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4. FUNDRAISING
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6. ADJOURNMENT
MOTION FOR BUDGET COMMITTEE
November 1st, 2010.

Subject: Financial Requirements and facilities renewal needs for the 2011 budgetary cycle

From: Trustee Irene Atkinson

WHEREAS there is serious urgency called for to ensure that a very strong and deliberate “ask” is delivered to the province at all levels in time to have an impact on the budgetary decision-makers for the 2011 budget decisions. To make an impact, there has to be a closely co-ordinated effort by the Board and its stakeholders.

AND WHEREAS at the Board level, there must be a focused political response that provides clear direction to staff.

AND WHEREAS Provincial pre-budget consultations start the first week of January. So far we have no plan to deliver any kind of “ask” to the Ministry’s Education Finance division, to the Minister or Deputy Minister of Education, or to the Minister of Finance.

AND WHEREAS we have no plan to approach the Minister of Infrastructure or the Premier with respect to the inclusion of school renewal in the forthcoming Ontario 10-Year Infrastructure plan.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

THAT the Director of Education be directed to adopt the following measures to ensure that TDSB takes a proactive approach to its financial requirements and facilities renewal needs entering the 2011 budgetary cycle:

a) Board staff develop options for funding TDSB school capital and school renewal, including by elaborating the eight options presented to the board in the April 20, 2010, report by Enid Slack Consulting: ie. Capital levy on the property tax; density transfers; Section 37 of the Planning Act; Development charges; public-private partnerships; community hubs/partnerships; feed-in tariff (FIT) program under the Green Energy Act; Federal transfers. Board staff shall develop the options through a publicly-transparent process in collaboration with the Board's stakeholders. Board staff shall prepare a report on the options by January 15, 2011, in time for submission by the Board to Education Finance and to the Ministry of Finance during the 2011 Pre-Budget Consultations, so as to enable the options to be considered by the province in development of the 2011 Ontario Budget and the associated 2011 Grants for Student Needs.
b) Facilities Division be directed to articulate the Board's school renewal needs to the Ministry of Education by November 30, 2010, so as to ensure those needs are fully understood by the province and may be addressed through a new school renewal funding program replacing Good Places to Learn in the 2011 Ontario Budget, or at a point subsequent to the Budget in 2011.

c) Finance Division be directed to articulate the Board's operating funding needs to the Ministry of Education by December 31, 2010, to ensure those needs are fully understood by the province and may be addressed in the 2011 Ontario Budget and the associated 2011 Grants for Student Needs.

d) The Director shall prepare a pre-Budget submission to the Ministry of Finance in January detailing the Board's financial requirements, education funding and school renewal needs, and the submission will be delivered by the Director and/or the Chair during the Pre-Budget Consultations in January 2011.

e) Board staff shall determine the province's intent with respect to including school capital and school renewal in the forthcoming Ontario 10-Year Infrastructure Plan, and take all possible measures to ensure that TDSB's capital and renewal needs are recognized, considered and included in the Plan by the Minister of Infrastructure.

AND THAT

The Director be requested to report on these matters in a timely fashion to the appropriate Committee of the Board, or the Board.

The foregoing is respectfully submitted for your consideration.

Irene Atkinson.
For Immediate Release

Monday, November 1, 2010

TDSB Budget Committee Takes a Strong Step Forward on Funding and Renewal
Motion Directs Board Staff to Spell Out 2011 Needs to Ontario Government

TORONTO – Trustees on the Toronto District School Board’s Budget Committee showed strong leadership and initiative Monday by approving a motion that directs Board staff to take a timely, proactive approach to ensuring the Ontario government fully understands TDSB’s financial needs and school renewal backlog early in the 2011 provincial Budget cycle.

Introduced by committee chair Irene Atkinson (Ward 7 – Parkdale-High Park), the motion ensures that the needs of TDSB’s students and schools will be clearly conveyed to the province in time to be considered and addressed in development of the last Budget before the fall 2011 provincial election. The motion directs TDSB staff to elaborate options for funding school capital and school renewal through a publicly transparent collaboration with its stakeholders; convey the Board’s school renewal needs to the Ministry of Education to allow them to be addressed through a new funding program similar to the cancelled Good Places to Learn program; convey the Board’s operating funding needs to the Ministry of Education to allow them to be addressed in the Budget and the 2011 Grants for Student Needs; make a comprehensive pre-Budget submission to the Minister of Finance; and, ensure TDSB’s school capital and renewal needs are included by the Minister of Infrastructure in the forthcoming Ontario 10-Year Infrastructure Plan.

RebuildOurSchools.org commended Budget Committee members who bolstered the motion with additional suggestions. Shaun Chen (Ward 21 – Scarborough-Rouge River) urged that Board staff ensure community consultation to tap the input of school councils and individual parents. Gerri Gershon (Ward 13 – Don Valley West) asked that Board staff ensure the development of funding options focus on the province recognizing the unique needs of large urban boards like TDSB. Sheila Cary-Meagher (Ward 16 – Beaches-East York) suggested staff undertake a line-by-line budget analysis to demonstrate to the province that current Board spending “has been cut to the bone.”

Committee chair Atkinson said the motion directs Board staff to work closely with stakeholders on priority issues entering 2011, including addressing TDSB’s $2.9 billion school renewal backlog. Updated ward-by-ward data on the backlog was compiled by the Board in September, taking into account the last spending on maintenance and repairs using the $413 million in funds provided under the province’s Good Places to Learn program before its termination in the 2010 Ontario Budget.
In the seven months since the Budget, the backlog of repairs and retrofits at TDSB’s aging schools has increased nearly $200 million. Following is the ward-by-ward breakout of TDSB’s renewal backlog, as of September 22, 2010:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARD</th>
<th>TRUSTEE-ELECT (incumbent*)</th>
<th>GPL PROJECTS 2005-10</th>
<th>RENEWAL BACKLOG 22 SEPT 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>John Hastings*</td>
<td>$14,053,192</td>
<td>$114,043,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chris Glover</td>
<td>$15,033,924</td>
<td>$165,932,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pamela Gough</td>
<td>$11,678,863</td>
<td>$87,474,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Stephnie Payne*</td>
<td>$10,509,037</td>
<td>$131,758,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Howard Kaplan</td>
<td>$10,264,768</td>
<td>$125,585,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chris Tonks*</td>
<td>$12,175,660</td>
<td>$154,109,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Irene Atkinson*</td>
<td>$ 9,732,665</td>
<td>$137,358,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Howard Goodman*</td>
<td>$15,144,837</td>
<td>$125,164,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Maria Rodrigues*</td>
<td>$12,993,042</td>
<td>$117,540,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Chris Bolton*</td>
<td>$18,981,918</td>
<td>$189,147,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Shelley Laskin</td>
<td>$17,828,533</td>
<td>$94,338,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mari Rutka*</td>
<td>$14,237,146</td>
<td>$123,139,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Gerri Gershon*</td>
<td>$19,384,856</td>
<td>$111,150,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sheila Ward*</td>
<td>$12,606,587</td>
<td>$105,310,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Cathy Dandy*</td>
<td>$21,153,975</td>
<td>$184,859,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sheila Cary-Meagher*</td>
<td>$31,223,088</td>
<td>$124,991,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Michael Coteau*</td>
<td>$21,910,905</td>
<td>$167,168,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Elizabeth Moyer</td>
<td>$23,978,374</td>
<td>$145,927,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>David Smith</td>
<td>$32,226,745</td>
<td>$207,876,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Soo Wong*</td>
<td>$14,581,581</td>
<td>$108,595,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Shaun Chen*</td>
<td>$13,486,781</td>
<td>$97,357,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Jerry Chadwick</td>
<td>$19,927,107</td>
<td>$163,402,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$373,113,597</td>
<td>$2,992,805,101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information, please contact the RebuildOurSchools.org co-chairs:

Maureen O’Shaughnessy  416.482.5002 or Maureen.OShaughnessy@RebuildOurSchools.org
Jimmy Hazel  647.201.5002 or Jimmy.Hazel@RebuildOurSchools.org
5. **French Course Costs**

On motion of Trustee Atkinson, on behalf of Student Trustee Wu, the Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee **RECOMMENDS**:

Whereas, French and English are the two official languages of Canada and are recognized to have equal rights, and both are actively promoted in TDSB schools; and

Whereas, a Grade 9 French credit is required for a student to receive an OSSD; and

Whereas, students have to pay for French workbooks but never incur any fees for English courses, even though both are mandatory for graduation; and

Whereas, students should have equitable access to resources, and fees should not be charged based on arbitrary factors;

Therefore, be it resolved that the following policy statements be adopted:

(a) Students shall not be made to pay a fee for additional learning materials in French classes.

(b) Payments made in French courses shall be consistent with payments in English courses. No student shall be made to pay for any course material in a French course which they would not otherwise pay for in an English course.

(c) Should any payments be absolutely required in a French course, the parent or student shall be informed beforehand about what the cost is and where it will be spent.

6. **Student Activity Fees and Course Cost Fees**

On motion of Trustee Harrison, the Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee **REFERS WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION** the following (introduced by Student Trustee Ng):

That staff provide related information for the Board meeting scheduled for June 23-24, 2010:

Whereas, results of student consultations conducted by the Board’s Student SuperCouncil show that the large majority of students must pay some form of fee each year, which
covers items such as yearbooks, locks, and agendas (often as part of a welcome package), in addition to certain course materials, and

Whereas, the Board’s operational procedure PR579, Student Activity Fees and Course Cost Fees is in need of revisions in order to mitigate inequities and increase the transparency of the collection of student activity fees;

Therefore, be it resolved:

(a) That the revisions to PR579, Student Activity Fees and Course Cost Fees, as highlighted (see attachment), be adopted;

(b) That the revised procedure be disseminated to all school staff and administrators to ensure its proper implementation and compliance beginning September 2010.
Title: Student Activity Fees and Course Cost Fees

1.0 OBJECTIVE
To provide guidelines for the administration of student activity fees and course cost fees

2.0 DEFINITIONS

Student activity fee  Student activity fees are collected from students in secondary schools to allow the organizing of activities and sponsoring of events that promote school spirit, such as spirit days, dances, student groups, clubs, teams, and other appropriate activities.

3.0 RESPONSIBILITY

Associate Director

4.0 PROCEDURES

4.1 Student Activity Fees
(a) No student shall be denied a timetable for failure to pay the student activity fee.
(b) Principals will involve school councils in deciding the amount of the student activity fee and what additional costs are included in the student activity fee. A parent representative could sit on the committee that allocates these funds.
(c) Principals will involve student councils in deciding the amount of the student activity fee in the annual budgeting and allocation of student activity fees.
(d) Principals will publish and communicate a student activity fee budget summary to school councils, students, and parents annually to ensure transparency.
(e) As per the financial reporting requirements, schools are required to submit a financial statement to the Board of all school financial activity, which includes all student fees collected and related disbursements. These records may be subject to audit as part of the Board’s financial audit process. Therefore, it is important that schools properly maintain their financial records by following the recommended accounting practices.
4.2 Course Costs:

(a) All students in regular day school programs can expect to be provided textbooks in order to complete the course expectations.¹

(b) There may be additional costs for learning resource materials that students may purchase to enhance their program. Examples of these include uniforms for physical education classes, art supplies, and similar personal or consumable items over which a student retains ownership.

(c) Parents/guardians/caregivers and students must be notified in writing, if there is any additional cost for learning and resource materials for courses at the school.

(d) To the extent possible, dependence on charges for learning and/or resource materials should be minimized.

(e) If students are charged additional costs to enhance their program, the principal is responsible for the collection and disbursement of all monies collected.

(f) Where there is financial hardship, the principal may waive the requirement charge for learning resource materials to allow a student to enroll and participate fully in the educational experience.

(g) Notwithstanding course costs, students must be able to enroll and participate in any class and have the opportunity to acquire all skills and knowledge required to complete course requirement without any additional cost to enhance their program.

4.1 Student Activity Fees

(a) The current amount and intended allocation of the student activity fee shall be in each school’s profile on the Board’s website and in each school’s agenda. Fee schedules for the upcoming school year should be made widely available to the school community and to new students and their parents in September before the school year begins. Information about the process to confidentially address financial hardship should also be included.

(b) Written documentation in the form of a receipt will be provided to students and/or parents upon payment of the student fee, indicating the intended allocation of the fee.

¹ “Every school board shall provide without charge for the use of each pupil enrolled in a day school operated by the board textbooks for courses in which the pupil is enrolled.” (s. 7, Reg. 298, Education Act). “A teacher has a duty to use only approved textbooks.” (s. 264, Education Act).
(c) Schools should make every effort to communicate with the school community by providing information on student fees in multiple languages and formats.

(d) Each spring, principals will consult staff, school councils, and student councils in deciding the amount and breakdown of the student activity fee.

(e) Where the principal (or designate) is satisfied that a financial hardship exists for a student or family, all or part of the activity or special program fee may be waived in a confidential manner. Students must be able to participate in school activities and access resources regardless of personal financial barriers.

(f) Information about the student activity fee must be provided to parents looking to enrol their child(ren) in the school to allow them to make informed decisions.

(g) Funds collected through student activity fees shall remain in the school or be used towards supporting the student community.

(h) Fees charged should reflect the actual cost of the services or materials being provided to the student.

(i) Fees raised for school purposes are to complement, and not replace, public funding for education.

4.2 Course Costs

(a) All students in regular day school programs can expect to be provided with course materials in order to complete the course expectations. Successful completion of a required course leading to graduation cannot be dependent on the payment of any course fee. No student will be refused admission to a course, program, or school because of failure to pay the course fee.²

(b) Mandatory learning materials that are required with the textbook for completion of the curriculum such as workbooks, cahiers, musical instruments, art supplies, science supplies, lab material kits, and safety goggles are ineligible for fee charges.

(c) There may be optional additional costs for learning resource materials that students may purchase to enhance their program. Examples of these include uniforms for physical education classes, art supplies, and similar personal or consumable items.

(d) During course selection, information will be provided on costs students can expect to pay in any course. Costs students have paid in the past by enrolling in a particular course will be used as a reference.

² “Every school board shall provide without charge for the use of each pupil enrolled in a day school operated by the board textbooks for courses in which the pupil is enrolled.” (s. 7, Reg. 298, Education Act). “A teacher has a duty to use only approved textbooks.” (s. 264, Education Act).
(e) To the extent possible, costs related to enhancing programming shall be kept to a minimum.

(f) If students are charged additional costs to enhance their program, the principal, a designate, or a curriculum leader is responsible for providing advance notification to parents and students detailing the collection and disbursement of all monies collected.

(g) Where the principal is satisfied that a financial hardship exists for a student or family, all or part of the course fee may be waived.
BRIEFING NOTE

Date 29 October 2010  
To Trustees  
From Penny Mustin  
Deputy Director of Operations  
(416) 397-3188  

Donna Quan  
Deputy Director, Academic  
(416) 397-3190  

Staff Person Carrying Responsibility:  
Karen Grose, Coordinating Superintendent, Futuristic Schools  
(416) 394-3910  

Subject PROGRAMS OF CHOICE FEASIBILITY STUDY UPDATE #2  

Background On 26 April 2010, the Board decided: that a feasibility study be approved for four elementary Programs of Choice in each quadrant, and that the study include potential viable site locations and their potential pathways to secondary programming, equity of opportunity for families wishing to attend Programs of Choice, a budget plan including the cost of school start up and the resources required for each and be presented to the Program and School Services Committee by August 2010:

(i) the Boys’ Leadership Academy; 
(ii) the Girls’ Leadership Academy; 
(iii) the Choir School [the Vocal Music Academy]; 
(iv) the Sports Academy [the Sports and Wellness Academy].

Over the past three months as outlined in Update #1, work regarding the Programs of Choice Feasibility Study included:

A. Determination of Guiding Principles as a Framework for the Feasibility Study; 
B. Examination and Determination of Potential Program Models; 
C. Initial Site Scan for Determination of Available Space; 
D. Examination of Staffing Implications; 
E. Initial Discussion of Admission and Application Process.

Context This briefing note provides an update on work done to date through September and October 2010.
1. A comprehensive site scan was conducted to determine potential Programs of Choice site locations in all elementary schools in each Quadrant. The site scan was conducted using the following criteria:

- Surplus space of 150 Head Count in 2009/10 and 180 Head Count in both 2015 and 2019 to accommodate growth potential (the scan included system-wide implementation of Full Day Kindergarten);
- Identification of currently existing programs (e.g. Extended French and French Immersion, Full Service Schools, Alternative Schools) to honour Guiding Principle #6 which states: The Board will work towards fair and equal distribution of specialized programs so that all schools have an opportunity for a specialized program focus and so that existing specialized programs can be supported for growth and expansion;
- Identification of and surplus space for all elementary school pathways and potential pathways to secondary school programming;
- Collection of information regarding the location of currently existing programs (e.g. Parent and Family Literacy Centres, Child Care, Special Education, Continuing Education Programs, Model Schools for Inner City, Safe and Caring Programs, Section 23 Programs, Alternative Programs) to ensure these programs would not be impacted by accommodating a proposed Program of Choice; and
- Collection of information regarding existing operational elements (e.g. barrier free access, the Facility Condition Index, portables on site).

As a result of the comprehensive site scan, it has been determined there are 32 potential sites that could accommodate a Program of Choice. (See Appendix A)

2. A Programs of Choice Program Area Review Team (PART) Process was created and includes:

- Striking a PART Committee (week of 25 October 2010);
- identification of background information and applicable data to share;
- input into coordinating and participating in the collection of local school based information at the 32 potential sites (1-12 November 2010); and
- input into coordinating and participating in the sharing of the feasibility study process to date and the programming elements of each Program of Choice with interested students, parents/caregivers and staff at Community Information Meetings in each Quadrant (22-25 November 2010)

3. A marketing and communications plan to share information and determine the level of community interest in Programs of Choice is being developed.

4. The initial concept of a centralized on-line registration process is being explored.
Next Steps

Next Steps include:

- implementing the Program Area Review Team (PART) process;
- determining a final proposed site list based on the 32 potential sites identified;
- determining the initial level of community interest in Programs of Choice through Community Information nights and paper and on-line surveys;
- determining a budget including the cost of school start up and the resources required for each Program of Choice; and
- developing a centralized on-line registration process.

The Programs of Choice feasibility study report will be provided to the Board in January 2011.

Appendices

Appendix A  Programs of Choice Potential School Sites
Appendix B  Programs of Choice Potential School Sites Map

A03Administrative Council(s)(Briefing Notes/programs of choiceupdate#2BNfinrev)kg.
Last update: 29 October 2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOS</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NW1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Elms JMS</td>
<td>JK-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Broadacres JS</td>
<td>JK-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>James S Bell JMS</td>
<td>JK-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Second Street JMS</td>
<td>JK-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yorkwoods PS</td>
<td>JK-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shoreham PS</td>
<td>JK-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Calico PS</td>
<td>JK-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fisherville JHS</td>
<td>7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Portage Trail JCS/Portage Trail MCS</td>
<td>JK-5/6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Queen Victoria Jr PS</td>
<td>JK-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Flemington PS</td>
<td>JK-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Carleton Village Jr &amp; Sr PS</td>
<td>JK-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fairbank Memorial CS</td>
<td>JK-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>General Mercer Jr PS</td>
<td>JK-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ryerson CS</td>
<td>JK-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Forest Hill Jr &amp; Sr PS</td>
<td>JK-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Church Street Jr PS / Native Learning Centre</td>
<td>JK-6 / 9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Jesse Ketchum Jr &amp; Sr PS</td>
<td>JK-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lord Dufferin Jr $ Sr PS</td>
<td>JK-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Bruce Jr PS</td>
<td>JK-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Morse Street Jr PS</td>
<td>JK-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Earl Beatty Jr &amp; Sr PS &amp; Community Centre</td>
<td>JK-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Donview MS</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ernest PS</td>
<td>JK-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Lescon PS</td>
<td>JK-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Rene Gordon ES</td>
<td>JK-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Fairglen Jr PS</td>
<td>JK-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Highland Heights Jr PS</td>
<td>JK-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Pauline Johnson Jr PS</td>
<td>JK-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Heather Heights Jr PS</td>
<td>JK-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Jack Miner Sr PS</td>
<td>7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>West Rouge Jr PS</td>
<td>JK-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BRIEFING NOTE

Date 5 November 2010

To Trustees

From Penny Mustin
Deputy Director, Operations
(416) 397-3188

Donna Quan
Deputy Director, Academic
(416) 397-3190

Staff Person Carrying Responsibility:
Karen Grose
Coordinating Superintendent, Futuristic Schools
(416) 394-3910

Subject PROGRAMS OF CHOICE FEASIBILITY STUDY, UPDATE #3

Background On 26 April 2010, the Board decided: that a feasibility study be approved for four elementary Programs of Choice in each quadrant, and that the study include potential viable site locations and their potential pathways to secondary programming, equity of opportunity for families wishing to attend Programs of Choice, a budget plan including the cost of school start up and the resources required for each and be presented to the Program and School Services Committee by August 2010:

(i) the Boys’ Leadership Academy;
(ii) the Girls’ Leadership Academy;
(iii) the Choir School [the Vocal Music Academy];
(iv) the Sports Academy [the Sports and Wellness Academy].

From June to August 2010, as outlined in Update #1, work regarding the Programs of Choice Feasibility Study included:

A. Determination of Guiding Principles as a Framework for the Feasibility Study;
B. Examination and Determination of Potential Program Models;
C. Initial Site Scan for Determination of Available Space;
D. Examination of Staffing Implications;
E. Initial Discussion of Admission and Application Process.

In September and October 2010, as outlined in Update #2, work regarding the Programs of Choice Feasibility Study included:
F. Comprehensive Site Scan for Determination of Available Space which resulted in the identification of 32 potential elementary sites that could possibly accommodate a Program of Choice

G. Creation of a Programs of Choice Program Area Review Team (PART) process

H. Initial Discussion of a Marketing and Communications Plan for sharing information and determination of preliminary level of community interest in Programs of Choice

I. Exploration of the concept of a centralized on-line registration process

**Context**

An information flyer and survey has been created to share information and determine the preliminary level of community interest in the four Programs of Choice. (See Appendix A)

It is intended the information flyer and survey will be sent home to parents, guardians and caregivers of all elementary students, Junior Kindergarten to Grade 7, in the November Progress Report Card. The November Progress Report Card goes home with students the week of 15 November 2010.

The information flyer and survey will also be available to parents, guardians and caregivers on-line. Paper and on-line information and surveys will be available in all official languages.

**Next Steps**

Next steps include:

- determining the final available site list based on the 32 potential sites identified;
- determining a budget including the cost of school start up and the resources required for each Programs of Choice; and
- developing a centralized on-line registration process.

Given the recent feedback from Trustees regarding the Programs of Choice Feasibility Study and more specifically, the proposed Community Information Evenings tentatively planned for 22 - 25 November 2010, Programs of Choice will be discussed as part of the Director’s update at the next Board Meeting on 10 November 2010.

The Programs of Choice feasibility study report will be provided to the Board in January 2011.

**Appendices**

Appendix A Programs of Choice Information Flyer and Survey
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