about accountability. At the same time, provincial funding for public schools has declined, while public funding for private schools has increased significantly. Online education has been consolidated into a Crown corporation, removed from the authority of school divisions, and placed solely under the Minister of Education, effectively eliminating local oversight and requiring divisions to purchase services they previously delivered themselves.

The provincial government has justified these unilateral changes by appealing to the principles of efficiency, equity, and strategic alignment; arguing that centralized oversight better aligns education policy with Saskatchewan's Growth Plan<sup>5</sup> to prepare students for workforce demands, centralization reduces duplication of services<sup>6</sup>, and the removal of local mill rate authority ensures fairness between regions<sup>7,9</sup>. While framed as efforts to create system-wide coherence, these shifts have come at a significant cost. They have eroded democratic governance, replaced collaborative decision-making with unilateral control, and strained long-standing relationships with school divisions, teachers, and educational organizations. As local authority diminishes and public input is sidelined, public trust weakens.

This policy paper traces the major recent education policy shifts in Saskatchewan and examines their cumulative effect on governance, funding, and public accountability. It argues that these changes reflect not just a policy direction but a deeper ideological shift away from education as a public good. It calls for a course correction that reasserts democratic principles through local accountability, fiscal transparency, equitable funding, and meaningful community involvement.

## ► The Elimination of Local Control: Consolidation and Centralization (2006–2012)

Saskatchewan's education system is at a tipping point. Ongoing public frustration with service delivery, long-term underfunding, and declining trust in school governance are linked to past decisions that stripped local communities of meaningful control. Understanding the present state of disengagement requires first revisiting the pivotal provincial governmental reforms between 2006 and 2012 that restructured how, and by whom, educational decisions are made in the province. These changes laid the foundation for our current damaged system with which we continue to grapple today: one that appears democratic on paper but lacks the levers of accountability, transparency, and responsiveness that define a proper functioning democracy.

The erosion of local democratic control began in 2006 when the provincial government amalgamated school divisions, reducing their number from 117 to just 28 (now 27). Framed as a response to duplication and inefficiency, the move was promoted as a way to improve administrative coordination and establish a consistent tax base across communities.<sup>6,7,8</sup>

The 2006 amalgamation of Saskatchewan's school divisions did achieve some of its stated goals, particularly achieving a more consistent and equitable tax base across communities<sup>6</sup>. It can be assumed that reducing the number of school divisions also lowered the cost of governance of provincial public schools, although the cost of ensuring local democratic voice is 0.5% of total school division expenditures<sup>9</sup>. Shared services such as transportation, payroll, and IT infrastructure were claimed as feasible within larger divisions; however, actual evidence on any improved efficiency

is difficult to find. Although equity improved, the trade-off was a weakening of local voice, identity, and responsiveness, raising questions about whether technical gains justified the local governance losses.

Though it achieved greater equity across divisions<sup>10</sup>, the consolidation sparked concerns about the loss of community identity, representation, and local decision-making<sup>11,10</sup>. Importantly, however, is that one essential principle remained intact: school boards, though larger, retained the authority to levy property taxes. This preserved a vital democratic principle where those responsible for educational outcomes still had the fiscal authority to meet those responsibilities. In this way, local governance held substance, and taxation remained tied to community priorities<sup>13</sup>.

That changed abruptly in 2009. Overnight, the province eliminated school boards' authority to set local education property tax mill rates in favour of a uniform, province-wide rate set by the government<sup>11,12</sup>, doing so without consultation<sup>13</sup>. The change was framed as a response to rural landowner concerns about inconsistent tax burdens and as part of a broader property assessment reform, with the government promising increased provincial funding for education<sup>6,7,11</sup>. A provincially set mill rate would not be problematic if public education were adequately funded; however, that commitment has not been meaningfully fulfilled.

While the shift may have brought consistency, it severed the fiscal connection between local taxpayers and their schools and removed the ability of communities to invest in education according to local needs<sup>13</sup>. The symbolic and practical result was a hollowing out of democratic governance at the local level<sup>14</sup>. School boards remained responsible for balancing budgets and setting priorities<sup>6</sup>, but no longer had the tools to raise revenue. They were left to manage trade-offs between competing demands, under public scrutiny, without the authority to act meaningfully on behalf of those they were elected to serve<sup>13</sup>.

### Principle Violated: Responsibility with Authority

In a democracy, those who are accountable for public services must also have the tools to shape them.

In Saskatchewan, however, school boards are responsible for student outcomes but no longer have the necessary authority to raise the funds needed to meet those expectations.

When elected officials have no real power, voter turnout declines, as it has in Saskatchewan. With fewer citizens feeling their vote matters, public attention drifts. Board meetings are sparsely attended. Community voices grow quieter. This erosion of participation weakens the relationship between schools and their communities. What remains is the appearance of local governance, but not its substance.

This decline in democratic engagement has real consequences. It reduces provincial accountability, diminishes transparency, and leaves schools more vulnerable to one-size-fits-all decision-making. And the cost of this disengagement is borne by the students.

## ► The Loss of Fiscal Transparency: Redirecting Education Taxes to the GRF (2012–2017)

If the 2006 and 2009 reforms weakened local control over education funding, the 2017 shift to the provincial General Revenue Fund (GRF)<sup>7</sup> eliminated it altogether. This change didn't just centralize authority, but instead it severed the last visible connection between citizens and the public schools their taxes were meant to support. In doing so, the government moved education funding from one of fiscal accountability to fiscal opacity.

In 2012, even after school boards lost the ability to set mill rates, there remained one democratic safeguard: education property taxes collected by the municipality were still remitted to the local school divisions. This arrangement respected the benefit principle; the idea that those who pay the tax should see the benefit in their own community. Said another way, education dollars collected from a community should be visible and invested in that community's children.

That principle was unilaterally abandoned by the government in 2017. The provincial government redirected all locally collected education property taxes to the GRF. Municipalities still collect education taxes on behalf of the province, creating the illusion that local dollars support local schools, but those funds now vanish into a consolidated provincial account<sup>7</sup>. No longer is there a clear line between what is collected, what is spent on education, and what is redirected elsewhere. What once was a transparent exchange has become a murky shuffle of public funds behind closed doors.

This restructuring eliminated the last direct fiscal link between taxpayers and their schools. Residents still see "education" on their tax bills, but they have no way of knowing whether that money supports students, or even education at all. Transparency, a core principle of democratic governance, was deeply eroded<sup>16</sup>. The redistribution of funds is now fully at the discretion of the province, with no public oversight or visibility.

The consequences are profound. Trust in the system has weakened, and for good reason. Despite increasing enrolments<sup>17</sup>, the government itself admits that the proportion of overall provincial dollars dedicated to education has declined from 26% a decade ago to just 21.92% today<sup>5</sup>. In fact, Saskatchewan had the lowest increase in public education spending in Canada from 2012/13 to 2019/20, at just 5.2%, compared to 29.0% in Québec, 28.7% in Nova Scotia, and a national average of 17.8%<sup>18</sup>. Although the funding in dollar terms has increased, the purchasing power of those dollars has contemporaneously dramatically decreased<sup>19</sup>. There is a clear pattern of under-investment relative to other provinces.

Meanwhile, school divisions report chronic underfunding and face structural barriers to meeting student needs<sup>6,20,21</sup>, including

conditional funding restrictions, misaligned fiscal timelines, unpredictable allocations, aging infrastructure, overcrowded schools, and insufficient supports for educators<sup>6</sup>. These divisions continue to operate under tight provincial constraints that leave them little flexibility to respond to inflation, demographic shifts, or the growing complexity of student needs.

And yet, the public continues to believe that education is being funded as it always has been, because that's what the tax bill says<sup>22</sup>.

This is not simply a change in budget mechanics. It is a democratic rupture. By consolidating education taxes into the GRF, the government has removed a democratic mechanism through which citizens could meaningfully trace, question, and influence how their contributions shape their communities<sup>18</sup>. What remains is a system that appears efficient, but in truth obscures the growing disconnect between citizens, their taxes, and the public services on which they rely.

### Principle Violated: Transparency and the Benefit Principle

The benefit principle holds that public funds should serve the communities from which they are drawn.

But in Saskatchewan, locally collected education taxes are pooled into the provincial General Revenue Fund with no public tracking or guarantee of reinvestment in local schools, or even education.

## ► The Expansion of Publicly Funded Privilege: Growing Support for Private Schools (2018–present)

Saskatchewan's public education system, already weakened by the loss of local control and fiscal transparency, is now being reshaped by another troubling shift: the redirection of public dollars toward private schools. This is not simply a matter of dollars and cents, but instead it is a further breach of core democratic principles. By increasing public subsidies for selective private institutions, the government has prioritized consumer choice over collective responsibility, weakening the very foundation of equity and the common good.

Historically, Saskatchewan limited public funding for private education. Government support for independent schools was modest and designed to respect parental choice without undermining public education. Families who opted out of public education assumed most of the financial responsibility. When public dollars were provided to private schools, it was proportional to the degree of public oversight, ensuring some accountability in exchange for the public funding<sup>23,24</sup>. Given the most recent concerns regarding abuse in certain private schools in the province<sup>25</sup>, meaningful government oversight is essential. As one critic noted, "We've learned of schools that are not following the curriculum, that are not protecting students, that are not being transparent with their finances"<sup>26</sup>. This raises serious questions about the public responsibility that accompanies public investment.



Limited public funding for private education changed beginning in 2018. While public school divisions faced increasingly constrained budgets<sup>6,19,20</sup>, rather than dealing with the underfunding issue, the province chose to instead expand its financial support for private education<sup>4,27,28</sup>. Through subtle legislative changes, a new category of Certified Independent Schools was introduced to its list of independent school categories<sup>26</sup>, which stipulated that Certified Independent Schools, when approved, would receive an unprecedented 75% of the average per-student public funding allocation<sup>25</sup>. Interestingly, while Certified Independent Schools<sup>29</sup> receive this high level of funding, the more regulated Qualified Independent Schools receive only 50%. This inconsistency is highly problematic. Not only does the decision to prioritize funding for private institutions defy any reasonable logic, especially when public schools continue to be underfunded, but the funding breakdown within the private categories themselves makes even less sense, lacking transparency, consistency, or justification.

From 2020–21 to 2024–25, provincial support for independent schools increased by 79%. In contrast, public education funding grew by just 13%. During this period, private school enrolment increased by approximately 1,200 students (from 4,585 in 2018 to 5,766 in 2023<sup>25</sup>), while public school enrolment grew by more than 6,000 students in the past year alone. Note also that public schools serve more than 97% of Saskatchewan's student population, all while facing increasing student complexity and rising costs. The imbalance lies not only in the mismatch between funding and enrolment growth, but in the allocation of public dollars away from a universal, democratically governed system to one serving a small and self-selecting population.

The Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation (STF) has labelled the increase of funding to private schools as part of the government's broader plans toward privatization<sup>19,31</sup>, one that jeopardizes the sustainability of the public system.

But there is another deeper issue here, and that is duplicity of regulations and funding levels. Consider the numbers: in Saskatoon, Certified Independent Schools like the Saskatoon Christian School (as well as the Saskatoon Misbah School and Valley Christian Academy) receive 75% of the provincial average per-student funding allocation, which is currently averaging \$11,343<sup>32</sup>. These schools, however, charge additional tuition ranging from \$1,620 to \$5,860 annually<sup>33,34,35</sup>. On the high end, this means the total per-student funding is \$17,203, well above the funding levels allocated to public schools. Note that public schools are prohibited from charging any tuition. In short, private schools, publicly subsidized using taxpayer dollars, have the potential to enjoy higher student funding levels, while public schools are expected to do more with less. This wouldn't be a problem if the parents who are choosing private schooling also foot the majority of the tuition, but they do not. These private schools are predominantly funded using taxpayer dollars originally intended for public schools.

The inequities continue. Public schools operate under tight provincial restrictions, cannot themselves collect local tax revenue, and face clawbacks if they raise additional funds through donations or fees<sup>6</sup>. Separate school divisions, which are for the purposes of funding considered equivalent to public schools, are protected by the Canadian Constitution and permitted to set their own mill rates, but they too are subject to clawbacks: any amount collected beyond the provincial per-student funding level is deducted from their grant<sup>13</sup>. Certified Independent Schools, by contrast, receive substantial public funding while retaining the freedom to charge tuition and fundraise without penalty.

This is not simply a funding model problem; rather it is a test of democratic values. A truly democratic and equitable education system ensures that all students, regardless of income, geography, or background, can access the supports they need to thrive. When funding flows toward schools that exclude or select students based on ability to pay, or in the case of some independent schools in the province, to schools that allegedly coerce students to work on political campaigns<sup>36</sup>, the system fractures. While all public spending carries political consequences, it should not be intentionally used to influence votes, pay for favours, or to deepen inequality.

The result is a two-tiered system funded by taxpayer dollars. Public schools are tightly regulated, underfunded, and fiscally restrained. Select private institutions enjoy growing public subsidies and greater financial flexibility. Resources follow privilege rather than need. This undermines both equity and the democratic promise of shared responsibility.

## Principle Violated: Equity and the Common Good

Public education is built on the principle of common good, meaning that all children, regardless of background or income, have equal access to quality learning.

Yet in Saskatchewan, while public schools face chronic underfunding and tight restrictions, select private schools receive growing public subsidies and retain the freedom to charge tuition and raise additional funds. This undermines both equity and our collective responsibility to serve the common good.

## ► Education for Sale: The Crown Takeover That Costs School Divisions Twice (2023)

The province's 2023 decision to centralize online education through the creation of a new Crown corporation marks perhaps the most dramatic consolidation of power in Saskatchewan's education system to date. This new Crown, called the Saskatchewan Distance Learning Centre (Sask DLC)<sup>8</sup>, continues the government's trajectory of fiscal centralization and ministerial control over educational delivery. This isn't modernization. It's the dismantling of local democratic good governance in public education.

Before this shift, and even prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, many school divisions across the province had developed strong online learning programs tailored to their communities. When part of school divisions, they were governed by elected boards and staffed by local educators. These centers offered students flexible and responsive courses as alternatives to in-person learning. They reflected local priorities and supported access in areas underserved by traditional models.

That local capacity has now been eliminated since the government chose to appropriate online learning and all online courses previously developed by provincial school divisions<sup>37</sup>. Under the new regime, the province unilaterally legislated that only the Sask DLC is authorized to provide online education (with few exceptions, among them online programs provided by separate school divisions) across the province. School divisions who wish to offer their own must seek provincial approval to offer online programming and are rarely granted it. That means divisions with existing infrastructure and proven success in distance education have been barred from their own service delivery. Meanwhile, while claiming to have increased public school funding, the province actually redirected \$23 million from the education budget<sup>38</sup> to launch this Crown corporation, and increased this by 10 million in the 2024-2025<sup>39</sup> budget and a further 6 million in the 2025-2026 budget<sup>40</sup>. School divisions did not see any of that money. When calculated on a per student basis, these funds are higher than what public schools receive per student. These are funds that could have otherwise supported public school needs in program delivery, infrastructure needs, classroom complexity, and growing enrolment<sup>6,42</sup>. While the ministry of education has partnered with other provincial ministries to develop online courses aimed at preparing students for industry (demonstrating a clear willingness to invest in programming that aligns with its own economic and political agenda)<sup>43</sup>, it has simultaneously stripped school divisions of their autonomy and diverted resources away from the broader, locally responsive needs of the public education system.

To make matters worse, despite the government reporting that these courses would be free<sup>8</sup> and that they would save school divisions money because of the provincial DLC<sup>44</sup>, access to these courses are not free for school divisions. School divisions must pay the Crown \$500 per student per class when their students enroll in Sask DLC courses. Yet, in the best interests of their own students, school divisions appear to remain supportive of their students' choice to take courses through the Sask DLC, paying for such course delivery notwithstanding the additional cost to the division. So in effect, school divisions have lost their own programs and are being charged to access a centralized system they didn't ask for or already had. This financial burden, layered onto an already underfunded system, creates a shell game where local divisions lose both authority and resources while the province presents the illusion of new investment in education.

When developments regarding the DLC were initially announced, many provincial partners in education, including the Saskatchewan

Teachers Federation; the League of Educational Administrators, Directors, and Superintendents; the Saskatchewan School Boards Association; and the Saskatchewan Association of School Board Officials each expressed concerns, including why the development of the DLC was being rushed when it was not at all a priority for provincial schools<sup>45</sup>. The government did not respond to these concerns<sup>8</sup>.

Instead, the government went ahead with the Sask DLC, claiming that this move was needed to ensure quality and consistency<sup>8</sup>, but published evidence suggests otherwise.

### Principle Violated: Democratic Governance and Public Accountability

Public education must remain under democratic control, where communities have a voice and elected officials are accountable.

In Saskatchewan, the Sask DLC is governed solely by the Minister of Education, with no public board, no community consultation, and no transparency requirements. This undermines public accountability and removes a core educational service from the people it is meant to serve.

The Sask DLC bought out the Sun West School Division's online school<sup>46</sup>, despite a 2022 report from the Provincial Auditor raising concerns about Sun West's outdated courses, poor student engagement tracking, slow grading, and low completion rates<sup>47</sup>. Rather than selecting one of the many successful online learning models that had been built and refined by other school divisions across the province, the government chose to adopt a model that had already been flagged for serious issues. At the same time, Flex ED, an alternative provider with successful graduation rates of 85–90%, offered to support the government with its DLC and was turned away<sup>48</sup>. This information raises serious questions about the government's commitment to quality, transparency, and the real drivers behind the Sask DLC's creation.

The governance structure of the DLC is even more alarming. Though the legislation allows for a three-person board (quite small in comparison with the boards of school divisions across the province), in practice the Minister of Education is the sole board member and, as such, singular elected governor of the Sask DLC<sup>49,50</sup>. This is not governance, but instead it is control. Despite the promise of a three-person board<sup>50</sup>, there is still no independent oversight, no stakeholder input, and no separation between policymaking and delivery. The Sask DLC is not subject to public meetings, is exempt from the transparency and financial requirements to which school boards are subject<sup>51</sup>, and is insulated from local accountability mechanisms<sup>44</sup>. Such a public service without democratic oversight ceases to be a public institution in any meaningful sense.

The implications to education are severe. Communities have lost the ability to shape online education. Parents and educators cannot attend board meetings, raise concerns, or advocate for better supports. Students now rely on a system governed by a single political actor, detached from the local democratic structures that once protected educational quality, equity, and responsiveness. And school divisions are charged for it.

This is not just about online learning. It's about how this government is wielding power and taking it away from communities. Further, by embedding a market-based logic into a core public service and removing oversight, the province has commodified education. It has turned learning into a transaction and eliminated the mechanisms through which the public can question, influence, or hold decision-makers to account. As the Broadbent Institute noted, commodification removes services from democratic control and places them behind closed doors.<sup>53</sup>

## ►► Policy Recommendations: Four Actions to Restore Accountability and Public Trust in Saskatchewan's Education System

The ongoing funding issues, coupled with unchecked centralization of power in Saskatchewan's education system has almost irreparably damaged education in the province. It has hollowed out local voice, blurred fiscal transparency, damaged what were once collaborative relationships, and eroded the principle of equity. While a full reversal may be unlikely under the current government, a clear path forward remains. The longer these reforms are avoided, the more it appears that the government's priority is control, not collaboration; opacity, not openness; and private interests, not public good.

***Four actions are necessary to return public education to public hands.***

### 1. Restore Local Authority and Financial Agency

Currently, elected school boards are held accountable for outcomes but are denied the fiscal tools required to deliver on those expectations. That disconnect undermines local democracy and weakens public trust. It gives the impression of a government unwilling to share decision-making with communities, but still holding them responsible for success.

Research has shown that fiscal decentralisation harnesses the proximity and informational advantages of local decision-makers, improving alignment between services and community needs while stimulating cost-effective innovation<sup>53</sup>. It is also known that poorly designed decentralisation can lead to inefficiencies of scale, capacity gaps, and widening have-and-have-not disparities. These risks have been well-studied and are readily managed through

robust equalization mechanisms such as provincial matching formulas, spending floors, and targeted grants that guarantee every division a strong baseline of funding<sup>55</sup>. When combined with shared best-practice networks and provincial support for professional development, local fiscal and administrative autonomy and equity are mutually reinforcing rather than competing objectives.

**What must happen:** As part of a hybrid model, this government must reinstate school board authority to set local education property tax rates within a provincially coordinated, equity-based framework. Such restores the link between responsibility and decision-making and enables communities to support their schools in meaningful ways.

### 2. Require Full Transparency on Education Tax Revenues

Taxpayers deserve to know where their money goes, or whether it actually supports public education.

Today, education property taxes are collected under the promise that they fund local schools, but those funds are quietly redirected into the province's General Revenue Fund. There is no breakdown, no regional reporting, and no way for the public to know how much of its money paid in education property tax actually goes to education. This isn't just a gap in reporting, but instead it's a decision to keep the public in the dark. It gives the impression of a government that prefers to obscure financial decisions rather than be held accountable for them.

**What must happen:** This government must mandate annual public reporting that shows how much education tax is collected within a geographic division, where it is spent, and what percentage is reinvested in local schools. Dedicated education accounts must be created within the GRF to prevent diversion and restore public confidence.

### 3. Prioritize Public Education in Public Spending

Public dollars should serve the public good and not selective access or private gain.

While public schools face rising enrolment, staff shortages, and clawbacks on locally raised funds, government spending on private schools has surged, despite many of them charging tuition and operating with limited public oversight. Ironically, while the government restricts public school divisions from funding local needs in the name of equity, it permits greater fiscal autonomy for independent schools, including tuition-based revenue streams and public grants. This funding approach has created a two-tiered system that privileges the few while shortchanging the majority. This is inequitable and indefensible. It gives the impression of a government that is actively choosing to fund exclusivity while starving the system meant to serve everyone else.

What must happen: This government must cap public subsidies to private schools and remove clawback penalties on public school divisions. The per-student funding formula must reflect real enrolment, inflation, and the growing complexity of student needs to ensure that public schools are funded fairly and sustainably.

#### 4. Return Oversight and Voice for Online Education

Education services should be built around student needs, not manufactured priorities.

The Saskatchewan DLC was created without meaningful consultation, without demand from school divisions, and without regard for the successful online programs already in place across the province. It was also created at a time where resources for public schools are too thin. Rather than invest in what the sector was asking for, the government bypassed local expertise, ignored the input of trusted education partners, and unilaterally created a Crown corporation. On top of that, this Crown receives direct public investment and charges school divisions for access. This gives the appearance of government profiteering off the very divisions it stripped of authority. It isn't just bad policy; it signals a deeper disregard for fairness, transparency, and the role of education as a public good.

What must happen: At minimum, this government must dismantle the current governance structure of the DLC and replace it with an independent, representative board that includes school divisions and key education stakeholders. Divisions must have the legal right to develop and deliver their own funded online programs without requiring provincial approval. And under no circumstances should they be forced to pay for access to a publicly funded service that they neither asked for nor helped shape and that is already being financed by taxpayer dollars through a government grant. Public reporting must be mandatory to ensure transparency, financial accountability, and democratic oversight of a system that has so far operated behind closed doors.



**Earn a Masters degree without disrupting your career or personal life. Discover the ease of flexible learning with our Online Master of Public Administration (OMPA).**

**LEARN HOW** 

 **JOHNSON  
SHOYAMA** [schoolofpublicpolicy.sk.ca](http://schoolofpublicpolicy.sk.ca)

## ►► Conclusion

These four reforms are not radical. They are baseline conditions in the name of good governance of a democratic and public education system. If we believe education is a public good, we must demand that it is governed as one and demand the same from those who currently hold the reins.

Each of these recommendations for reform responds to a specific and deliberate erosion of public governance: the removal of local fiscal authority, the concealment of education tax flows, the diversion of public funds toward selective schooling, and the consolidation of control over learning. In succession, these trends represent a destructive shift away from an education system that is supposed to be governed to serve all students with the public money with which it has been entrusted. If we believe education is a public good, then we must expect that it be governed like one, and hold this government accountable for consistently failing to do so.



**Michelle Bussière-Prytula** is an Associate Professor and Graduate Chair at the Johnson Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy, specializing in education policy, funding, and governance. With over 30 years' experience, she integrates teaching, research, and collaborative partnerships to train future leaders, advance evidence on educational challenges, and inform innovative policy solutions.



**Arisha J. Ahmad** is a Legislative Auditor with the Provincial Auditor of Saskatchewan, where she works to enhance accountability and transparency in the public sector. She is also part of the Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science and Justice Studies, where she promotes their interdisciplinary research on reducing victimization to inform policy and practice.



## ► Endnotes

1 Center for Civic Education. (n.d.). The concepts and fundamental principles of democracy. In Elements of democracy. [https://www.civiced.org/pdfs/books/ElementsOfDemocracy/Elements\\_Subsection3.pdf](https://www.civiced.org/pdfs/books/ElementsOfDemocracy/Elements_Subsection3.pdf)

2 Learning for Justice. (n.d.). What are the values of democracy? <https://www.learningforjustice.org/what-are-the-values-of-democracy>

3 Simon Fraser University. (n.d.). Five principles of democratic engagement. Morris J. Wosk Centre for Dialogue. <https://www.sfu.ca/dialogue/what-we-do/knowledge-practice/strengthening-canadian-democracy/5-principles-of-democratic-engagement.html>

4 Taylor, Z. (2016). Good governance at the local level: Meaning and measurement. Institute on Municipal Finance and Governance. [https://politicalscience.uwo.ca/about\\_us/news\\_and\\_announcements/imfg-paper\\_no26\\_goodgovernance\\_zacktaylor\\_june\\_16\\_2016.pdf](https://politicalscience.uwo.ca/about_us/news_and_announcements/imfg-paper_no26_goodgovernance_zacktaylor_june_16_2016.pdf)

5 Government of Saskatchewan. (2019). Saskatchewan's Growth Plan: The next decade of growth 2020–2030. <https://www.saskatchewan.ca/government/budget-planning-and-reporting/plan-for-growth>

6 Saskatchewan School Boards Association. (1996, March). Restructuring school division governance in Saskatchewan. <https://saskschoolboards.ca/wp-content/uploads/96-03.htm>

7 Perrins, D. (2016). Educational Governance Review Report. <https://publications.saskatchewan.ca/#/products/83797>

8 Government of Saskatchewan. (2009, March 18). Financing pre-kindergarten to grade 12 education: Media backgrounder. <https://www.saskatchewan.ca/-/media/news-archive/2009/march/18/provincial-government-delivers-largest-education-property-tax-cut-in-history/funding-education-bkgd.pdf>

9 Saskatchewan School Boards Association. (2017). K-12 education governance review: Submission to the panel. <https://saskschoolboards.ca/wp-content/uploads/SSBA-Panel-Submission-Jan-2017.pdf>

10 Government of Saskatchewan. (2016, February 1). Education Minister celebrates 10th anniversary of school division amalgamations [News release]. <https://www.saskatchewan.ca/government/news-and-media/2016/february/01/school-division-amalgamation-anniversary>

11 Bashutski, B. (2011). 2005–2011: A history of the Saskatchewan School Boards Association. Saskatchewan School Boards Association. <https://saskschoolboards.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/2011SSBAHistory.pdf>

12 CBC News. (2009, March 21). Saskatchewan school boards stripped of power to set taxes. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/saskatchewan/saskatchewan-school-boards-stripped-of-power-to-set-taxes-1.820998>

13 Prytula, M. (2024, February 22). The problem with illusory autonomy in Saskatchewan's education funding. Policy Options. <https://policyoptions.irpp.org/magazines/february-2024/saskatchewan-education-funding/>

14 United Nations Mission in Timor-Leste. (n.d.). Democratic governance. <https://unmit.unmissions.org/democratic-governance>

15 Maess, D. (2024, October 24). Voter turnout has declined significantly in Saskatchewan since 1982 and it can be hard to pinpoint why. CTV News. <https://www.ctvnews.ca/regina/article/voter-turnout-has-declined-significantly-in-saskatchewan-since-1982-and-it-can-be-hard-to-pinpoint-why/>

16 Freedom House. (n.d.). Accountability and transparency: Essential principles. Democracy Web. <https://www.democracyweb.org/study-guide/accountability/essential-principles>

17 Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation. (2024, January 23). Education in Saskatchewan: Facts and Statistics. [https://www.stf.sk.ca/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/Education-in-Saskatchewan-Facts-and-Statistics\\_23\\_Jan\\_2024.pdf](https://www.stf.sk.ca/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/Education-in-Saskatchewan-Facts-and-Statistics_23_Jan_2024.pdf)

18 Fuss, J., Palacios, M., & Emes, J. (2022). Education spending in public schools in Canada, 2022 edition. Fraser Institute. <https://www.fraserinstitute.org/sites/default/files/education-spending-in-public-schools-in-canada-2022.pdf>

19 Saskatchewan School Boards Association. (2024). Education funding discussion paper. <https://saskschoolboards.ca/wp-content/uploads/Education-Funding-SSBA-Discussion-Paper.pdf>

20 Schick, L. (2023, August 30). Sask. one of two provinces with a reduction in per-student funding: Report. CKOM News. <https://www.ckom.com/2023/08/30/sask-one-of-two-provinces-with-a-reduction-in-per-student-funding-report/>

21 Saskatchewan. Legislative Assembly. Human Services Committee. (2023, April 3). Hansard: Human Services Committee debates (p.355). <https://www.legassembly.sk.ca/>

22 u/rvision7MD. (2023, May 17). TIL that when my 2023 Property Tax Notice states "100% Public" for the Education Tax portion, it actually means it will still go to funding PRIVATE schools like Legacy. [Online forum post]. Reddit. [https://www.reddit.com/r/saskatoon/comments/13kk3gg/til\\_that\\_when\\_my\\_2023\\_property\\_tax\\_notice\\_states/](https://www.reddit.com/r/saskatoon/comments/13kk3gg/til_that_when_my_2023_property_tax_notice_states/)

23 Dirks, G. (1987). A review of private schooling in Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan Department of Education. [https://pubsaskdev.blob.core.windows.net/pubsask-prod/143293/A\\_Review\\_of\\_Private\\_Schooling\\_in\\_Saskatchewan\\_1987.pdf](https://pubsaskdev.blob.core.windows.net/pubsask-prod/143293/A_Review_of_Private_Schooling_in_Saskatchewan_1987.pdf)

24 Hodgson, E. (n.d.). Independent schools. In The Encyclopedia of Saskatchewan. Canadian Plains Research Center, University of Regina. [https://esask.uregina.ca/entry/independent\\_schools.html](https://esask.uregina.ca/entry/independent_schools.html)



- 25 Saskatchewan Advocate for Children and Youth. (2023, December). Making the Grade: Moving Forward in Independent Education. <https://www.saskadvocate.ca/assets/making-the-grade-independent-school-report-pdf-final-dec-2023.pdf>
- 26 Pennings, R., & Van Pelt, D. (2018). Qualified independent schools in Saskatchewan. Cardus. <https://www.cardus.ca/research/education/reports/qualified-independent-schools-in-saskatchewan/>
- 27 Government of Saskatchewan. (2022, May 11). Government of Saskatchewan provides \$17.5 million to support the operation of independent schools and historical high schools in 2022-23. <https://www.saskatchewan.ca/government/news-and-media/2022/may/11/government-of-saskatchewan-provides-175-million-to-support-the-operation-of-independent-schools-and>
- 28 Sorokan, K. (2024, October 4). Private school funding draws attention during STF education forum. CTV News Saskatoon. <https://saskatoon.ctvnews.ca/private-school-funding-draws-attention-during-stf-education-forum-1.6581234>
- 29 Government of Saskatchewan. (n.d.). Qualified Independent Schools – Eligibility. <https://www.saskatchewan.ca/government/education-and-child-care/facility-administration/services-for-school-administrators/qualified-independent-schools#eligibility>
- 30 Pennings, R., & Van Pelt, D. (2018). Qualified independent schools in Saskatchewan. Cardus. <https://www.cardus.ca/research/education/reports/qualified-independent-schools-in-saskatchewan/>
- 31 Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation. (2024, September 13). Teachers condemn government's ongoing privatization of Saskatchewan schools. <https://www.stf.sk.ca/about-stf/news/teachers-condemn-governments-ongoing-privatization-of-saskatchewan-schools/>
- 32 Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation. (2024, March 20). Today's budget means Saskatchewan will fall even further behind in education operating funding. <https://www.stf.sk.ca/about-stf/news/todays-budget-means-saskatchewan-will-fall-even-further-behind-in-education-operating-funding/>
- 33 Saskatoon Misbah School. (n.d.). Tuition & fees. <https://misbah.ca/tuition-fees/>
- 34 Valley Christian Academy. (n.d.). Tuition. <https://vcaschool.com/tuition/>
- 35 Saskatoon Christian School. (2024, May 15). 2024–2025 tuition rates. [https://www.saskatoonchristianschool.ca/editoruploads/files/Registration/2024-2025/2024-2025\\_TuitionRates%2024MAY15.pdf](https://www.saskatoonchristianschool.ca/editoruploads/files/Registration/2024-2025/2024-2025_TuitionRates%2024MAY15.pdf)
- 36 Anton, J. (2022, August 8). Former Sask. private school students allege being 'coerced' into working on political campaigns. CBC News. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/saskatchewan/former-sask-private-school-students-allege-being-coerced-into-working-on-political-campaigns-1.6543746>
- 37 Saskatchewan. Legislative Assembly. Human Services Committee. (2023, May 9). Hansard: Human Services Committee debates (p.536; p. 546; p. 547). <https://www.legassembly.sk.ca/>
- 38 Saskatchewan. Legislative Assembly. Human Services Committee. (2023, April 3). Hansard: Human Services Committee debates (p.347). <https://www.legassembly.sk.ca/>
- 39 Government of Saskatchewan. (2024). 2024- 25 budget. Publications Saskatchewan. [https://publications.saskatchewan.ca/#/products/123288&#8203;:contentReference\[oaicite:0\]{index=0}](https://publications.saskatchewan.ca/#/products/123288&#8203;:contentReference[oaicite:0]{index=0})
- 40 Government of Saskatchewan. (2025). 2025–26 provincial budget: Delivering for you. [https://budget.saskatchewan.ca/pub/documents/2025-26%20Budget%20materials/2025-26-provincial-budget--web.pdf&#8203;:contentReference\[oaicite:0\]{index=0}](https://budget.saskatchewan.ca/pub/documents/2025-26%20Budget%20materials/2025-26-provincial-budget--web.pdf&#8203;:contentReference[oaicite:0]{index=0})
- 41 Saskatchewan. Legislative Assembly. Human Services Committee. (2023, May 9). Hansard: Human Services Committee debates (p.541). <https://www.legassembly.sk.ca/>
- 42 Saskatchewan. Legislative Assembly. Human Services Committee. (2023, April 6). Hansard: Human Services Committee debates (p.3590). <https://www.legassembly.sk.ca/>
- 43 Saskatchewan. Legislative Assembly. Human Services Committee. (2023, May 9). Hansard: Human Services Committee debates (p. 546-547). <https://www.legassembly.sk.ca/>
- 44 Saskatchewan. Legislative Assembly. Human Services Committee. (2023, April 3). Hansard: Human Services Committee debates (p.356). <https://www.legassembly.sk.ca/>

- 45 Saskatchewan. Legislative Assembly. Human Services Committee. (2023, April 3). Hansard: Human Services Committee debates (p.360). <https://www.legassembly.sk.ca/>
- 46 Saskatchewan. Legislative Assembly. Human Services Committee. (2023, April 3). Hansard: Human Services Committee debates (p.363). <https://www.legassembly.sk.ca/>
- 47 Provincial Auditor of Saskatchewan. (2022, June 7). Improvements needed to boost Sun West's Distance Learning Centre students' course completion rates [News release]. [https://auditor.sk.ca/pub/news\\_releases/2022/2022-report-vol-1\\_sun-west-distance-education-completion-news-release.pdf](https://auditor.sk.ca/pub/news_releases/2022/2022-report-vol-1_sun-west-distance-education-completion-news-release.pdf)
- 48 Warick, J. (2022, December 21). Sask. government rejected offer of help from online school with 90% graduation rate. CBC News. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/saskatoon/sask-government-rejected-offer-of-help-from-online-school-with-90-graduation-rate-1.6694060>
- 49 Saskatchewan. Legislative Assembly. Human Services Committee. (2023, May 9). Hansard: Human Services Committee debates (p.543). <https://www.legassembly.sk.ca/>
- 50 Saskatchewan. Legislative Assembly. Human Services Committee. (2023, April 3). Hansard: Human Services Committee debates (p.362). <https://www.legassembly.sk.ca/>
- 51 Saskatchewan. Legislative Assembly. Human Services Committee. (2023, May 9). Hansard: Human Services Committee debates (p.545). <https://www.legassembly.sk.ca/>
- 52 Saskatchewan. Legislative Assembly. Human Services Committee. (2023, April 3). Hansard: Human Services Committee debates (p.362). <https://www.legassembly.sk.ca/>
- 53 Broadbent Institute. (n.d.). Broadbent principles for Canadian social democracy. <https://broadbentinstitute.ca/principles/>
- 54 Lastra-Anadón, C. X., & Mukherjee, S. (2019). Cross-country evidence on the impact of decentralisation and school autonomy on educational performance (OECD Working Papers on Fiscal Federalism No. 26). OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/c3d9b314-en>
- 55 OECD (2019), Making Decentralisation Work: A Handbook for Policy-Makers, OECD Multi-level Governance Studies, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/g2g9faa7-en>

*People who are passionate about public policy know that the Province of Saskatchewan has pioneered some of Canada's major policy innovations. The two distinguished public servants after whom the school is named, Albert W. Johnson and Thomas K. Shoyama, used their practical and theoretical knowledge to challenge existing policies and practices, as well as to explore new policies and organizational forms. Earning the label, "the Greatest Generation," they and their colleagues became part of a group of modernizers who saw government as a positive catalyst of change in post-war Canada. They created a legacy of achievement in public administration and professionalism in public service that remains a continuing inspiration for public servants in Saskatchewan and across the country. The Johnson Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy is proud to carry on the tradition by educating students interested in and devoted to advancing public value.*

**[Sign up to receive digital copies of the Policy Brief](#)**

**For more information on the Johnson Shoyama Graduate School, visit [www.schoolofpublicpolicy.sk.ca](http://www.schoolofpublicpolicy.sk.ca)**

**Share your comments or feedback to the editor: [dale.eisler@uregina.ca](mailto:dale.eisler@uregina.ca)**