

**Draft**

Committee Name: **Inner City Advisory Committee**

Date: **Tuesday, June 09, 2015**

Time: 9:30 am to 12:30 pm, 5050 Yonge Street, Committee Room A

 Present: Trustee Cary-Meagher, Trustee Ford, Trustee Kaplan, Trustee Stiles, Vicky Branco, Helen Fisher, Simona Emiliani, Hilary Wollis, Fiona Bowser, Alejandra Bravo, David Clandfield, Nathan Gilbert, Pat Gracey, Laurie Green, Graham Hollings, Matthew Judd, Liz Rykert, Michael Kerr, Ingrid Palmer, Sejal Patel, Debra Payne, Annie Peng, Vincenza Pietropaolo, Bob Spencer, NadiraYasmin.

 Regrets: Sharlene Bourjot , Nanci Goldman, Claudette Holloway, George Martell, Chris Penrose, Cheryl Skovronek, Kwabena Yafeu.

Guests: Trustee Jennifer Story, Liz Rykert, Cindy Gregoric (SPT), Kathleen Qu (SPT)

Recorder: Hilary Wollis, Coordinator

| **ITEM** | **DISCUSSION** | **RECOMMENDATION/MOTION** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Call to Order /** **Approval of Agenda** | Co-Chair Ingrid Palmer called the meeting to order. The draft Agenda was presented for approval. Moved Nathan Gilbert, seconded Marit Stiles. Approved |  |
| **Welcome and Introductions** | * Palmer welcomed the group to the last meeting of the year. Introductions were made around the table. Palmer read the Regrets: into the record.
* Palmer shared the proposed ICAC meeting dates for the upcoming year.

**Q**: Have we selected school sites for the 3 community meetings? A: Model Schools (MSIC) staff will update the group at the September meeting. The criteria we use are; a school that volunteers to host, close to TTC, haven’t been to before.* Member Michael Kerr shared flyers from the Colour of Poverty. The blue page relates to our discussion of the Learning Opportunity Index ( LOI) and the funding formula. The Learning Opportunity Grant ( LOG) should have an equity in education component built into the Grant. This flyer is a submission to the Provincial budget process from Colour of Poverty. The yellow flyer is a tool the group uses in community outreach, supporting conversations around race and marginalization that may be helpful to members.
 | **ACTION**: Model Schools staff will report back on the 3 school sites for next year’s community meetings in September.**MOTION**: to approve 2015-2016 meeting dates. Moved Nathan Gilbert, Seconded Annie Peng. Approved.**ACTION**: Approved dates will be circulated to membership, submitted to the TDSB system calendar, posted to ICAC web page, and shared with PCEO.**ACTION**: Michael Kerr will share electronic copies of the flyers with the Coordinator for distribution. |
| **Approval of Previous Minutes** | * 4 sets of Minutes were presented for approval by the Committee: March 10, 2015, April 09, 2015, May 14, 2015 (am) and May 14, 2015 (pm).

**1. March 10, 2015**: moved Nathan Gilbert, seconded Marit Stiles, Approved.**2. April 9, 2015**: moved Nathan Gilbert, seconded Michael Ford, Approved.**3. May 14, 2015 (am)**Amendments:-add Debra Payne to regrets-Pg. 3 bullet: amend to remove “these affect the ability to identify pockets of poverty”.-Pg. 8: Whistleblower policy is not required as part of Wilson report. Is an initiative of the Board of Trustees. Amend to reflect this point.Moved David Clandfield, seconded, Laurie Green. Approved**4. May 14, 2015 (pm)** Amendments: -add Debra Payne and Marit Stiles to RegretsMoved: Debra Payne, seconded Laurie Green. Approved. | **ACTION**: Minutes will be amended as approved and posted to the ICAC web page, and submitted to the September PSSC meeting Agenda. |
| **Community Investment Strategy** | * Model Schools staff reviewed the motion from the May 14th ICAC meeting, asking that they return with a draft framework for the Local Planning Table.
* A first draft was shared with the group via library copies. It was noted that this is a very early skeletal plan. Time was allowed for everyone to read the draft.
* Staff recommends that through the Model Schools program we begin a small pilot as a Special Project, starting to work with this framework. MSIC will approach one school Principal to ask if we can practice this framework in their school community, to refine what this planning table model should look like.
* The Design Team will continue to support the process with advice from Community Partners. Liz Rykert was introduced to the group as facilitator of Design Team.
* The historic models were considered:

1. TBE's (Toronto Board of Education) Parallel Use committee: includes the use of schools within the school day. 2. TBE's Shared Use Committee: Includes the use of schools after hours: In (1974) an eight point criteria called “shared use” was considered as the City worked with the TBE to share costs, etc. This was a very collaborative approach.* In the 1970s, there were Parallel Use guidelines . We are reviewing this to see how we can align the "Open Schools" guidelines to these guidelines.
* Next steps include developing Guiding Principles and considering how this strategy is going to work. That needs to be done here and with the consultation of the Design Team.

*Comment*: A Community - School joint development project should begin with a gap analysis.* Model Schools hopes that the Design Team will help formulate this, and that the school – based team will define local needs.

*Comment*: The School Board / City Advisory Committee is talking about how to protect schools. It is not looking at spending a lot of money, or purchasing sites. The Advisory Committee passed a motion to establish a Community Asset Utilization Measure. *Comment*: I think it is worth noting that TDSB was part of the Toronto **First Duty** project, which used schools as a hub to deliver early child development services in the early 2000s. The first five **First Duty** models were each very different, with common elements.*Comment*: A lot of work around principles needs to be done. What values are we bringing to how we look at the gap; whose voices are heard; whose ideas move forward? The experiences of individuals and groups have changed since the 1970s.*Comment*: With regard to the selection of a pilot school, please consider not downtown. TDSB needs a win in a suburban area. I think the old York, Scarborough, North York when I think about such a school. **Q: Is there a rationale for not listing a parent / community representative on the planning committee?** A: The School Council representatives are where we engage with parents. We can make it more explicit in the document and list parents.**Q: Using the example of daytime ESL classes which locate classes in libraries for free, instead of schools, which charge fees. Classes should be in schools, along with daytime Senior activities. Not one senior activity is located in a school, because they cannot afford the permits.**A: These are very good points. This is the gap analysis that is required. We will need hard numbers to work with as this strategy develops.**Q: How will this be different from the current permit system? What will happen to groups currently using school space? Will they continue to remain a priority?**A:There are permit costs that can’t change right away. Change will also depend on the willingness of the City. This strategy also has to address a Principal's reasonable fear of damage to school facility or equipment. The strategy has to address who manages that circumstance. *Comment*: The goal is to lower or eliminate costs in some places; to localize decision making; and to re-evaluate and localize what organizations are in our schools.**Q:Are you concerned that the City Priority Neighbourhoods and the Model Schools are not totally aligned?**A: The City's new Neighbourhood Improvement Areas (NIAs) are much better aligned than the old designations..**Q: Does this plan include outdoor space?** A: Not at this point in its development. **Q: Are you looking at existing successful hubs, like United Way's (UWGT) recently opened Hubs?** A: Yes, the UWGT is on the Design Team. **Q: Safety concerns will arise. Will the pilot have a response to that concern?** A: Yes. Another consideration is that some aspects of school security are Ministry-mandated. * Superintendent Branco asked members to please send her an email with any research or examples they think the team should consider.
* In September, the team will bring you an update from our summer work.
* Members were asked to return their library copies of the draft.
 | **ACTION**: MSIC staff will update ICAC at the September meeting regarding progress made over the summer months, with the Design Team and with the selection of pilot schools. |
| **Terms of Reference** | * Alejandra Bravo presented the Terms of Reference (TOR) recommended by the Governance sub-committee for adoption.
* A TOR is a living document, and will never be perfect. It can be reviewed and changed. It is one of our duties to refresh the document.
* We would like ICAC's inclusive approach to membership and decision-making to continue.

**Q: Section 2 Mandate: The reference to *"reviewing funding issues*** ***(LOG and the LOD)" W*hat is LOD?** A:This is the historic mandate from 2005. **Suggested revision: "The ICAC was established in 2005". Remove the balance of the detail. Amendment Approved.**Membership and Composition (section 3).*Clarification* requested: Membership and Composition (section 3).A: Last meeting, we were asked to place ICAC in its historic context. This is the historic Membership as set out in 2005. **Recommend amendment: Change to read one superintendent; change Principal to read "Coordinating Principal, MSIC".** **Recommendation: Add Minimum of 4 parent / community members;***Suggestion*: let's look at previous draft description:Draft D: Membership description:* ***ICAC membership is comprised of:***
	+ ***TDSB Trustees and TDSB staff representatives;***
	+ ***TDSB parents and community members;***
	+ ***Representatives from Employee Groups, Federations, and Unions;***
	+ ***Post-secondary institutions; staff representatives from public institutions and departments of the City of Toronto; and representatives from foundations and community agencies.***

**Motion: List the membership as it is, incorporating above changes re: superintendent and principal, minimum 3 Trustees and minimum 4 parent / community.****Approved.**Section 3: Page 2: **Amend to read "The committee is supported by a part-time coordinator.**" (Remove the part about MSIC).Section 5: Decision making.**Recommendation:** **a) Remove the full section on decision-making.** **b) Section 6: Ahead of the statement on Roberts Rules of Order "Decisions are made by voting members."**Section 7, Page 4: **Remove the first sentence "trustee co-chair rotates". Add “as stated in section 3”****Motion to Adopt as Amended:**Moved: Trustee Stiles, Seconded Trustee Ford. Approved | **MOTION:** to Adopt TOR as Amended. Moved: Trustee Stiles, Seconded Trustee Ford. Approved**ACTION**: Coordinator will revise the TOR as per the approved amendments, and Governance will provide a final review of the document. The adopted TOR will be forwarded to the PCEO and posted to the ICAC web page. |
| **ICAC Sub-Committees** | **Fairer Ways & Greater Means:*** Laurie Green and David Clandfield gave the report
* The review of the Learning Opportunity Index (LOI )is on the Planning and Priorities (P&P) Agenda for the meeting tomorrow, Wednesday, June 10th. The Coordinator has booked a deputation spot for ICAC.
* This stage was a review of the LOI Policy. Staff are recommending no changes.
* Next Step is a review of the LOI procedures. Staff recommend the creation of a Workgroup. ICAC needs to be represented on the Workgroup.
* ICAC is concerned with the issue of cut-offs for support as determined by the LOI. A hard cut off creates a dislocation in resources, and a lack of continuity in support. It is important to raise this issue again.
* One suggestion is to change the LOI review period from 2 years to 5 years, to allow the kind of intensive teaching and curriculum support provided by Model Schools to show results. This solution does not accommodate fast moving changes in school demographics that sometimes occur.
* Example: This year, there are 16 schools that are not Model Schools because this Review was underway and changes were delayed by a year. If the LOI is reviewed every two years, the list of Model Schools will change every 2 years.

 *Comment*: This past year, Model Schools started to implement a tiered approach to support, with its iPad early literacy program, providing iPads and professional development to the next 100 schools beyond the Model Schools cut-off.**Deputation**: David Clandfield and Laurie Green will represent ICAC. They share the deputation with Trustees Stiles, M. Ford and Cary-Meagher in advance of the P&P meeting.**Special Education**: no report.**International Languages**: * Bob Spencer provided the report.
* A meeting was held at Bala School with a group of interested parents. The group supports an extended day model that involves integrating language and culture in the school. It needs to have almost unanimous parent support to work.
* Superintendent Branco and Professor Jim Cummins discussed the possibility of dual language books as a pilot. This initiative requires a similar conversation as that around Open Schools, because it requires multiple sites.
* The group will report in September.
 | **MOTION**: The ICAC deputation to the P&P Committee on June 10th, 2015, will ask that the LOI review period be moved from 2 years to 5 years to better support continuity within the MSIC program. It will also ask that ICAC be included as a member of the LOI Procedural Review Work Group.Moved, Laurie Green. Seconded, Nathan Gilbert. Approved.**ACTION**: The Coordinator will share the draft deputation and Confirmation of the Deputation appearance with Laurie Green and David Clandfield, copying Trustees Stiles, M. Ford and Cary-Meagher.  |
|  **Trustee Report** | None. |  |
| **New Business** | * Alejandra Bravo raised an item
* I am asking that ICAC pass a motion on police carding. There is a Police Services Board meeting next week with community representation on the issue.

**MOTION**:***"Whereas, youth living in Toronto's inner city communities are disproportionately affected by the practice of Police Carding, the Inner City Advisory Committee (ICAC) opposes carding and asks that any new Toronto Police Service policy require that all persons stopped by a police officer are informed of their rights, they receive a receipt of the interaction, and that existing carding data be purged."****Comment*: Is this an appropriate motion for ICAC? *Comment*: Should ICAC make a motion to a standing committee or to the Board for inclusion at June 17th regular meeting?* Trustee Stiles: I am in support of the motion. There is a busy Agenda at the June 17th Board. I would be proud to bring this motion forward.
* Moved, Alejandra Bravo, Seconded Marit Stiles. Approved.

**Q: Is there any update on the progress towards the establishment of an Inner City Department, as outlined in the Years of Action?** A: There is no progress to report. This is still in the background.**Q: Can there be further updates to the ICAC web page please?** A: Yes some items have been recently updated, and further changes, like an Archive tab and adding new information will be discussed at a meeting Friday, so that changes can go ahead. | **MOTION**:**"Whereas, youth living in Toronto's inner city communities are disproportionately affected by the practice of Police Carding, the Inner City Advisory Committee (ICAC) opposes carding and asks that any new Toronto Police Service policy require that all persons stopped by a police officer are informed of their rights, they receive a receipt of the interaction, and that existing carding data be purged."****ACTION**: The Coordinator will forward the motion to Alejandra Bravo for a final review. The Coordinator will submit the motion to Board Services on the morning of June 10th for inclusion in the Agenda for the Regular Board meeting on June 17, 2015. A copy of the motion will be provided to Trustees Cary-Meagher and Stiles.  |
| **Next Meeting Date** | Thursday, September 24th, 9:30 to 12:30 pm at 5050 Yonge Street, Boardroom. |  |
| **Adjournment** | Moved. Nathan Gilbert. Seconded. Nadira Yasmin. Adjourned. |  |