

Regular Meeting

May 19, 2004

A regular meeting was convened at 4:15 p.m. on Wednesday, May 19, 2004, in the Boardroom at 5050 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario with Sheila Ward, Chair of the Board, presiding.

The following members were present: Trustees Irene Atkinson, Chris Bolton, John Campbell, Sheila Cary-Meagher, Michael Coteau, Gary Crawford, Gerri Gershon, Bruce Davis, Howard Goodman, Scott Harrison, Elizabeth Hill, Sheine Mankovsky, Josh Matlow, Stan Nemiroff, Noah Ng, Stephnie Payne, Maria Rodrigues, Mari Rutka, Patrick Rutledge, David Shory, Rick Telfer, Sheila Ward (Chair) and Student Trustees Alison Wong and William Wong. Trustees Harrison and Telfer participated by electronic means.

168. Approval of the Agenda

Trustee Matlow, seconded by Trustee Goodman, moved: **That the agenda be approved.**

The motion was carried.

169. Declaration of Possible Conflict of Interest

Trustee Cary-Meagher declared a possible conflict of interest with regard to the matter of Negotiations as presented in Report No. 8 of the Committee of the Whole (Private) as her daughter is a member of OSSTF, District 12. Trustee Cary-Meagher was not present during discussion or voting on this matter in private or in public.

170. Resolution Into Committee of the Whole (Private Session)

At 4:20 p.m., on a motion by Trustee Rutledge, seconded by Trustee Shory, the regular meeting resolved into Committee of the Whole (Private Session) to consider matters on the private agenda of the Committee of the Whole.

171. Reconvene

At 6 p.m. the regular meeting reconvened.

172. Committee of the Whole (Private Session), Report No. 8, May 19, 2004 (see page 343)

Trustee Atkinson, seconded by Trustee Hill, moved: **That Report No. 8 of the Committee of the Whole (Private Session) be adopted.**

The motion was carried.

173. Reports From the Board's Representatives on Other Organizations

Board of Health

Trustee Cary-Meagher informed the members that the Board of Health is addressing issues related to the pesticide ban.

Ontario Public School Boards' Association, Board of Directors

Trustee Gershon informed the members of a recent Canadian School Boards' Association meeting held in Prince Edward Island and the upcoming annual general meeting of the Ontario School Boards' Association that will be held June 4 and 5, 2004.

174. Consent Agenda

Trustee Davis, seconded by Trustee Bolton, moved: **That the following matters presented as Consent Agenda items be received or adopted, as appropriate.**

The approved matters presented as Consent Agenda items were as follows:

- (a) Special Education Advisory Committee, Report No. 5, April 19, 2004 (see page 346)
- (b) Communications
 - From the City Clerk, A Resolution From City Council, Stand Up for Scarborough, Scarborough Community Council
 - From the Minister of Education, dated April 14, 2004, re Ontario Scholar Program, Eligibility of Students Taking Workplace Preparation and Open Courses
- (c) Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 4, May 13, 2004 (see page 351)
- (d) Human Resources and Staff Development Committee, Report No. 6, May 4, 2004 (see page 356)
- (e) Accountability and Finance Committee, Report No. 5, May 12, 2004 (see page 360)
 - Item 1, System Report Card
- (f) House Committee, Report No. 4, May 6, 2004 (see page 373)
 - Item 1, Trustee Salary and Benefits

175. Confirmation of Minutes

Trustee Hill, seconded by Trustee Matlow, moved: **That the minutes of the Regular Meetings Held on March 24 and April 21, 2004 and the Special Meeting Held on April 19, 2004, be confirmed.**

Trustee Cary-Meagher, seconded by Trustee Davis, moved: **That consideration of this matter be postponed to the next regular meeting.**

The motion to postpone consideration was carried.

176. Reconsideration of School Year Calendar

Having given notice at the previous regular meeting held on April 21, 2004, Trustee Gershon, seconded by Trustee Davis, moved: **That in accordance with Board Bylaw 4.9, the matter of the school year calendar be reconsidered.**

The motion to reconsider was defeated on a recorded vote (Recorded Vote 67, see page 342). (Reconsideration requires a majority of all members of the Board, Bylaw 4.9).

177. Synchronization of GTA School Year Calendars

Trustee Rutka, seconded by Trustee Atkinson, moved:

Whereas, having been granted Ministry permission, our board has the opportunity to consolidate March (Spring) and Easter Breaks in 2005, thus creating a longer, uninterrupted holiday for students and staff; and

Whereas, if we are the only GTA board to have this holiday schedule this may cause considerable inconvenience to families who have students or staff who would be taking March Break and Easter Break on different schedules; and

Whereas, if we are the only GTA school board to schedule March and Easter holidays contiguously, we may be burdened with substantial extra transportation costs;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Chair ask the Ministry of Education to consider the implications and possibility of joining March (Spring) Break and Easter Break in those years when the two breaks are separated by a week or less so that, in future years, school boards may have clear direction on whether or not such a linkage is desirable.

The motion was carried.

178. Exit Interviews for Departing Staff

Trustee Cary-Meagher, seconded by Trustee Matlow, moved:

- (a) That a qualified external human resources management firm be engaged to conduct confidential exit interviews between now and the end of the school year with:**
 - (i) every supervisory officer and senior manager leaving the Board's employment;**
 - (ii) a representative sample of principals and vice-principals leaving the Board's employment;**
- (b) That the exit interview process be structured in order to provide the Board with a report on:**

- (i) **specific areas of the Board's operations that are meeting student needs;**
 - (ii) **specific areas of the Board's operations that could be improved;**
 - (iii) **specific factors that played a material part in the individual's decision to leave the Board's employment;**
- (c) **That the exit interviews of current employees who will be leaving the Board's employment within the next four months be concluded by June 15, 2004;**
- (d) **That a special committee be appointed to select, direct and monitor the work of the human resources management firm and that the special committee receive the input of the Executive Superintendent, Employee Services during this process;**
- (e) **That the special committee consist of the Chair of the Board, the Chair of the Human Resources and Staff Development Committee and the Chair of the Accountability and Finance Committee;**
- (f) **That the human resources management firm present its report on the initial round of exit interviews to the Chair's Committee by June 30, 2004, or earlier if this can be accommodated;**
- (g) **That \$20,000 be allocated to fund this initiative.**

The motion was carried.

179. Portugal Week

Trustee Rodrigues, seconded by Trustee Shory, moved: **That the important place of the Portuguese community in the fabric of our multicultural city be honoured by recognizing Portugal Week from June 5 to 12 and the activities held during the week, and particularly June 10, Portugal Day.**

The motion was carried.

180. Recommendations of the Community Use of Schools Task Force

Trustee Coteau, seconded by Trustee Cary-Meagher, moved:

- (a) **That Facility Services make available a shared or pro-rated permit fee schedule when a building is occupied by multiple permit holders during the same time period and that staff advise all applicants of the opportunity to share incremental costs in buildings where there are multiple permit holders;**
- (b) **That in sites where Parks and Recreation is currently programming, the balance of the building be open during those permit hours to not-for-profit local community youth groups for modest incremental costs until such time as the new fee structure is implemented.**

Trustee Gershon, seconded by Trustee Campbell, moved: **That this matter be tabled.**

The motion to table was defeated.

Trustee Cary-Meagher, seconded by Trustee Matlow, moved: **That in Part (a) after “all applicants,” the following be added: “at the time of application.”**

The amendment was carried.

Trustee Goodman, seconded by Trustee Atkinson, moved: **That the matter, as amended, be referred to the Community Use of Schools Task Force for further information to be provided to the Board.**

The motion to refer was carried.

181. Optional French Programs at Adam Beck and Williamson Road Public Schools

Trustee Cary-Meagher, seconded by Trustee Hill, moved:

Whereas, there has been difficulties in implementing optional French programs at Adam Beck Junior Public School and Williamson Road Public School;

Therefore, be it resolved that the local trustee, superintendent of education and principals be empowered to present a solution to the Board concerning the problems of intake for optional French programming at Adam Beck Junior Public School and Williamson Road Public School for the 2004-05 school year.

Following discussion, Trustee Bolton, seconded by Trustee Payne, moved: **That the debate be ended.**

The motion to end the debate was carried.

The main motion was carried.

182. Recess

At 6:40 p.m. on a motion of Trustee Nemiroff, seconded by Trustee Davis, the meeting recessed for one hour.

183. Reordering of the Agenda

With the agreement of the members, agenda items were reordered during the meeting.

184. Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004 (see page 375)

Trustee Davis, seconded by Trustee Coteau, moved: **That Report No. 7 of the Program and School Services Committee be adopted.**

re Item 1, Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools Report (see page 375)

Trustee Bolton, seconded by Trustee Cary-Meagher, moved in amendment: **That the recommendation in the committee report be replaced by the following:**

- (a) That the report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools be referred to the Chair's Committee:**
 - (i) to establish the work group as referenced in the report (agenda page 42);**
 - (ii) to review and report back to the Board by September 2004 regarding implementation of the recommendations;**
- (b) That recommendations 7.1, 9.1, 11.2 (a) only, 11.3 (f) and (h) only, 11.5, 11.6 (b) only and 11.8 (a) to (e) and (h) only from the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools report be approved.**

Trustee Davis, seconded by Trustee Atkinson, moved in amendment to the amendment: **That the following be added to the end of Part (b): "and that staff report to the Board in June on how these recommendations can be implemented."**

The amendment to the amendment was carried on a recorded vote (Recorded Vote 68, see page 342).

The parts of the motion, as amended, were voted on separately as follows:

Part (a)(i) was carried on a recorded vote (Recorded Vote 69, see page 342). Student Trustees A. Wong and W. Wong voted in favour.

Part (a)(ii) was carried on a recorded vote (Recorded Vote 70, see page 342). Student Trustees A. Wong and W. Wong voted in favour.

Part (b), as amended, was carried on a recorded vote (Recorded Vote 71, see page 342). Student Trustees A. Wong and W. Wong voted in favour.

Later in the meeting, Trustee Gershon, seconded by Trustee Rutledge, moved: **That staff be requested to prepare an analysis and recommendations with regard to the report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools.**

The motion was carried.

For a summary of the Board's decision regarding the report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools, see page 401.

Later in the meeting, the Board considered the remainder of Report No. 7 of the Program and School Services Committee.

re Item 2, Building Bridges for Youth at Risk Pilot Project (see page 375)

The Board considered additional information as requested by the Program and School Services Committee concerning costs involved in adjusting the project as recommended by the Committee (see page 408).

Trustee Harrison, seconded by Trustee Campbell, moved: **That the matter be referred to the Budget Committee for consideration of costing and possible funding.**

Trustee Rodrigues, seconded by Trustee Cary-Meagher, moved in amendment: **That referral be changed to the Building Bridges committee for consideration of a different staffing configuration that remains within the allocated budget of \$2.2 million.**

The amendment to the motion to refer was carried.

The motion to refer, as amended, was carried on a recorded vote (Recorded Vote 72, see page 342).

The main motion to adopt Report No. 7 of the Program and School Services Committee, as amended, was carried.

185. Written Notice of Motion

Trustee Payne presented the following written notice of motion for consideration at the next regular meeting:

Whereas, Pathways to Success has been established and had its first meeting on May 13, 2004; and

Whereas, the committee members identified various barriers which inhibit the academic success for many students; and

Whereas, students from identifiable racialized and “at risk” groups are performing at academically lower levels than others and are at risk of dropping out;

Therefore, be it resolved:

- (a) That the Pathways to Success committee explore the idea of an innovative pilot school program in an urban inner-city area for students who are at risk in general and specifically students of African heritage;
- (b) That the Pathways to Success committee explore ideas and research linking academic achievement of children that are at risk, specifically those of African heritage with structured cultural intervention and prevention programs.

186. Student Trustees and Student SuperCouncil Executive, 2004-05

Student Trustees A. Wong and W. Wong introduced the two Student SuperCouncil representatives who will serve next year as the Board’s student trustees and next year’s SuperCouncil executive as follows:

- Student Trustees : Ige Egal and Hillay Nabi
- Student SuperCouncil President: Tim Kim
- Vice-president: Lena Yam
- Secretary-Treasurer: Debi Banerjee
- Conference Chair: Babu Camalan
- Communications Officer: Igor Denisov
- South West Quadrant Co-Chairs: Melissa Seow and Ilyas Ally
- North East Quadrant Co-Chairs: Zarna Shah and Kyle Ma
- South East Quadrant Co-Chairs: Elli Weisbaum and Isaivany Sadacharalingam
- North West Quadrant Co-Chairs: Pallvi Popli and Dana Koubar

187. Community Use of Schools Task Force Report

Trustee Coteau presented brief overview of the activities of the Community Use of Schools Task Force to date including the formation of two subcommittees: the Literature/Research Work Group and the Financial Audit Work Group.

188. Communications

Trustee Cary-Meagher, seconded by Trustee Nemiroff, moved: **That the following communications be received:**

- (a) **From the Elementary Teachers' Federation of Ontario to the Minister of Children and Youth Services, dated April 29, 2004 re School Food Programs;**
- (b) **From Trillium Lakelands District School Board to the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, dated April 14, 2004, re the Ontario Youth Apprenticeship Program;**
- (c) **From the Waterloo Region District School Board to the Minister of Finance, dated April 8, 2004, re Full Relief from the GST.**

The motion was carried.

Trustee Cary-Meagher, seconded by Trustee Shory, moved: **That communications from the Trillium Lakelands District School Board to the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, dated April 14, 2004, re the Ontario Youth Apprenticeship Program and the Waterloo Region District School Board to the Minister of Finance, dated April 8, 2004, re full relief from the GST be received.**

The motion was carried.

189. Campaign Against School Boards Paying GST

With the permission of the meeting, Trustee Atkinson, seconded by Trustee Payne, moved:

Whereas, the Board pays approximately \$6 million (net) in GST per year; and

Whereas, the federal government recently announced that it would exempt municipalities from paying GST; and

Whereas, the Board has asked the federal minister of finance to exempt the Board from paying GST and he has not agreed to do so;

Therefore, be it resolved:

- (a) That a communications campaign be mounted (similar to the Save Our Pools campaign) at a cost not to exceed \$30,000 to lobby the federal government;**
- (b) That other school boards across Canada be invited to join this campaign.**

Trustee Gershon, seconded by Trustee Campbell, moved: **That the matter be referred to the Intergovernmental and Community Relations Committee.**

The motion to refer was defeated.

The main motion was carried on a recorded vote (Recorded Vote 73, see page 342). Student Trustee W. Wong voted against the motion.

190. Special Education Advisory Committee, Report No. 6, May 10, 2004 (see page 410)

Trustee Hill, seconded by Trustee Cary-Meagher, moved: **That Report No. 6 of the Special Education Advisory Committee be adopted.**

The motion was carried.

191. Intergovernmental and Community Relations Committee, Report No. 3, May 4, 2004 (see page 417)

Trustee Matlow, seconded by Trustee Mankovsky, moved: **That Report No. 3 of the Intergovernmental and Community Relations Committee be adopted.**

re Item 1, Parent, Community and Student Involvement Policy Review

Trustee Matlow, seconded by Trustee Rodrigues, moved in amendment: **That Part (a) of the committee's recommendation be referred back to the Intergovernmental and Community Relations Committee.**

The amendment was carried.

The main motion to adopt Report No. 3 of the Intergovernmental and Community Relations Committee, as amended, was carried.

192. Joint Special Meeting of the Accountability and Finance Committee and the Human Resources and Staff Development Committee, Report No. 1, May 12, 2004 (see page 420)

Trustee Goodman, seconded by Trustee Campbell, moved: **That Report No. 1 of the joint special meeting of the Accountability and Finance Committee and Human Resources and Staff Development Committee be received.**

The motion was carried.

193. Accountability and Finance Committee, Report No. 5, May 12, 2004 (see page 360)

Trustee Goodman, seconded by Trustee Campbell, moved: **That the remainder¹ of Report No. 5 of the Accountability and Finance Committee be adopted.**

The motion was carried.

194. Extension of the Meeting

At appropriate times during the meeting, the Ending Time procedure was applied and the meeting was extended.

195. Schedule of Board and Committee Meetings, June 2004

The Board considered a memorandum from staff providing information about the dates required for the budget consultation process in May and June and recommending changes to the meeting dates for Board and committee meetings.

Trustee Hill, seconded by Trustee Goodman, moved: **That the following meeting dates for regular and special Board meetings be approved:**

- (i) **Special Meeting of the Board to consider the 2004-05 budget, Wednesday, June 16, 3 or 4 p.m.**
- (ii) **Regular Meeting of the Board, Wednesday, June 23, 4 p.m.**
- (iii) **Reserve dates for possible Board meetings, June 24, 30 and July 14**

The motion was carried.

196. House Committee, Report No. 4, May 6, 2004 (see page 373)

Trustee Cary-Meagher, seconded by Trustee Hill, moved: **That the remainder² of Report No. 4 of the House Committee be adopted.**

¹ Item 1 of the report was adopted as part of the Consent Agenda motion (see page 332).

² Item 1 of the report was adopted as part of the Consent Agenda motion (see page 332).

The motion was carried.

197. Trustee Statements

An opportunity was provided for trustees to make public statements on matters of concern.

Trustee Rutka told the members about a drama at A. Y. Jackson Secondary School which was directed by Student Trustee William Wong. She also spoke about the recent Arts Matters initiative and a dance team from Newtonbrook which had won awards at a recent competition in Orlando, Florida.

Trustee Cary-Meagher reminded the members of the city-wide parent community forum which will be held on May 29.

Trustee Hill expressed gratitude to central staff and the staff of Amesbury Middle School for the quick and efficient manner in which student had been accommodated after a recent fire in the school.

Trustee Shory extended congratulations to the staff and students of Inglewood Heights Junior Public School for the significant gains made on the latest EQAO tests.

Trustee Davis spoke about the success of the recent 118th Annual Spring Music Festival and informed the members that the next meeting of the Program and School Services Committee will be held at Georges Vanier C.I.

Trustee Atkinson raised the matter of replacing retiring supervisory officers and the reorganization of senior staff. The Director advised concerning the process and timelines. Aspects of this matter will be considered at the June 16, 2004, special meeting.

Student Trustee W. Wong asked about the status of the review of the excursion policy and procedures.

198. Adjournment

At 11:55 p.m., on a motion of Trustee Davis, seconded by Trustee Shory, the meeting was adjourned.

Sheila Ward
Chair of the Board

Confirmed by the Board at the meeting held on
June 23, 2004.

Sheila Ward, Chair of the Board

Recorded Votes Summary

Recorded Votes Summary

Recorded Vote Number	Minute Page	<u>TRUSTEES</u>																				<u>TOTALS</u>				
		Atkinson	Bolton	Campbell	Cary-Meagher	Coteau	Crawford	Davis	Gershon	Goodman	Harrison	Hill	Mankovsky	Matlow	Nemiroff	Ng	Payne	Rodrigues	Rutka	Rutledge	Shory	Telfer	Ward	Yeas (Y)	Nays (N)	Ab-sent (A)
67	333	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A	N	A	N	N	A	A	N	Y	A	N	A	*	7	8	6
68	336	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A	*	16	4	1
69	336	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	*	15	6	0
70	336	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	21	0	0
71	336	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	*	17	4	0
72	337	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	A	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	19	0	3
73	339	Y	Y	N	Y	A	N	A	N	Y	N	Y	A	A	Y	A	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	*	10	5	6

* No vote cast. The Board’s Bylaws, Section 7.2 states: Every member, except the Chair, will vote on all questions, unless excused by the Board. Any member present when a vote is taken who does not vote and has not been excused by the Board, will be deemed to have voted in the negative. The Chair may vote on all questions before the Board.

Committee of the Whole (Private Session)**Report No. 8**

May 19, 2004

A meeting of the Committee of the Whole (Private Session) convened at 4:15 p.m. on Wednesday, May 19, 2004, in the Boardroom at 5050 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario, with Stan Nemiroff, Vice-Chair of the Board, presiding.

The following members were present: Trustees Irene Atkinson, Chris Bolton, John Campbell, Sheila Cary-Meagher, Michael Coteau, Gary Crawford, Gerri Gershon, Bruce Davis, Howard Goodman, Elizabeth Hill, Josh Matlow, Stan Nemiroff, Noah Ng, Stephnie Payne, Maria Rodrigues, Mari Rutka, Patrick Rutledge, David Shory and Sheila Ward (Chair).

Regrets were received from Trustees Scott Harrison, Sheine Mankovsky and Rick Telfer.

The Committee decided to report as follows:

1. Declarations of Possible Conflict of Interest

Trustee Cary-Meagher declared a possible conflict of interest with regard to the matter of Negotiations as contained on the private agenda of the Committee of the Whole as her daughter is a member of OSSTF, District 12. Trustee Cary-Meagher was not present during discussion or voting on this matter.

2. Staff Changes

The Committee considered a report from staff presenting staff changes including transfers and promotions of school principals and vice-principals (on file in the Director's office) for approval.

The Committee of the Whole **RECOMMENDS** that the staff changes be approved.

3. Negotiations and Compensation Committee (Private), Report No. 5, May 4, 2004

The Committee of the Whole considered Report No. 5 of the Negotiations and Compensation Committee (Private Session) (as attached to the private minutes of the Committee of the Whole).

The Committee of the Whole **RECOMMENDS** that Report No. 5 of the Negotiations and Compensation Committee (Private Session), as attached to the private minutes of the Committee of the Whole, be adopted.

4. Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 4 (Private), May 13, 2004

The Committee of the Whole considered Report No. 4 of the Facilities Management Committee (Private Session) (as attached to the private minutes of the Committee of the Whole).

Committee of the Whole (Private Session), Report No. 8, May 19, 2004

The Committee of the Whole **RECOMMENDS** that Report No. 4 of the Facilities Management Committee (Private Session), as attached to the private minutes of the Committee of the Whole, be adopted, including the following recommendations:

(a) McNicoll Long-term Land Lease

That a staff report advising that the plan to lease the McNicoll property for a long-term care facility will not be proceeding be received.

(b) Franklin Horner Property

- (i) That the Franklin Horner be declared property surplus to the needs of the Board and made available for lease for a period of up to ten years;
- (ii) That pursuant to the requirements of Regulation 444/98, Disposition of Surplus Real Property, the Board renew the lease to the City of Toronto Parks and Recreation Department based on the business terms outlined above;
- (iii) That the Director of Education, or designate, be directed to execute a Lease Agreement with the City of Toronto Parks and Recreation Department.

5. Private Property Matter

The Committee considered a private property matter as contained in the private minutes of the Committee of the Whole.

The Committee of the Whole **RECOMMENDS** that the private property matter as contained in the private minutes of the Committee of the Whole be approved.

6. Supervisory Officer Selection Process, 2003-04

The Committee considered a staff report concerning the supervisory officer selection process.

The Committee of the Whole **RECOMMENDS** that the following candidates to be added to the qualified applicant pool of supervisory officers as contained in the private minutes of the Committee of the Whole.

Varla Abrams
Gen Ling Chang
Karen Falconer
Heidi Gollert
Karen Grose
Linda Rung
Allan Wolch

Committee of the Whole (Private Session), Report No. 8, May 19, 2004

7. Legal Matter

The Committee considered a staff report concerning a private legal matter.

The Committee of the Whole **RECOMMENDS** that the private legal matter as contained in the private minutes of the Committee of the Whole be approved.

Stan Nemiroff
Chair of the Committee

Adopted May 19, 2004

Special Education Advisory Committee

Report No. 5

April 19, 2004

A meeting of the Special Education Advisory Committee convened this day at 7:35 p.m. in the Boardroom, 5050 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario, with Scott Bridges, Co-Chair, presiding.

The following committee members were present: Scott Bridges (Co-Chair), Nancy Cooper, Merle Fedirchuk, Elizabeth Fisher, Dr. Norm Forman, Charlotte James, Ann Martindale, Mara Meikle, Susan Musgrave, Debbie Phillips, Sharon Watt, Mary Weedon, Michelle Worley (Co-Chair) and Trustees Chris Bolton (Vice Chair) and Elizabeth Hill. Alternates Sherron Grant and Hyla Scherer, were also present.

Regrets were received from Elizabeth Fisher, Kym Kristalie, Gordon McClure, Rob Perkins, Pat Sparks, and Trustee Bruce Davis.

1. Seminar – 6:25 – 7:15 p.m.

Special Education Advisory Committee Web site

Presenters: Moira Sinclair, Acting District Manager, and Carolyn Anco, Education Officer, Ministry of Education. This seminar on the Special Education Advisory Committee Web site included an outline of the following main units:

- E-Learning
- Roles and Responsibilities
- School Board Responsibilities
- Legislation and Policies
- Special Education Funding

The Web site is expected to be accessible to SEAC members in May. Moira Sinclair responded to a variety of questions at the end of the presentation.

2. Resignation

Scott Bridges noted with regret, that Dr. Gordon McClure has resigned his position as Community Representative, due to health reasons. Dr. McClure was thanked for his invaluable contribution and service to SEAC. A formal letter of thanks will be forwarded to Dr. McClure.

3. Presentations

Student Transportation

Bill Zumpano, Manager, Student Transportation presented an overview of student transportation. Over nine hundred vehicles transport 15,000 students (40% of whom are special education stu-

Special Education Advisory Committee, Report No. 5, April 19, 2004

dents) at this time. Since November 2003 a stable level of service has been achieved. The transportation policy outlines who is eligible, with the basic criteria consisting of:

- 1.6 km JK – Grade 5
- 2.3 km Grades 6 – 8
- 4.8 km Grades 9 – 12

Exceptions may be made for some students with special needs.

The following responses were given to inquiries from various committee members:

- the Board is in the fourth year of a multi-year contract. The Student Transportation office ensures that the contractor abides by the rules of the contract i.e. children spending a maximum of 1.25 hours on the vehicle.
- Buses may be rerouted to accommodate changes in scheduled pick up and drop off locations
- A log is kept for each vehicle re concerns, incidents
- Students are usually transported together, although some students are transported individually
- A report on a pilot project for the GPS will be brought back to SEAC in October

Trustee Bolton, amended by Trustee Hill, moved: That a process be put in place to survey parents of Special Education students in the 2004-05 school year, the results of which will be used for the purpose of directing improvement to student transportation.

The motion was carried.

4. Approval of the Agenda

Debbie Philips, seconded by Merle Fedirchuk moved: That the agenda be approved.

The motion was carried.

5. Confirmation of the Minutes

Nancy Cooper, seconded by Debbie Philips, moved: That the minutes of the SEAC meeting held on March 19, 2004, be confirmed.

The motion was carried.

6. Change of Agenda Order

Trustee Hill, seconded by Debbie Philips, moved: That the agenda order be changed to present Item 11, Trustees' Report after Item 7, Executive Superintendent's Report, as the trustees must attend a special Board meeting tonight at 9:00 p.m.

The motion was carried.

7. Business Arising from the Minutes of March 19, 2004

Letter to Ministry of Education re Special Education Tribunals

The final version of this letter noting the importance of the Special Education Tribunal in the IPRC process, was sent to the Minister of Education. A copy was provided to committee members.

8. Executive Superintendent's Report

- D. Rowan has nominated the Language Labs for a Learning Partnership Technology award
- Literacy initiative funded by the government (Comprehensive Early Intervention Pilot) will provide opportunities for students in grades one through five who are achieving Level I or less on their report cards to receive intensive support through literacy summer camp and/or summer literacy programs, and school-based tutorials
- Update provided on elementary special education staffing explaining the impact of declining enrolment. A funding shortfall necessitates the reduction of 47.5 elementary teachers, 27.5 secondary teachers and 75-85 educational assistants/CYW's/SNA's across both panels
- Special Education teachers qualification Parts I and II will be offered again this summer at York University. the Board will cover some of the cost for up to 100 teachers in each of the courses.
- Meeting Friday, April 23 with Support Services coordinators and consultants to develop educational assistant handbook. for intranet Web site
- Special note of thanks to Dr. McClure for all his contributions to SEAC
- Brian Ellerker and Sharon Schad retiring after many productive years of service
- Career Awareness Advisory Seminar Apr 22 – 9:15 a.m. to noon, Fairmeadow Centre
- Proposal in package from Dr. Janice Currie re Behavioural Resource Team
- Judith Melville-Bennoch update re summer institutes; and ISA claims,

9. Trustees' Report

Trustee Elizabeth Hill

- At March 3 meeting teacher allocation was reviewed. Deadline dates necessary for teachers declared surplus. Guidance teacher and teacher-librarian levels will be maintained
- class size cap of 30 students in primary grades
- new schools being considered for overcrowded Scarborough area
- intensive support to be provided for students working below grade level
- monthly trespass and suspension ward reports to be provided to trustees, 2003/04 summary provided in April
- School Year Calendar – 2005 Spring Break will adjoin Easter weekend
- Proposal to create senior management position for student retention, recruitment
- A 10 year debenture with the province, not to exceed \$5M, will alleviate deficit
- Trustee Harrison will be putting forward a motion to review the Gifted program locations
- Letter from Near North board requesting elimination of EQAO testing and Grade 10 Literacy test
- Motion re increase in elementary JK/SK educational assistants

Special Education Advisory Committee, Report No. 5, April 19, 2004

10. Correspondence Received by the Chair

Ottawa-Carleton District School Board

- Stating right of appeal for Special Education students
- Would like Ministry to address all exceptionalities

Toronto Family Network Moving to Inclusion Workshop

- Outlines details on how to attend

Educational Assistant Support

- Janis Jaffe-White e-mail:
 - clarifying issue of special needs student in regular class with support
 - SEAC needs to receive all pertinent information in order to fulfil role

Co-Chairs Michelle Worley and Scott Bridges will be establishing protocol for handling correspondence.

11. Process to Address Special Incidence Portion Claims (SIP)

It was agreed that the Executive Superintendent will forward a letter to the Ministry requesting additional funding on SIP claims, with SEAC's full support.

12. Reports/Updates from Representatives on TDSB and Other Committees

Safe and Compassionate Schools Task Force

Dr. Forman noted that there would be four meetings around the city in May. Additional meetings planned this week and next for principals, students and legal funding groups. Submissions will be made to May Board.

Optional Attendance Task Force

- Merle Fedirchuk gave update on declining student enrolment
- Information is forthcoming from Child Care and Sibling subcommittees. Target date for report is the fall of 2004, with implementation expected in fall of 2005.

13. Local SEAC Association Reports

Ontario Brain Injury Association

Fund raising event for Brain Injury May 6 – Evening of Comedy at Second City on Blue Jay Way.

Special Education Advisory Committee, Report No. 5, April 19, 2004

Community Based Resource Model (Nancy Cooper)

There is transition from the former rationalization model. It was requested that this item be put on the agenda before June.

Down Syndrome (Debbie Philips)

Volunteers are needed for the Eighteenth Annual "Down in the Beach" 5K Run, 1K Run and Children's Festival on Sunday, May 30.

Association for Bright Children (Michelle Worley)

There will be an AGM in London, ON on May 1 that will include a presentation on communication via the Internet /chat rooms, and workshops for children on robotics.

VOICE for Hearing Impaired Children (Mary Wheedon)

A skating event held yesterday raised over \$6,000 for VOICE. More success expected next year.

14. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Michelle Worley
Co-Chair of the Committee

Scott Bridges
Co-Chair of the Committee

Received May 19, 2004

Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 4, May 13, 2004

Facilities Management Committee

Report No. 4 (Public)

May 13, 2004

A meeting of the Facilities Management Committee convened on Thursday, May 13, 2004, from 6:15 p.m. to 8:10 p.m., in Committee Room A, 5050 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario, with Trustee David Shory presiding.

The following committee members were present: Trustees David Shory (Chair), Chris Bolton, Sheila Cary-Meagher, Noah Ng and Mary Rutka. Regrets were received from Trustees Scott Harrison, Maria Rodrigues and Patrick Rutledge. Also present were Trustees Sheine Mankovsky and Stan Nemiroff.

The Committee decided to report and recommend as follows:

PART A: COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Renaming Charles H. Best West Elementary School (04-04-0513)

The Committee considered a staff report (see page 354) seeking approval for the renaming of Charles H. Best West Elementary School.

On a motion of Trustee Cary-Meagher, the Facilities Management Committee **RECOMMENDS** that the Board approve the renaming of Charles H. Best West Elementary School to Wilmington Elementary School.

PART B: INFORMATION ONLY

2. Delegations

The Committee heard the following delegations in accordance with the Board's procedure for hearing delegations:

re Maintenance Standards

- Cathy Dandy, Toronto Parent Network

re Caretaking Allocation

- Dave Smith, CUPE 4400
- John Weatherup, CUPE 4400

PART C: ONGOING MATTERS**3. Maintenance Standards (03-04-0490)**

The Committee considered a staff report requesting the approval of general standards of building maintenance for the Board.

On a motion of Trustee Cary-Meagher, the Facilities Management Committee decided to:

- Defer consideration of this matter to the next Committee meeting, pending any funding announcements.
- Request staff to arrange a tour with the Committee of four schools to demonstrate the maintenance standards.

4. Facility Renewal (05-04-0528)

The Committee considered a staff report seeking approval for debenture funding for critical facility maintenance projects.

On a motion of Trustee Cary-Meagher, the Facilities Management Committee decided to defer this matter to the next Committee meeting.

5. Caretaking Allocations, 2004-05 (05-04-0524)

The Committee received a staff report regarding planned caretaking allocations in schools/centres in 2004-05.

On a motion of Trustee Cary-Meagher, the Facilities Management Committee decided to defer this matter to the next Committee meeting.

6. Facility Permits

The Committee deferred review of this matter, which was presented for information at the Committee meeting of April 1, 2004, to the next Committee meeting.

7. Status of School Site in Greenwood Development Area

The Committee deferred review of this matter, which was presented for information at the Committee meeting of April 1, 2004, to the next Committee meeting.

8. Continuing Education Cost Recovery

Staff will provide information regarding this matter at the next Committee meeting.

9. Consideration of Notices of Motion

- Bickford Centre, Current Use of Space (Trustee Bolton)
- Security Dispatch Centre (Trustee Davis)
- Inner-city Schools in Scarborough, Multiple Users (Trustee Cary-Meagher)

Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 4, May 13, 2004

10. Written Notice of Motion

The following written notice of motion was presented for consideration at a future meeting of the Committee.

Caretaking Allocations, 2004-05 (Trustee Cary-Meagher)

That staff investigate the impact of freezing the caretaking staff allocation currently in place.

David Shory
Chair of the Committee

Adopted May 19, 2004

Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 4, May 13, 2004
Renaming Charles H. Best West Elementary School (04-04-0513)

Renaming Charles H. Best West Elementary School (04-04-0513)

As presented to the Facilities Management Committee on May 13, 2004 (see page 351).

This report requests approval by the Board for the renaming of Charles H. Best West Elementary School to Wilmington Elementary School.

In accordance with the Board's policy P.047 FAC: Naming Schools, a School Renaming Committee was established at Charles H. Best West Elementary in the fall of 2003 in response to a proposal that was initiated by the Best West School Council (June 2003) to change the school name.

In the spring of 2002, Charles H. Best Elementary and Middle School (East and West), was officially separated and became two schools, each with its own principal. The elementary portion of the school, grades JK to 4, became known as Charles H. Best West Elementary School.

In the fall of 2003, it was decided that when it came time to change the name of either of the schools, the east building would maintain the Charles H. Best name in order that the students presently attending the middle school would be able to graduate under that name.

The Best West School Council proposed that the name be changed for a variety of reasons:

- *Identity*: felt it important that the elementary school develop an identity of its own;
- *Safety*: on more than one occasion, an ambulance called to the west building has arrived at the east building;
- *Efficiency and organization*: Board mail, billings and visitors still frequently arrive at the wrong building.

The consultation process included:

- a letter to students and their parents inviting input;
- a ballot for final selection (Appendix 4);
- a letter to Councillor Michael Feldman requesting his approval for the name change;
- an invitation to the community at large via the east building's outside community sign inviting suggestions for a new name be sent to the school's e-mail address;
- a letter from Councillor Feldman supporting the name change;
- a letter to parents announcing the selection of the name, Wilmington Elementary School;
- a final announcement and invitation to a public meeting on March 4, 2004 at the School Council meeting.

Throughout the consultation process, there was strong support from all stakeholders including the trustee, students and parents, and staff to change the name of the school.

Text of letter to superintendent dated June 3, 2003, from the principal and school council chair, Charles H. Best West Public School

The Charles H. Best West School Council would like to ask for a consideration of the request to rename the school.

Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 4, May 13, 2004
Renaming Charles H. Best West Elementary School (04-04-0513)

When first built, Charles H. Best West School was called Cedar Grove Public School and housed children from JK to Grade 6. One block south and across the road was Dufferin Heights Junior High School, comprised of Grades 7 to 9.

In 1979, C. H. Best became an amalgamation of three former North York Schools: Wilmington Elementary (Now C.H.A.T.), Cedar Grove and Dufferin Heights, and became known as Charles H. Best West (housing JK to Grade 4) and Charles H. Best East (housing Grades 5 to 8), with one principal. The name was chosen through a contest run by the then Home and School. In September 2003, the two schools were again separated and became two distinct entities, each with its own administration and school council. C. H. Best West is for JK to Grade 4, while C. H. Best East teaches Grade 5 to 8. In requesting consideration of a name change, we have weighed the following factors:

Identity: As the two schools were once separate, then became one, and are now separate again, it is extremely important that each form its own identity. There was some initial discussion on whether C. H. Best East would change its name, but the idea was rejected as the older students were more attached to a name that they had spent at least seven years with. Currently the name C. H. Best has become more associated with the Junior School, whose presence, by nature of the age of the children and the fact that it houses the specialized CyberArts program, is stronger in the community. We consider it paramount that the primary school develop its own, distinct identity.

Safety: We recently had an incident where we needed to call an ambulance to the school, and it showed up at C.H. Best East instead, where staff had no idea why it was there. While the incident was not life threatening, it certainly highlights the confusion that is often felt when it comes to emergencies, deliveries and even Board mail.

We are very cognizant that the tradition of naming schools after local streets, districts or famous Canadians should be maintained. We are also aware that a new name could reflect the particular program focus of the school.

Should the Board approve consideration of a name change, we would undertake the following processes:

- Form a school renaming committee comprised of the local trustee, superintendent, principal, school staff representatives, school council representatives, and a representative of a local ratepayer or recognized umbrella community to review possible names and to recommend a new name
- Consult with members of the local community, the local city councillor, and other identified stakeholders regarding the selection of the new name;
- Hold a public meeting of the school community to endorse any chosen name;
- Submit the recommendation to the board for final approval.

We would like to begin this process in September 2003, as we understand the name change process could take up to one year, and that such a change would best take place at the beginning of the school year 2004.

For the Board's decision see page 351.

Human Resources and Staff Development Committee

Committee Report No. 6

May 4, 2004

A meeting of the Human Resources and Staff Development Committee convened on Tuesday, May 4, 2004, from 1:15 to 2:35 p.m. in Committee Room A, 5050 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario, with Elizabeth Hill presiding.

The following members were present: Trustees Elizabeth Hill (Chair), Sheila Cary-Meagher, Howard Goodman and Stephnie Payne. Also present was Trustee Gerri Gershon.

The Committee decided to report and recommend as follows:

PART A: COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Joint Occupational Health and Safety Committee (04-04-0520)

At its meeting held on January 28, 2004, the Board referred the matter of appointing a trustee representative to the Joint Occupational Health and Safety Committee to the Human Resources and Staff Development Committee and requested that staff outline any concerns and how these could be addressed. At this meeting, the Committee considered a staff report (see page 358) which includes the following information:

...no one may serve on a JOHSC who is not an employee of the employer...

The Education Act, Section 219(4), makes it clear that a trustee cannot be an employee of the Board for which he or she is a trustee.

On a motion of Trustee Gershon, amended by Trustee Goodman, the Human Resources and Staff Development Committee **RECOMMENDS:**

- (a) That copies of the minutes of Joint Occupational Health and Safety (JOHS) Committee meetings and individual copies of the JOHS reports be available to trustees upon request;
- (b) That trustees be surveyed to determine their requirements in receiving these documents.

2. Same-sex Partners

At its meeting held on April 21, 2004, the Board referred a notice of motion on this matter from Trustee Mankovsky to this committee.

On a motion of Trustee Goodman, the Human Resources and Staff Development Committee **RECOMMENDS:**

- (a) That the Board's relevant policies and procedures be reviewed and revised, as appropriate, to comply fully with all provisions the *Ontario Human Rights Code* and in particular those provisions concerning same-sex partners;

Human Resources and Staff Development Committee, Report No. 6, May 4, 2004

- (b) That the review be completed by the end of the school year and a report describing the steps taken in the review be presented to the Board in June 2004.

Note: Staff report will delineate necessary changes to comply with legislative requirements.

PART B: INFORMATION ONLY

3. Delegations

The Committee heard the following delegations in accordance with the Board's procedure for hearing delegations:

re Mandatory Retirement

- Barrie Sketchley, Principal, Rosedale Heights

PART C: ONGOING MATTERS

4. Mandatory Retirement – Interim Report (04-04-0519)

The Committee considered a staff report presented in response to the following decision of the March 24 Board meeting.

- (a) That the Board move toward the abolition of the mandatory retirement policy and that staff bring a report to the May Human Resources and Staff Development Committee meeting with special attention paid to:
- those jurisdictions that have already passed similar legislation;
 - savings and/or costs;
 - implementation:
- (b) That steps be taken to hold any related arbitration until after the Board considers the matter.

On a motion of Trustee Goodman, the Human Resources and Staff Development Committee decided to postpone consideration pending an analysis by staff of any obstacles to the initiative, gathering information from other jurisdictions, and requesting input from staff and employee groups on the impact of allowing employees to work past age 65.

Elizabeth Hill
Chair of the Committee

Adopted May 19, 2004

Human Resources and Staff Development Committee, Report No. 6, May 4, 2004
Joint Occupational Health and Safety Committee (04-04-0520)

Joint Occupational Health and Safety Committee (04-04-0520)

As presented to the Human Resources and Staff Development Committee on May 4, 2004 (see page 356).

This information to the Board on whether trustees should be members of the Joint Occupational Health and Safety Committee.

At its meeting of January 28, 2004, the Board decided:

That the matter of the Board appointing a trustee to the Board's Health and Safety Committee be referred to the Human Resources and Staff Development Committee and that staff be requested to outline any concerns and how these could be addressed.

The formation of a Joint Occupational Health and Safety Committee (JOHSC) is a requirement of the *Ontario Health and Safety Act*. The *Act* states:

- (a) that all workplaces with 20 or more workers who are regularly employed must establish a Joint Occupational Health and Safety Committee (JOHSC)
- (b) that the Committee must be made up of worker representatives and employer representatives. At least half the members of the Committee must be workers who do not exercise managerial functions. The remaining members must be selected from persons who do exercise managerial functions for the employer
- (c) no one may serve on a JOHSC who is not an employee of the employer, and
- (d) anyone who ceases to be employed at the workplace ceases to be a member of the Committee.

The *Education Act*, Section 219(4), makes it clear that a trustee cannot be an employee of the Board for which he or she is a trustee.

Trustees do not exercise "managerial" functions within the meaning of the Ontario Health and Safety Act. The Board of trustees exercises collective statutory powers and duties but, individually, trustees have no management authority. Consequently, trustees do not meet the requirement of the OHS Act either as employees or as employees who exercise managerial functions in an employment context. (There is a precedent in which an officer of the Ministry of Labour declared the presence of a trustee on a board's JOHSC as "non-conforming" to the legislation.)

The JOHSC meets every month and its duties are time-consuming (see Statutory Functions of JOHSC below). Each meeting is minuted and minutes are distributed to the members of the committee, to the executives of the federations and unions and to staff in the Facilities, Business and Employee Services departments. Distributing minutes to trustees is entirely feasible and can be undertaken immediately.

Human Resources and Staff Development Committee, Report No. 6, May 4, 2004
Joint Occupational Health and Safety Committee (04-04-0520)

Statutory Functions of JOHSC

A committee's duties include:

- regular monthly inspections of the conditions of the workplace
- investigation of workplace accidents
- investigation of workplace refusals
- participation in inspections and investigations conducted by the Ministry of Labour
- participation in the annual review of the instruction and training given to workers who are exposed to or likely to be exposed to hazardous materials or agents
- participation in the development and implementation of training programs for those workers
- selection of two chairs for the committee
- appointment of a designated member representing workers at the beginning of industrial hygiene testing
- participation in preparation of compliance notices and compliance plans to be developed and filed with the Ministry of Labour.

For the Board's decision see page 356.

Accountability and Finance Committee

Committee Report No. 5

May 12, 2004

A meeting of the Accountability and Finance Committee convened on Wednesday, May 12, 2004, from 6:05 to 9:55 p.m. in Committee Room A, 5050 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario, with Howard Goodman presiding.

Committee members present: Trustees Howard Goodman (Chair) and John Campbell. Also present were Trustees Sheila Cary-Meagher and Elizabeth Hill.

The Committee decided to report and recommend as follows:

PART A: COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. System Report Card, External Validation (04-04-0514)

The Committee considered a staff report (see page 363) seeking support for a Level One external validation submission to the National Quality Institute for the Progressive Excellence Program.

On a motion of Trustee Campbell, the Accountability and Finance Committee **RECOMMENDS** that the Level One submission to the National Quality Institute, Public Sector, Progressive Excellence Program, be approved as the first step in an ongoing external validation process.

2. Contract Awards (04-04-0510)

The Committee considered a staff report (see page 365) presenting contracts for products and/or services for receipt or approval of the Board. The Committee received the contracts listed on Chart A and approved the contracts listed on Chart B.

On a motion of Trustee Campbell, the Accountability and Finance Committee **RECOMMENDS** that the contracts on Charts A and B be received and the contracts listed on Chart C be approved.

Staff undertook to provide information to the trustees on any remedial work required as a result of removal of oil tanks and the reason for the swimming pool renovations at York Mills CI.

3. Bulk Purchase of Natural Gas (04-04-0511)

The Committee considered a staff report (see page 370) seeking approval of a Request for Proposal for the supply of natural gas to cover the three-year period November 2004 to October 2007.

On a motion of Trustee Campbell, the Accountability and Finance Committee **RECOMMENDS** that staff be authorized to issue an RFP and award contract/s for the purchase of approximately 3,120,000 gigajoules of natural gas per year over a contract period of three years, estimated in the range of \$18 to \$19 million in the first year with subsequent years pricing to be determined by market conditions.

Accountability and Finance Committee, Report No. 5, May 12, 2004

4. Central Equity Fund: Canadian Artists' CD (04-04-0512)

The Committee considered a staff report (see page 372) seeking approval for the Board's participation in a partnership with Juno Award-winning artists to produce an urban hip-hop CD to raise funds for the Board's Central Equity Fund.

On a motion of Trustee Cary-Meagher, the Accountability and Finance Committee **RECOMMENDS** that the production of an urban hip-hop CD for fundraising purposes be approved.

PART B: INFORMATION ONLY

5. Delegations

The Committee hears the following delegations in accordance with the Board's procedure for hearing delegations:

re Legal Report

- Katie McGovern, CUPE, Local 4400

re Community Programs

- Sean Usher, Citizen's for Lifelong Learning and the Canadian Adult and Community Education Alliance

6. Legal Report, Volume One, Issue One

The Committee considered a staff report providing information about important legal matters that affect the Board, including litigation, legal opinions, arbitration hearings and legal precedents.

Staff undertook to provide information about the costs related to several items in the report.

On a motion of Trustee Campbell, the Accountability and Finance Committee received the report.

7. Ongoing Major Contracts: Beverage, Food and Telephones

The Committee heard an oral report from staff on the ongoing process to secure contracts for the supply of beverages, food and telephones.

Accountability and Finance Committee, Report No. 5, May 12, 2004

PART C: ONGOING MATTERS

No matters to report.

Howard Goodman
Chair of the Committee

Adopted May 19, 2004

Accountability and Finance Committee, Report No. 5, May 12, 2004
System Report Card: External Validation (04-04-0514)

System Report Card: External Validation (04-04-0514)

As presented to the Accountability and Finance Committee on May 12, 2004 (see page 360).

This report is presented to request Board support for the Level One external validation submission to the National Quality Institute's (NQI) Progressive Excellence Program (Appendix 1).

In May 2003, a Budget and Business, School Improvement Planning Framework was introduced to provide overall coordination in the development of the budget and business planning processes.

Guided by the Budget and Business Steering Committee, the System Report Card Project Team is one of four project teams supporting the planning implementation framework, which includes resource allocation, performance appraisal, system reporting and Family of Schools simulations.

The mandate of the Project Team is to develop a report to communicate to staff, parents and the community what it is the Board is committed to achieving, how it will achieve it, how much it will cost and how effective it has been in achieving service area targets.

The Project Team's work included the development of guiding principles and the review of other organizational report card frameworks. As a result, ten recommendations were made to support development of the Board's System Report Card.

The recommendation to partner with an externally recognized validation organization, such as the NQI, to systematically report on the organizational progress of the Board was made and acted upon.

The Project Team determined that the NQI Progressive Excellence Program would provide both a framework for the system report card and a process for external validation, which would assist the Board in demonstrating accountability internally and externally.

The Board values public confidence and accountability and, as a result, has engaged in continuous improvement, external validation and recognition processes with NQI and other validation organizations at the departmental and school levels since amalgamation in 1998.

The NQI Progressive Excellence Program, Public Sector is a nationally recognized external validation program. The NQI Canadian Excellence in Education Program is a school-based companion program that was developed in 2001 as a partnership between the NQI and the Board (Appendix 2).

Both programs are based on six areas of emphasis, including leadership, planning, student, staff and partnership focuses and process management. Criteria within the six areas of emphasis guide improvement of processes and programs to support overall organizational--school performance. Evidence of continuous improvement, via progress of identified targets, in each area of emphasis is required. The criteria within these six areas of emphasis are congruent with effective organizational and schools research.

Accountability and Finance Committee, Report No. 5, May 12, 2004
System Report Card: External Validation (04-04-0514)

The Level One Submission is focused on an “approach” that demonstrates progress in four key areas:

1. a method to develop a mission and mandate statements, and to communicate such information to all levels in the organization;
2. a method to define stakeholders and/or stakeholder groups;
3. a training plan and program that covers effective organizational (Board and School) practices;
4. evidences of self assessment and gap analysis to assist the process of establishing priorities on improvement and moving the organization forward to meet the needs of its students, staff and partnership members.

A Level One Submission to the NQI confirms the Board’s future commitment to participate in an external validation process that focuses on continuous improvement and accountability.

Note: The appendices mentioned in the report will be maintained in Board Services for a limited time.

For the Board’s decision see page 360.

Accountability and Finance Committee, Report No. 5, May 12, 2004
Contract Awards (04-04-0510)

Contract Awards (04-04-0510)

As presented to the Accountability and Finance Committee on May 12, 2004 (see page 360).

The Accountability and Finance Committee and the Board respectively must approve contracts for goods or services over \$175,000 and \$250,000, exclusive of taxes, prior to an award. The Board must also approve consulting contracts over \$50,000 prior to an award. Contracts for goods and services over \$50,000 and up to \$175,000 may be approved by the Director, or designate, and reported to the Accountability and Finance Committee for information.

The Board's Purchasing Policy allows the Director, in consultation with the Chair of the Accountability and Finance Committee, to call meetings to approve contracts during months where there are no scheduled meetings and report such approvals at the first scheduled Board meeting.

The recommended suppliers and the term of each contract are shown on the attached charts. Chart A outlines contract awards over \$50,000 and under \$175,000 provided for information; Chart B outlines contracts requiring Accountability and Finance approval; Chart C outlines contracts requiring Board approval. The amounts shown are based on the estimated annual consumption unless indicated otherwise. Actual amounts depend on the volume of products/services actually used during the term of the contract.

Purchasing and Distribution Services, where possible, invited bids from a minimum of three firms. Requirements expected to exceed \$100,000 were also posted on two electronic bulletin boards (MERX and ETN) to facilitate broader public access.

The lowest cost bid is accepted where quality, functional, safety, environmental and other requirements are met. Every effort is made to include input from the users in the development of specifications and the evaluation process. Copies of all bids received and detailed information regarding all recommended awards are available in the Purchasing and Distribution Services Department.

For the Board's decision see page 360.

Accountability and Finance Committee, Report No. 5, May 12, 2004
 Contract Awards (04-04-0510)

CHART A: Contract Awards Provided for Information

	User/Budget Holder School/Department	Products/Services Details	Ward	Recommended Supplier	Low Bid	Objections	No. of Bids Received	Estimated Annual Amount	Projected Start/End Date of Contract	Customer Involvement	Funding Source for Facilities Contract Awards
1	Facility Services	Oil to Gas Burner Conversion at Ossington PS – CF04-127Q. Replace existing oil fired burners with gas and upgrade gas service to accommodate.	10	Leeson Mechanical	Yes	No	3	\$97,475	April 2004 – July 2004	Staff from Facility Services	Standards & Compliance
2	Facility Services	Harbord CI - Barrier Free Alterations – STM04-126T. Sp.Ed. Accessibility Program, Installation of rated corridor separations, Barrier-Free Path of Travel zone protection.	10	West Metro Contracting	Yes	No	6	\$105,400	April 2004-August 2004	Facility Services	Capital
3	Facility Services	Building Automation System Upgrade to conserve energy at Broadacres JS – STM04-122T and Mechanical – STM04-123Q	2	TAC Controls	Yes	No	2 for Controls and 3 for Mechanical	\$69,515	Immediately August 2004	Facility Services	Energy Conservation
4	Facility Services	Building Automation System Upgrade to conserve energy Driftwood PS – STM04-122T	4	Optimira Controls	Yes	No	2	\$60,760	Immediately August 2004	Facility Services	Energy Conservation
5	Facility Services	Replacement of Steam Traps and Vacuum Pump Repairs at Danforth Tech & CI – DW04-117T	15	Gorbern Mechanical	Yes	No	3	\$130,000	Immediately August 29, 2004	Facility Services	Conservation Maintenance
6	Facility Services	Public Address and Master Clock Replacement at Hodgson PS – RB04-116Q	11	Baldwin Sound Systems Ltd.	Yes	No	5	\$65,370	Immediately June 15, 2004	Facility Services	Conservation Maintenance
7	Various Schools	Language Labs software upgrade for Dragon Naturally Speaking	N/A	VocaLinks	Yes	No	3	\$123,644	One Time Upgrade	Special Education	N/A
8	Facility Services	Oil Tank Removal – Various Locations – DW03-220T	N/A	KLD Construction	No	No	3	\$50,000	Year 2/ Summer 2004 and possibly 2005 extension	Facility Services	Standards, Compliance and Environment
9	Facility Services	Public Address and Master Clock Replacement at Jarvis	14	Baldwin Sound	Yes	No	5	\$132,750	Immediately	Facility Services	Conservation Maintenance

Accountability and Finance Committee, Report No. 5, May 12, 2004
 Contract Awards (04-04-0510)

	User/Budget Holder School/Department	Products/Services Details	Ward	Recommended Supplier	Low Bid	Objections	No. of Bids Received	Estimated Annual Amount	Projected Start/End Date of Contract	Customer Involvement	Funding Source for Facilities Contract Awards
		C.I. – RB04-121T									
10	Facility Services	Fire Alarm Replacement at HumberSide CI – STM04-132T. Replacement of outdated existing system.	7	Ehrlich Electric	Yes	No	6	\$169,000	Immediately	Facility Services	Conservation Maintenance
11	Facility Services	Under performance of Heat Pumps at York Humber High School –DW04-131Q. The heat pumps that provide the heating and cooling to the school are malfunctioning, there is an immediate need to correct the problems associated with continued down-timing of the heating/cooling system.	6	Carmichael Engineering	Yes	No	3	\$85,513	Immediately August 13, 2004	Facility Services	Emergency Reserve

CHART B: Contracts Requiring Accountability and Finance Committee Approval (>\$175,000 to \$250,000)

	User/Budget Holder School/Department	Products/Services Details	Ward	Recommended Supplier	Low Bid	Objections	No. of Bids Received	Estimated Annual Amount	Projected Start/End Date of Contract	Customer Involvement	Funding Source for Facilities Contract Awards
1	Facility Services	Boiler Replacement at Vradenburg PS – DW04-125T. Boiler requires replacement.	20	M. Schultz Mechanical	Yes	No	5	\$200,375	Immediately August 20, 2004	Facility Services	Conservation Maintenance
2	Facility Services	HVAC Control Renovation & Misc. Heating & Electric Revisions at Danforth CI – STM04-135T Requires Replacement	15	Johnston & Damery	Yes	No	5	\$198,968	Immediately August 20, 2004	Facility Services	Conservation Maintenance

Accountability and Finance Committee, Report No. 5, May 12, 2004
 Contract Awards (04-04-0510)

CHART C: Contracts Requiring Board Approval (>\$250,000 and Consulting Services >\$50,000)

	User/Budget Holder School/Department	Products/Services Details	Ward	Recommended Supplier	Low Bid	Objections	No. of Bids Received	Estimated Annual Amount	Projected Start/End Date of Contract	Customer Involvement	Funding Source for Facilities Contract Awards
1	Facility Services	Swimming Pool Renovations at York Mills CI – DW04-134T. Humidity Control & Painting is required. The swimming pool paint is peeling off and there are reports that excessive humidity continues to affect the pool structure and indoor air quality. This project is to resolve these problems.	13	Leeson Mechanical	Yes	No	4	\$292,352	August 27, 2004 - October 10, 2004	Facility Services	Health & Safety
2	Facility Services Business Services	Employee Uniforms – STM04-100P for Maintenance & Construction, Full /Part Time Caretaking, Operations Maint., Bus Drivers, Transportation, Warehouse employees and Courier.	N/A	Mark's Work Wearhouse	Yes	No	4	\$528,600	August 1, 2004 – July 31, 2006 Option to extend additional year	Customer Committee	Operations/ Design & Construction/ Business Services

Accountability and Finance Committee, Report No. 5, May 12, 2004
Contract Awards (04-04-0510)

Briefing Note for Oil Tank Removal Services, KLD Construction (Chart A, Item 8)

To provide information in support of item no. 8 appearing in Chart A of the Contract Award report no. 04-04-0510 for the purchase of oil tank removal services.

On June 5, 2003, Purchasing and Distribution Services, in consultation with Facility Services staff, issued Tender DW03-220T in response to a request to secure oil tank removal services for a three year maximum term ending June, 2006.

Bids were submitted from three (3) firms including Claybar Contracting and KLD Construction, the two lowest bidders.

Claybar Contracting was unknown to the Board and, while their bid was slightly lower than KLD's, it was deemed appropriate to recommend a split award between Claybar and KLD for the first year of the contract, allowing staff to measure Claybar's performance. A recommendation to award Claybar Contracting up to a three (3) year contract and KLD with a one (1) year contract was approved by the Supervisor on July 10, 2003.

There are no current performance issues with Claybar Contracting. However, staff considered the number of upcoming oil tank removal projects and recommend that we continue with the split award by extending KLD's contract for up to two additional years, ending June, 2006.

The value of KLD's extended contract is estimated to be \$50,000. per year.

The expenditure is budgeted by Facility Services (Standards, Compliance and Environment).

Staff recommends that we extend KLD's contract for up to two additional years.

Accountability and Finance Committee, Report No. 5, May 12, 2004
Bulk Purchase of Natural Gas (04-04-0511)

Bulk Purchase of Natural Gas (04-04-0511)

As presented to the Accountability and Finance Committee on May 12, 2004 (see page 360).

Since 1987 the Toronto District School and its predecessor boards embarked on direct bulk purchase agreements for Natural Gas from Natural Gas producers, in an effort to benefit from economies of scale in the deregulated natural gas market. This practice of bulk purchase provides the Board with a predictable cost and avoids the risk of market price fluctuations, which can have a negative impact on the Board's operations.

The Facility Services Energy Management Unit is responsible for monitoring and managing the energy contracts as part of their activities. The Board also retains the services of a natural gas consulting company, Energy Advantage, to assist in advising on the natural gas market and purchase strategy. They also assist in the preparation of the Request for Proposal and evaluation of responses. Appendix A provides a summary of the background of Energy Advantage.

The Board made its decision to bulk purchase the "gas commodity" due to the anticipated volatility of the gas market. We have been successful historically in locking in the price of gas as it avoids the risk of spiking prices, which can have a significant negative impact on our budgets.

We believe the continuance of locking in the cost of natural gas is an appropriate strategy to take out the risk of increased prices. Our advisors indicate that the pressures on prices are more on the up side over the next period of time. (Appendix B, Market Overview, April 21, 2004).

The Board's contracts for the supply of natural gas expire on October 31, 2004. We are advised that the timing for entering into our future supply contracts, particularly for 2004 – 2005, is in the May to early June 2004 period.

Components of Natural Gas Budget

The natural gas budgeted cost of \$32.7 million for 2003/204 is comprised of three components:

(a) Commodity Cost

This is the cost of the gas we purchase at the well head in Alberta. In our 2003/2004 fiscal year we budgeted \$18.3M on gas commodity, approximately 56% of the natural gas budget.

(b) Transportation Cost

the Board pays TransCanada Pipeline (TCPL) to transport the gas from Alberta to Ontario where it is stored in Enbridge storage facilities. In 2003/2004, \$4.9M is budgeted which constitutes 15% of the natural gas budget.

(c) Distribution Cost

Enbridge owns all the natural gas distribution pipelines in Ontario and it distributes Board gas from its storage facility to all our schools and buildings. For the 2003/2004 year, \$9.5M is budgeted or approximately 29% of the natural gas budget.

Accountability and Finance Committee, Report No. 5, May 12, 2004
Bulk Purchase of Natural Gas (04-04-0511)

The Ontario Energy Board regulates distribution and transportation cost and any increase in these costs must be approved by the OEB. The Gas commodity is deregulated and its cost is affected by many factors including; cost of substitute (Fuel Oil), weather, drilling activity and storage volume (Refer to Appendix B, Market Overview April 21, 2004).

Currently, the Board has two natural gas supply contracts:

- (a) A Western Canada contract with BP to supply 2,210,075 gigajoules (58,642,725 m³) of natural gas per year at a cost of approximately \$13,100,000.
- (b) An Eastern Canada contract with Seminole to supply 892,425 gigajoules (33,633 m³) of natural gas per year at a cost of approximately \$5,200,000.

These contracts expire on October 31, 2004, and a new gas purchase contract is needed. It is estimated that the Board will require 3,120,000 gigajoules of natural gas for the period, November 1, 2004 to October 31, 2005 and similar volume for the following two years. Based on today's prices, this volume would be priced at about the same price as currently budgeted. The ultimate price to be contracted will depend on market prices at the time we contract.

The consulting company recommends an aggressive natural gas procurement strategy in order for the Board to benefit from the softening in the price of natural gas, which should continue during the months of May and into early June 2004. To take advantage of this short term softening in the market it is recommended that the RFP be issued and contact awarded prior to May 31, 2004.

There are strong indications that the market price of natural gas will go up from its current price in June and in the summer 2004 as a result of increased demand for natural gas for power generation in the U.S.A., and low natural gas storage levels in Canada and U.S.A. It would therefore be in the Board's best interest to proceed with this procurement strategy.

Process for RFP and Contracting

The price volatility of natural gas requires Purchasing and Distribution Services to issue a Request for Proposal. Because the contract price is based on market prices, the selected supplier(s) will be asked for a quote and the price is normally held for a matter of hours. So the final decision to set the price must be given to staff who will act in concert with our advisors on the most appropriate timing.

There is a distinct possibility that the observed softening in the index price of Gas will not be sustained beyond May. If price increase by \$0.50 per GJ after May 2004 it would cost the Board \$1.6 million.

It would therefore be in the Board's best interest to take advantage of the current natural gas prices in May 2004, since these prices are not expected to hold. The locking in of the price will depend on what is happening in the market and staff will act in concert with our Advisor.

Note: The appendices mentioned in the report will be maintained in Board Services for a limited time.

For the Board's decisions see page 360

Accountability and Finance Committee, Report No. 5, May 12, 2004
Central Equity Fund: Canadian Artists' CD (04-04-0512)

Central Equity Fund : Canadian Artists' CD (04-04-0512)

As presented to the Accountability and Finance Committee on May 12, 2004 (see page 361).

In January of 2003, Business Development staff developed a working partnership with a major record label and several artists to support READON. Over the past year this partnership has been nurtured and developed to the point where they are not only supporting READON again but are committed to supporting at risk youth.

Preliminary discussions have taken place regarding the production of a fundraising CD to be used not only in the system but to be distributed across the city in local music stores. Top artists are willing to sign off on minimal royalty payments and acceptable sponsors have indicated an interest in underwriting any production costs.

The tracks for the CD have been carefully selected and vetted for content. Two of the tracks are currently in the Canadian top 10 hits and two of the artists won Junos in April 2004. The CD is designed to appeal to the 14-19 year old demographic. This target audience was chosen because we want to highlight youth literacy and also enable "Youth helping youth...one CD at a time."

Schools will be able to use the CD as a fundraising product through the Fundraising Guide Web site. In addition the CD will be offered in retail outlets for the general public.

There is no up-front financial commitment by the Board. Marketing, promotion and royalty costs for the CD have been projected at approximately \$4.65 per CD, due upon sale. With a selling price of \$15.00, each CD will generate approximately \$10.35. Given that this is the first time a GTA school Board has produced such a CD, it is difficult to estimate the amount that will be raised. What we do know is that the amount fundraised for each CD sold will be in the range of \$8 - \$10.

For the Board's decision see page 361.

House Committee

Report No. 4

May 6, 2004

A meeting of the House Committee met on Thursday May 6, 2004, from 3:40 p.m. to 4:10 p.m. in the Executive Meeting Room, 5050 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario, with Sheila Cary-Meagher presiding.

The following Committee members were present: Trustees Sheila Cary-Meagher (Chair), Elizabeth Hill and David Shory. Also present was Trustee Stan Nemiroff.

The Committee decided to report and recommend as follows:

PART A: COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Trustee Salary and Benefits

The Committee considered the following notice of motion from Trustee Atkinson as referred by the Board at its meeting held on April 21, 2004:

- (a) That Premier McGuinty be requested to convene a Citizen Advisory Committee to review school trustee salaries and benefits;
- (b) That the Ontario Public School Boards' Association be requested to solicit support for this review from its member boards.

On a motion of Trustee Nemiroff, the House Committee **RECOMMENDS** that Premier McGuinty be requested to convene a Citizen Advisory Committee to review school trustee salaries and benefits.

2. Funding on a Per-student Basis for Trustees

On March 25, the Chair's Committee referred this motion of Trustee Harrison to the House Committee. At its meeting held on April 1, 2004, the House Committee postponed consideration to this time.

- (a) That the Board receive a fixed amount for each student to be used for trustee support;
- (b) That the amounts be based on the final enrolments using the October adjustments of the FTE each calendar year;
- (c) That the funds be allocated to trustees on a pro rata basis according to the enrolment in each ward.

On a motion Trustee Hill, the House Committee **RECOMMENDS** that the Chair of the Board meet with the Minister of Education to request that the Ministry find ways to appropriately fund support/resources for trustees to facilitate their work.

House Committee, Report No. 4, May 6, 2004

PART B: INFORMATION ONLY

3. Community Action Centre

The Committee discussed the progress of this matter with staff.

PART C: ONGOING MATTERS

4. Trustees' Assistants' Access

The Committee discussed access for trustees' assistants. Staff undertook to provide information at the June meeting.

Sheila Cary-Meagher
Chair of the Committee

Adopted May 14, 2004

Program and School Services Committee

Committee Report No. 7

May 11, 2004

A meeting of the Intergovernmental and Community Relations Committee convened on Tuesday, May 11, 2004, from 5:05 to 9:15 p.m. in Central Technical School, 725 Bathurst Street, Toronto, Ontario, with Bruce Davis presiding.

Committee members present: Trustees Bruce Davis (Chair), Chris Bolton, Michael Coteau, Gary Crawford, Sheine Mankovsky and Mari Rutka. Also present were Trustee Sheila Cary-Meagher and Rick Telfer.

The Committee decided to report and recommend as follows:

PART A: COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools Report (amended by the Board, see page 336)

At its meeting held on December 17, 2003, the Board established the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools. The Board requested the task force to deliver a formal report to the Chair of the Board prior to the Board meeting in May 2004. The Committee heard a presentation from the Co-Chairs of the Task Force and the members of the task force responded to questions from the Committee. The report of the task force (see page 378) was compiled from information gathered during 16 days of hearings and numerous written submissions.

On a motion of Trustee Bolton, the Program and School Services Committee recommended:

- (a) That the report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools be received;
- (b) That staff be requested to prepare an analysis and recommendations with regard to the report of the task force and report in June on an implementation plan, including timelines.

For the Board's decision, see page 401.

2. Building Bridges for Youth at Risk Pilot Project (04-04-0522) (referred by the Board, see page 337)

The Committee considered a staff report (see page 406), provided as a draft implementation plan submitted to the Ministry of Education in March 2004.

On a motion of Trustee Cary-Meagher, the Program and School Services Committee recommended:

- (a) That the Building Bridges for Youth at Risk Pilot Project include: 17 Child and Youth Workers, 8 Community Support Workers,

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004

- (b) That the qualifications for Child and Youth Workers include a Bachelor of Arts degree in child and youth care,
- (c) That staff report to the regular meeting of May 19, 2004, on additional funds required to support the program beyond those provided by the Provincial Government.

The Board **DECIDED** (see page 337) that the matter be referred to the Building Bridges committee for consideration of a different staffing configuration that remains within the allocated budget of \$2.2 million.

PART B: INFORMATION ONLY

3. Greetings from Central Technical School

The Committee heard greetings and a summary of the many programs and student activities at Central Technical from the Principal.

4. Delegations

The Committee heard the following delegations in accordance with the Board's procedure for hearing delegations:

re Early French Immersion at Williamson Road

- Margot Koivisto, Parent
- Walter Hucker, Parent

re Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools

- Katie McGovern, CUPE 4400

re Building Bridges for Youth at Risk

-
- Jim Emptage, President, OSSTF

5. Shakespeare Works, Activities in Schools

The Committee heard a verbal report from the Executive Superintendent (northwest quadrant) that this program is presented by a theatre company in more than 75 schools for students with difficulties. Additional funding is being provided by the Toronto Foundation for Student Success, the Drama Department and an anonymous donor.

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004

6. Written Notices of Motion

The following written notices of motion were presented for consideration at a future meeting of the Committee.

- (a) Prioritization of Criteria for French Immersion Placements (Trustee Cary-Meagher)
- (b) French Immersion Retention Statistics (Trustee Cary-Meagher)

PART C: ONGOING MATTERS

No matters to report.

Bruce Davis
Chair of the Committee

Adopted, as amended, May 19, 2004

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
Report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools

Report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools

As presented to the Program and School Services Committee on May 11, 2004 (see page 375) and the Board on May 19, 2004 (see page 401). For the Board's decision (see page 401).

1. Purpose

On December 17, 2003, the Toronto District School Board of Trustees passed a motion that directed that a Safe and Compassionate Schools Task Force be established to ensure that Board schools are safe and inclusive learning environments for students and safe places in which employees work.

2. Task Force Objectives

To assess the effectiveness of the current Board's Safe Schools Policy and its implementation

To identify the necessary steps to ensure that every Board school is a safe, compassionate, peaceful and inclusive learning environment in which to study and to work

To assess whether race, gender, sexual orientation, mother tongue of students, disability, socio-economic status, or other dimensions of diversity as listed in the Board's Equity Statement has any impact on the application of the Safe Schools Policy and, if so, what the impact is.

To make recommendations to the Board and/or other public bodies on steps that can be taken to make schools safer and that will ensure that every student is treated fairly and equitably. This includes but is not limited to such recommendations as may have regard for legislation, regulations, policies, procedures, operations, or budget allocations. All such recommendations are to identify the short, medium and long term timeframes.

To request that the Ontario Public School Boards' Association assist with the information gathering, analysis of province-wide issues and public advocacy and lobbying necessary to effect provincial reviews of and changes to the legislation as recommended

The Task Force was to report to the Board of Trustees at its May 2004 meeting.

3. Task Force Membership

Zanana Akande, (Co-Chair) is a former principal with the TDSB. She is currently the President of Urban Alliance on Race Relations and President of Harbourfront Centre.

Chris Bolton (Co-Chair) is the Toronto District School Board trustee for Ward 10 -Trinity Spadina. He has been trustee since the election in November, 2003. Chris has also worked in the same Ward as a teacher, Special Education Consultant, and principal for 30 plus years from 1972 to 2001. He has also been involved in alternative schools programming, community schools movement and the preservation of public education in Canada.

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
Report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools

Norm Forman, is an advocate for and consultant to the needs of special education students. Dr. Forman is a practicing Psychologist with over thirty years of experience. He is a member of the Canadian Psychological Association, The Council for Exceptional Children, and is listed in the Canadian Register of Health Service Providers in Psychology. His is a member of the Education and Advocacy Committee of a major special needs association and is the representative to the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) of the Toronto District School Board..

Dr. Alok Mukherjee, teaches about Indian culture and society at York University. He is a consultant in equity, human rights and organization change. Dr. Mukherjee has served as Acting Chief Commissioner of the Ontario Human Rights Commission, and as a member of the Ontario Civilian Commission on Police Services.

Rick Sin, is a registered social worker. He received his MSW from McGill University and is currently doing his doctorate in sociology at the University of Toronto. He is a former Executive Director of the Chinese Canadian National Council Toronto Chapter, the Diversity Manager of the Canadian Cancer Society, and a social worker in Montreal, New York and Hong Kong.

Helen Yabu, has a long history with the TDSB. She attended Lord Dufferin PS and Jarvis Collegiate as a student. Helen's career with the TDSB included teaching and consulting in special education in several schools across the city. She has been a vice-principal at Leslieville PS and principal at Pape Avenue and Jesse Ketchum Schools.

Hamoon Ekhtiari, is 17 years old, came to Canada less than 3 years ago and started school in Grade 10 at Newtonbrook S.S. and is in his last year of high school. He is Vice President of TDSB's Supercouncil.

4. Consultation Process and Participants

The Task Force consulted with staff, students, parents, community agencies and organizations, and the community during the months of March, April, and May 2004. A community consultation was held in each of the four quadrants. Participants were divided into small working groups (roundtables) to discuss their views and recommendations in regard to the *Safe Schools Policy*. Each roundtable session was facilitated by a member(s) of the task force and summarized by recorders.

The task force held a total of 16 days of hearings to receive presentations. These presentations ranged from community organizations and individuals representing and involved with equity issues, students with disabilities, safe schools, and marginalized/racialized communities to organizations representing school staff (teachers, support staff and administration (principals and vice principals), central board staff from Equity, Human Rights, Safe Schools and Legal).

Over 300 emails were received from individuals and organizations who wished to offer written materials and opinions. These have been compiled and summarized.

Task Force members also met with representatives of the Ontario Human Rights Commission.

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
 Report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools

Special attention was paid to the youth/students consultation process. Task force members attended the TDSB Youth Equity Conference and made themselves available for one-on-one consultation with conference participants. A survey was circulated to all participants for their input.

Students were asked to share their opinions on the *Safe Schools Policy* at four consultation meetings – one in downtown Toronto, one in Scarborough, one at the Alexandra Park Community Centre and one at the San Romanoway Revitalization Association where a number of parents were also present. In total, over 160 children, teens, young adults and youth workers attended these consultations.

In addition to these community consultations and hearings, the task force received a number of written submissions. In total the task force consulted with over 600 people.

The Task force would like to thank the many individuals, organizations, and groups/agencies who took the time to participate in the consultation process. It would be difficult to name the over 600 parents and community members and the over 300 students, but we will attempt to name those groups and organizations that signed in for the sessions and wrote:

Alexandra Park Community Centre Youth	ARCH
Bellwoods Community Legal Services	Canadian Race Relations Foundation
Canadian Union of Public Employees	Catholic Children's Aid Society of Toronto
Community Equity Reference Group	Delisle Youth Services
Earl Grey Senior Public School	Elementary Teachers of Toronto
Elms Teachers Council	Family and Child Skills Development
Flemingdon Legal Services	Glenview Sr. Middle School
Jane/Finch Legal Services	Justice for Children and Youth
Leslieville Public School Council	Ont. Association of Children's Aid Societies
Ontario Human Rights Commission	Ontario Public School Boards Association
Ont. Secondary School Teachers Federation	Parent Coalition for Safe Schools
Rexdale Community Legal Clinic	Safe Schools Forum Working Group
San Romanoway Revitalization Assoc.	St. Stephen's Community House
Scott & Oleskiw, Barristers & Solicitors	The Canadian Safe School Network
Toronto Principal's Association	Special Education Advisory Committee
Community Equity Reference Group	

However, the task force knows that it has only scratched the surface. Given the short time frame (imposed by the Task Force on itself to ensure that recommendations could be developed before the end of the current school year), there were a number of community and service organizations unable to respond to the invitation to consult at this time. There has also been a heightened degree of research, forums, reports generated within the TDSB and outside that would preclude this report from being other than a snapshot of the moment at which it is written.

5. Introduction

Generally speaking, schools have continued to operate around behaviour management using the *Education Act* as a basis. It is acknowledged that this report addresses exceptional cases, however, the negative impact of the current zero tolerance philosophy has resulted in students and

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
Report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools

their communities feeling disenfranchised and marginalized not only from their schools but from society in general.

In a school system that addresses itself to all children and which has established a policy of concern and safety for all, it is important that everyone feel that they are being treated fairly and equitably.

The *Safe Schools Policy* of the Toronto District School Board (TDSB) is viewed as a policy that by its very implementation targets the children and youth of racialized and marginalized communities, and students with disabilities. Furthermore, it is clear by the statements made during the consultations, the impact of the *Safe Schools Policy* reaches beyond the walls of a particular school and into the very community itself. The *Safe Schools Policy* is seen by many deputants as a tool to get rid of the student who seems to have problems rather than getting rid of the problems.

The profound, pervasive and powerful sense of outrage felt by the parents who attended the consultations cannot be adequately represented on the written page. And on the basis of the personal stories told at the consultations, they are justified. Parent after parent spoke of the frustration of trying to maneuver through a system that seemed to be crammed with road-blocks designed to exclude parents from the process. Time and time again, the task force heard of attempts to speak to administrators at the school and board level only to be rebuffed. It is clear that the perceived heavy handedness on the one hand, and the perceived lack of interest in looking at mitigating factors on the other hand has resulted in distrustful, toxic relationships between too many parents and administrators and between too many communities and the Toronto District School Board.

In its consultations around *Safe School Policy* it became evident that the linkages between our schools and other societal institutions needed to be explored. Schools are seen as vital tools in effecting positive changes in our communities and participants were particularly concerned that schools had little connection to the communities in which they were situated. Community members, especially those from racialized and marginalized communities emphasized the direct link between healthy schools and healthy communities, and between education and gainful employment. "None of us want our children to live in poverty. We want our children educated so that they can live healthy and responsible lives," said one participant. There is great fear that children and youth who are alienated by their schools will be lost to the community.

The task force identified through anecdotal evidence, the impact current *Safe Schools Policy*, has had on our criminal justice system. The Ontario Human Rights Commission report *Paying the Price: The Human Cost of Racial Profiling* reports, "Persons who work with children and youth confirm that suspended students are more likely to hang out on streets and in malls creating the potential for increased contact with the police. Children who are out of school are more likely to meet anti-social kids and learn or engage in anti-social behaviours".

Lawyers and advocates working with young offenders confirm that the majority of young offenders have interacted with the *Safe Schools Policy* at an early age. As one parent put it, "We need to help the kids in elementary school right now. We will lose them in middle school and they will be criminals by high school."

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
Report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools

This is not to say that every student who is expelled or suspended will end up in the criminal justice system. But it makes the point that the education system does not exist in isolation and that the zero tolerance philosophy of TDSB's current *Safe Schools Policy* can have a life long effect. The Toronto District School Board is part of the broader society and these issues cross many borders. It is important therefore, to locate our schools in that continuum to ensure that children's needs are met and accommodated before these issues transition into other milieus.

Recommendation 5:1

The creation of the task force has stimulated a notable upsurge in data collection and analysis of various legal, social and human rights aspects both within the Toronto District School Board and within other boards and communities. Much of this information will not be available until after the task force reports to the Board. To say, therefore that the task force has been able to get the full picture is not reasonable.

Therefore, it is recommended that a new reference group called the *Safe and Compassionate Schools Work Group* consisting of Board Trustees, community, students and staff, is established to monitor *Safe Schools Policy* implementation. The *Work Group* will hold regular reviews and be given the power to make recommendations to the Program and School Services standing committee of the Board for consideration, additions and modification to *Safe School Policy* and its implementation. The composition and detailed mandate will be brought to the board of Trustees in June, 2004. The mandate will include but not be limited to the following areas: monitoring the implementation of any recommendations accepted by the Board; ensuring annual reviews of the *Safe School Policy*; overseeing the collection of statistical information and the dissemination of such information to schools and the public; effecting prominent use of preventative measures such as peer counselling and restorative justice; and continuing the consultation work begun by the task force including exploring the linkages between our schools and other societal institutions to create potential collaborative relationships. The workgroup will also liaise with school based safe school committees.

Timeline Sept., 2004 Responsibility: Office of Associate Director and Program and School Services

Recommendation 5:2

There has been much discussion by those who feel disenfranchised that the *Safe Schools Act* should be repealed. In the vast majority of consultations, this notion repeated itself.

Therefore, given the real concerns about the implementation of the act raised by communities in Toronto and by the Ontario Human Rights Commission, the task force recommends that the Board appeal to the Provincial Government to repeal the *Act*.

Timeline May, 2004 Responsibility: Board of Trustees

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
 Report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools

6. History of Provincial Legislation, Toronto District School Board Safe School Policies and Zero Tolerance

In a presentation by the Safe Schools Department to the Task Force the history of the provincial legislation and ensuing TDSB policies were outlined. It appears that as TDSB Safe School policies were created the lines between provincial safe schools policies and the zero tolerance policies originating in the United States became blurred and interconnected.

[Note: A chart indicating the historical perspective of Safe Schools and Safe Schools Policy was inserted here a copy of which will be maintained in Board Services for a limited time.]

Zero tolerance is not part of the provincial legislation language and the task force believes strongly that safe schools policies ought to be thought of as being fundamentally different than zero tolerance. It appears that two messages are being given to the administrators of safe school policies. The presence of mitigating factors in provincial legislation and TDSB safe schools policies inhibits the description of the *Safe Schools Policy* as being strictly zero tolerance.

One race relations expert stated to the Task Force that “Zero tolerance policy has been in effect for 10 years in the U.S. and there is now acceptance of the adverse affects of the policy, particularly the disproportionate and negative impact on minority students which occurs by the very operation of the act. Even though the TDSB has no Ontario statistical data on zero tolerance it would be incredible if the impact was any different from other jurisdictions that have data.”

Recommendation 6:1

The task force finds that use of zero tolerance language in TDSB policies presents itself as a compelling implementation practice and recommends that all reference to zero tolerance be removed from all current and future Toronto District School Board’s internal and external documents.

Timeline: Sept. 2004

Responsibility: Office of Assoc. Director - Program

7. TDSB Policy and Procedures

The Safe Schools Department has produced a comprehensive *Safe Schools Procedures Manual* which contains the *Safe School Policy* and procedures and corollary policies and procedures.

The manual is divided into the following sections:

Section A	Safe Schools Project Plan
Section B	Safe Schools Policies, Procedures and Guidelines
Section C	List of Additional TDSB Policies and Procedures
Section D	General Considerations Related to Discipline
Section E	Suspension Procedures
Section F	Suspension Review/Appeal Procedures
Section G	Expulsion Procedures
Section H	Expulsion Appeal Process

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
Report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools

Recommendation 7:1

The manual itself is very comprehensive but in its present form is not user friendly. The task force found that no attention was given to prevention and intervention techniques and that linkages between safe school policies and other TDSB policies, especially the *Equity Foundation Policy and Procedure, Human Rights Policy and Procedures and Guidelines and Procedures for the Accommodation of Religious Requirements, Practices and Observances* were not emphasized.

Given that the manual is the primary tool used by administrators in the implementation of the *Safe School Policy*, the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

- (a) That the *Safe School Procedures* manual be reorganized to facilitate easy access by principals and vice-principals. This would include an executive summary in checklist fashion, of a description of consequences, routines, and protocols which would be placed at the front of the manual.**
- (b) That the documents that detail these procedures be referenced as appendices.**
- (c) That the remainder of the manual focus equally on prevention and intervention techniques and that a separate section of the binder relate to the creation of and tasks related to safe schools committees.**
- (d) That linkages between the *Safe School Policy* and other TDSB policies such as *Equity Foundation Policy and Procedure, Human Rights Policy and Procedures and Guidelines and Procedures for the Accommodation of Religious Requirements, Practices and Observances* be more clearly defined and fully integrated.**

Timeline Sept. 2004

Responsibility: Safe Schools Department

8. Available Statistics

The only statistics currently available to the Task Force were given to us from the Safe School Department. These statistics did not contain race, language or other identifiers. Other agencies including the Human Rights Commission have articulated the same concerns as the Task Force regarding the information that has not been collected.

Furthermore, the Task Force was advised that due to data base problems, the information that has been collected is not easily produced in a useable form making analysis of the data near impossible.

The Task Force understands that for the Sept. 2002 – Aug. 2003 year, the number of expulsions totaled over 300.

According to a July 23, 2002 Toronto Star article, by Tess Kalinowski “Student Suspensions Up in the GTA – Principals say new mandatory reporting partly explains rise” suspensions rose 40 percent in the 2001 – 2002 academic year to 24,238 from 17,371. (In the data received from the Safe School Department, the suspension figure was 24,202). Although enrollment had dropped

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
Report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools

slightly in the 2002-2003 academic year the number of suspensions rose to 26,411 (although the media quotes the figure at 27,000) an increase of 9.1% over the previous year.

Furthermore, the number of students involved in suspensions increased over 7% between the 2002-2002 academic year and the 2002-2003 academic year.

For the 2002-2003 academic year, 77.70% of suspensions were given to boys. The Task Force understands that 20% of suspensions are issued to students with disabilities. It was difficult to get an absolutely accurate reading, since the statistics only reflected the number of times a particular Exceptionality had been selected and a suspension could have more than one Exceptionality associated with it. The statistics indicated that Behaviour, Learning Disability, and Mild Intellectual Disability were by far the most frequent Exceptionalities identified.

Of the 16,577 students suspended during the academic year 2003-2003, 109 suspended students were 5 years of age or younger, 512 were 6 years old, 804 were 7 years old, 1,041 were 8 years old, 1,374 were 9 years old and 1,605 were 10 years old. Not only were there suspensions in kindergarten, but the Task Force also heard testimony about kindergarten students who were expelled. 8,424 suspended students were 11 – 13 years of age; 8,680 were 14 to 16 years of age; and 3,862 suspended students were age 17 to 20 years old.

Information received from the Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies indicates that of 3,295 Crown Ward files reviewed, over 20% were suspended at least once from school in the last year. 41% of the Crown Wards who were suspended or expelled had been identified through an IPRC as having special needs. The Catholic children's Aid Society of Toronto, in a similar study indicated that of the 532 Crown Ward files reviewed, 112 or 21% had been suspended at least once from school and 34% of those suspended had been identified through an IPRC as having special needs.

During the task force's consultations, advocates, organizations and many parents called for the statistics collected on expulsions and suspensions to include the race and disability (ies) of the students involved. Furthermore, parents asked that expulsion and suspension data be made available to the public by school in a manner that provides for privacy issues and Freedom of Information. In the words of one parent, "If we are sending our kids to your school, we have the right to get those statistics."

Recommendation 8:1

Based on anecdotal and empirical data as well as minimal quantitative data, it is apparent that the Toronto District School Board's Safe Schools Policy impacts disproportionately on students from racialized and marginalized communities. Without statistics on race it is impossible to know this with any certainty, allowing an unfair discrediting of these communities concerns.

Therefore, the Task Force supports the Ontario Human Rights Commission's recommendation in its submission to the Task Force on April 29, 2004:

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
Report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools

- (a) That TDSB administration be directed to collect and analyze data on expulsions and suspensions under the *Safe Schools Act* and school board policies in order to monitor, prevent and combat any discriminatory effect on individuals protected under the *Code*, including students from racialized communities and students with disabilities. Consult with affected communities and the Ontario Human Rights Commission to establish appropriate guidelines on the collection and use of data, including ensuring anonymity and using data only for the purpose of addressing inequities and promoting compliance with the *Code*. “Where anecdotal evidence of racial profiling exists, the organization involved should collect data for the purpose of monitoring its occurrence and to identify measures to combat it. Such organizations should consult with affected communities and the Ontario Human Rights Commission to establish guidelines on how the data will be collected and its use. Such data should not be used in a manner to undermine the purposes of the Ontario Human Rights Code.”

Timeline Sept., 2004 Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program and Safe Schools Dept

- (b) That a researcher/statistician be designated to design an appropriate collection vehicle and data base to facilitate the collection and analysis of these statistics

Timeline Sept., 2004 Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program and Safe Schools Dept

- (c) That the results become part of the school improvement process at both the Board and school level

Timeline Sept., 2004 Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program and Safe Schools Dept

- (d) That in addition to the data collected on expulsions and suspensions there be the creation and maintenance of a data base to capture all information relevant to trespass letters, warnings and other exclusionary documents and processes.

Timeline Sept., 2004 Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program and Safe Schools Dept

- (e) That the data collected on expulsions, suspensions, trespass letters, warnings and other exclusionary documents and processes be reported monthly to the Board of Trustees.

Timeline June., 2004 Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program and Safe Schools Dept

- (f) That the Board of Trustees take action to ensure that the data base connected to *Safe Schools* be upgraded as soon as possible to allow for accessible accurate and timely statistical data.

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
Report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools

Timeline Sept., 2004 Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program and Safe Schools Dept

9. Available Research and Reports

Available material from an Ontario perspective is limited. The Toronto District School Board's Legal Department is just completing a research project which looks at the practices of schools boards across the province of Ontario.

The following research materials and reports were reviewed during the Task Force's deliberations:

Blickmore, Kathy (2004) Discipline for Democracy? School Districts' Management of Conflict and Social Exclusion, *Theory and Research in Social Education* Winter 2004, Volume 32, Number 1, pp. 74-96

Harvard University, The Civil Rights Project (2000) Opportunities Suspended: The Devastating Consequences of Zero Tolerance and School Discipline", *Report from a national summit on Zero Tolerance June 15-16, 2000 Washington D.C.*

Horsman, Jenny (2004) The Challenge to create a Safer Learning Environment for Youth *Parkdale Project Read, Spiral Community Resource Group*

Levinsky, Zachary (2003) *The Safe Schools Act: The Reproduction of Volatility and the Resistance to a "Piece of Paper"*, unpublished

Ontario Human Rights Commission (2004): *The Ontario Safe Schools Act, School Discipline and Discrimination, unpublished report*

Ontario Human Rights Commission (Dec. 2003) *Paying the Price: The Human Cost of Racial Profiling – Inquiry Report*

Ontario Human Rights Commission (July, 2003) *The Opportunity to Succeed: Achieving Barrier-free Education for Students with Disabilities – Inquiry Report*

Pieters, Gary (2003) *Disproportionate Impact, the Safe Schools Act and Racial Profiling in Schools, Ontario Network for Human Rights Web Site*

Roher, Eric M. and Freel, Walter H. (2003) *The Right Revolution: The Importance of legal Literacy for Educators, Education Law News, Borden, Ladner, Gervais LLP, Fall 2003, pp.2-8*

Ruck Martin D., Wortley Scot (2002) *Racial and ethnic minority high school students' perceptions of school disciplinary practices: A look at some Canadian findings, Journal of Youth and Adolescence; New York*

Skiba, Russel J.; Michael, Rober S., Nardo, Abra Carroll (2000) *The Color of Discipline, Sources of Racial and Gender Disproportionality in School Punishment, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Policy Research Report #SRSI*

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
Report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools

Skiba, Russel J.; Peterson, Reece (1999) *The Dark Side of Zero Tolerance: Can Punishment Lead to Safe Schools?* *Online article, Phi Delta Kappan*
<http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/kski9901.htm>

Siu, Jenny (2003) 'Has Zero Tolerance Policy in Schools Perpetuated Racism in Ontario's Education System?' Drawing on American Experience *unpublished*

Recommendation 9:1

The Task Force notes an upsurge in research in the area of Safe School policies. The Task Force also notes that the information held by the TDSB about this research is minimal. The Task Force also notes that work is just beginning on the compilation of best practices in Toronto and in other jurisdictions.

Timeline: School year 2004/2005 Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program

Therefore the Task Force recommends

- (a) That the TDSB research department report back to the working group with a project plan designed to compile research on an ongoing basis including but not limited to: an ongoing review of new research pertaining to safe schools policy implementation; a comprehensive listing of preventative and anti-bullying programs being offered within the TDSB and an evaluation of those programs including best practices; a comprehensive listing of preventative and anti-bullying programs being offered by community groups and agencies and an evaluation of those programs including best practices; a comprehensive listing of preventative and anti-bullying best practices in other jurisdictions including other provinces and territories, the United States, Britain and Australia.**
- (b) That the TDSB work with other research institutes, like The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and York University, to undertake research to study the impact of current safe school policies on people with disabilities and people from racial minorities**

10. Staffing levels

Every time there was a roundtable or a conversation about Safe Schools there were reports of the effects of the decrease in staff. Be it guidance staff, lunchroom supervisors, educational assistants in kindergarten and elementary school programs, child and youth workers for special programs, youth counsellors, hall monitors the comments were the same – return them to support all students but particularly those at risk and with special needs. They are the people who make the schools safe, not cameras and cards.

Unfortunately, statistics from the Toronto District School Board on the changes in staffing levels is hard to acquire for the Task Force. And so we have not been able to attach any hard data.

For recommendations in this area see **Recommendation 11:3.**

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
Report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools

11. Results of consultation process

Introductory Remarks

Clearly almost all who attended the consultations believed that discrimination caused students from racial minorities and students with disabilities to be treated more harshly than white students under the *Safe Schools Policy*.

A number of participants expressed the opinion that the system is biased and discriminatory and that “it was time to launch some kind of class action suit against the school board and the province”. Others expressed the view that it was time to repeal the act. “It discriminates against the poor, disadvantaged and those of African heritage”. Still others felt that “The policy that was in place before the *Safe Schools Act* worked just fine. We should go back to what we had before.”

Time and time again the Task Force heard accounts of incidents involving two students resulting in the black child being suspended while the white child was not. A mother recounted a recent incident, “My son lost two front teeth and the principal said it was a mistake. It was a white kid who pushed him. My other son who is only five years old said it was because the kid was white and my son is black. At five years old my son believes this.”

One student noted that “because we come from a certain neighborhood, we are judged a certain way”. A Somali community member in a written submission to the task force said “Parents are embattled by a system that does not understand either their cultural views or respect their struggles to parent effectively”.

Equity groups found that there was a disparate impact on vulnerable populations including students with special needs, students of colour and immigrant students. In their submission to the task force, one equity group noted that “The *Safe Schools Act* creates a system which disengages most at-risk children and youth from the school community at increasingly earlier stages of their lives.”

In Human Rights Commissioner Norton's report, *An Opportunity to Succeed: Achieving Barrier-free Education for Students with Disabilities* the disproportionate effect of the *Safe Schools Act* on exceptional students is noted. In the Human Rights Commission's *Report on Racial Profiling* racial profiling in schools under *The Safe Schools Act* is a clear concern. The Ontario Human Rights Commission in its soon to be published report *The Ontario Safe Schools Act, School Discipline and Discrimination* states, “Nearly all the interviewees identified discrimination – direct and systemic – as the main reason why the application of discipline in schools has a disproportionate impact on racial minority students and students with disabilities”.

The author of one submission states “Two Toronto lawyers (including the writer of these submissions) who between them have represented 15 students and their parents on expulsion hearings indicate that of the total, all were racialized minorities and 14 were African Canadian. All but one was male. In addition, it appears that the overwhelming majority of the students attending the statutorily required Strict Discipline Programs in Toronto (required when a student has been expelled) are African Canadian.”

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
Report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools

Advocates for students with disabilities were no less adamant that the *Safe Schools Act* discriminated against at-risk children and youth. As one advocate stated “People expect that their emotional development should be age appropriate even if their intellectual and cognitive development is delayed”. Another advocate pointed out that the TDSB needed to “recognize that so many of the resources once directed to inclusion, and building equity has been reoriented to the punitive measures of safe schools. TDSB needs to shift and reorient from the punitive to the restorative”.

Recommendation 11:1

The Task Force has concluded that there must be a fundamental change in the direction of the *Safe Schools Policy* from policing to creating truly safe and inclusive schools. In order to achieve this the Task Force recommends that the Board of Trustees redirect funds toward direct services to the schools and toward the creation of a new model which would include educators employed as safe school advisors, youth support workers, attendance counsellors and other youth support positions to work collaboratively with the Equity, Human Rights and Community Services Departments. Given the composition of our schools and the backgrounds of the majority of students who are expelled or suspended, the departments should be supervised by the superintendent of equity and inner-city schools in an enlarged portfolio.

Timeline Sept., 2004 Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program

Recommendation 11:2:

The Task Force found that the perception of discrimination against students from racialized and marginalized communities and students with disabilities must be addressed. Therefore the Task Force recommends:

- (a) That the *Safe Schools Policy* be reviewed to ensure that is consistent with the *Human Rights and Equity Foundation* statements and policies of the Toronto District Schools Board and ensure that all disciplinary actions are consistent with these policies**
- (b) That all staff involved in disciplinary actions within the *Safe Schools Policy* of the TDSB be trained in Equity and Human rights policy implications for Safe School Policy implementation.**
- (c) That training for principals, vice-principals, teachers and staff in cultural awareness, equity and anti-racism training be scheduled as part of professional development**
- (d) That there be careful selection of principals and staff who have knowledge and acceptance of the population the school serves. One of the ways this may be done is by having principals and teachers apply and be interviewed as to suitability for specific schools.**
- (e) That the selection of principals relative to schools be done with the involvement of trustees**

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
Report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools

- (f) **That every principal must have one year of special education training/experience.**
- (g) **That the staff and teacher performance review process be expanded to include Safe Schools**

Timeline for all these recommendations be Sept., 2005 Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program

Preventative measures and support for at risk children and youth

There is no question that parents, students, teachers and administrators expect our schools to be safe. Participants interpreted that to mean free of weapons, fights, and bullying behaviour where the atmosphere is one of mutual respect. There was clear recognition and strong support for the need to swiftly penalize acts of wrongdoing. As one student said, "If you come to school with a machete, it's pretty clear that you are going to be expelled. Why does the principal waste time giving the student a twenty-day suspension and then expelling him?"

However, the term, "safe schools" was also interpreted to mean an environment where students of different abilities, backgrounds, and different communication and social skills could feel safe to learn how to achieve their personal best.

In the words of a high school student, "The question we should be asking is why are kids acting up? Kids may have trouble at home, a lack of self-esteem and depression." An eight-year-old had this to say, "There are lots of fights at my school. People are angry with each other. Maybe we could be taught how to talk things over so there wouldn't be so many fights."

The task force found that far too many examples were given by participants of suspensions for behaviour that most likely could have been prevented if there were more trained adults present. The call for more youth counselors, hall monitors, attendance counsellors, community liaison workers and education assistants was heard from every stakeholder. There was recognition that the introduction of the *Safe Schools Policy* concurrent with staff reductions, has resulted in TDSB administration choosing the least time consuming method of addressing perceived 'bad' behaviours. "The act moves the action from supporting the kids to banishing them", said one advocate. While another stated "The result is that we have schools that cater to fewer and fewer types of children".

The overriding sentiment expressed by community consultation participants and community advocates, was that the *Safe Schools Policy* addressed the results of perceived 'bad' behaviour rather than trying to prevent the perceived 'bad' behaviours. Current bullying programs appear to be ineffective by themselves, while one-on-one interventions were virtually non-existent. Participants felt that because of the fragmented approach to programming concepts, it is difficult to develop a culture within the TDSB that is consistent about bullying and how to deal with it. Staff in particular expressed the need for a consolidated approach to the development of programming in this area. Parents feel ineffectual in helping their children who are being bullied and a number stated that they felt even more helpless after seeking the assistance of the school administration.

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
Report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools

Although a number of advocates were aware that TDSB had over 500 educational programs aimed at eradicating bullying and encouraging safe schools, they expressed concern that there was no coherent inventory of school programs, community programs or programs being offered through other government agencies. Furthermore it was noted that there seems to be no evaluation of the effectiveness of these programs.

The Task Force received a number of comments around the issue of lunchtime activities. A number of parent and administration representatives pointed out that the reduction of lunch room supervisors has resulted in situations where coverage is lacking during certain times of the lunch periods and that principals and vice-principals in other schools have to fill in the supervision gaps. Because of safety and truancy issues a number of schools do not allow their students to leave the premises during the lunch breaks. TDSB policy does not allow for volunteers to fill in the gaps.

The result is that far too many students are being supervised by far too few staff. The lack of resources also prevents schools from offering programs to the students at lunchtime. Safe School Committee representatives and parents saw this as losing an unique opportunity to offer programs that would allow students to interact with each other outside of the classroom setting but still under the supervision of adults.

There was a clear call for more programs and more personnel to work with students and parents through workshops, special programs and one-on-one interventions to begin to create a compassionate and caring school environment. There was acknowledgement that this would be a slow and sometimes painful process, but one that in the long run would be far more effective than the punitive responses encouraged by TDSB's *Safe Schools Policy*.

Teacher representatives spoke to the issue of teachers feeling unsupported in some schools and stressed the need for professional development in classroom management techniques, especially for new teachers and principals. The need for more in-school personnel was also discussed by the representatives of elementary and secondary teachers and principals and vice-principals.

Recommendation 11:3

The Task Force has concluded that preventative measures and support for at-risk children and youth must be given priority to ensure that students remain in the school. This means having adults in place who understand youth culture in general as well as the cultures of individual youths themselves. Principals and teachers work in the best interests of the student and want to do what is best for all students however; they have not been given the supports needed to fulfill these obligations. Support for students has been identified by staff, parents and students as crucial in assisting students with problems and helping students in their development. These supports are seen as pivotal in preventing crises, which currently often lead, to suspension or expulsion. The task force therefore recommends:

- (a) That there be an immediate restoration of appropriate numbers of lunch room supervisors, child care workers, youth support workers, attendance counsellors, hall monitors, caretakers, community liaison workers and educational assistants.**

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
Report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools

Timeline Sept., 2004 Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program and Human Resources Committee

- (b) That three professional development days be devoted to upgrading staff skills in classroom management, and safe school policy implementation including best practices.

Timeline Sept., 2005 Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program

- (c) That each of the 500+ anti-bullying and preventative programs apparently available to schools be evaluated and that a menu of a much smaller number of programs be provided to all schools. This will also help to encourage a common language around these issues when students move from elementary schools to middle and secondary schools.

Timeline Dec., 2004 Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program and Program and School Services Committee

- (d) That an evaluation of anti-bullying and preventative programs offered by community agencies be undertaken. That barriers to school/community agency linkages be identified and solutions developed to overcome these barriers.

Timeline Dec., 2004 Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program and Safe Schools Dept

- (e) That students who are trained in ‘anti-bullying’ and other preventative programs be used as resources.

Timeline Sept., 2005 Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program and Safe Schools Dept

- (f) That it be made mandatory that each school implement an ‘anti-bullying’ program as part of the *School Improvement Plan*.

Timeline Sept., 2004 Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program and Safe Schools Dept

- (g) That staff and families be trained in ‘anti-bullying’ programs

Timeline Sept., 2005 Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program and Safe Schools Dept

- (h) That safe school audits be enforced.

Timeline Sept., 2004 Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program and Safe Schools Dept

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
Report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools

Support for suspended and expelled students and their families

Participants of the task force consultations also want our communities to be safe. Many drew a direct link between safe schools and safe communities. In the words of one community member, "There is a relation between what goes on in the community and what goes on in a school. Keeping kids in school is the best crime prevention program".

Parents expressed concern that suspended students were often sent home without any homework so that they could keep up with their schoolwork during their suspension, and that there were not any compulsory programs for suspended students to attend. They stated that it seemed that all of the programs available are overbooked. In the words of one parent, "The Zero Tolerance policy dehumanizes perpetrators of wrong by seeming to just cut them off." An advocate group working with children and youth notes, "There is no protocol in place for connecting suspended students with supports during the suspension. If work is assigned, there is no accompanying supervision or tutoring for the student. When these students return to class they often find themselves 'hopelessly lost' because of missed lessons. Suspensions can become idle time spent in malls or neighbourhood parks where police attention is attracted. Sending them unsupervised into the community ultimately makes neither our schools nor communities safer."

Parents and advocates pointed out that families and therefore the larger community can suffer economically when kids are suspended or expelled. One mother told the task force, "I have six kids and I lost my job because I had to stay home when my son was suspended." She is still looking for employment.

Advocates noted that students feel alienated and depressed as a result of suspension, a view supported by one mother's remark "My son told the social worker that he wants to kill himself. He is nine years old."

A staff member of a social service agency related the difficulty her agency has had in getting information out to schools about programs available to students in the process of being suspended or expelled. She wondered how the collaboration between schools and community organizations could be encouraged and facilitated.

A number of students also thought that there were ways to make suspensions more meaningful. One student told the task force, "Make sure that kids who fight and get suspended get some help to make sure that they can leave the fight behind and get on with life. Otherwise when they get back to school they will just fight again." Another idea from another student, "Instead of giving students in Grades 11 & 12 suspensions, make them do community service so that it goes toward the community service time they need to graduate."

Parents and advocates are concerned that there appears to be little attempt to seek alternative responses that would afford the perpetrator the chance to understand the impact of his/her behaviours on other students while at the same time meet the needs of the victim who has been traumatized. Little emphasis appears to be given to the reintegration of the suspended student. In the words of one parent, "Zero Tolerance in our schools is fundamentally flawed because it leaves no room for forgiveness. No room to exercise forgiveness. No room to learn forgiveness."

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
Report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools

Recommendation 11:4

The Task Force believes that further research needs to be done by the Work Group to explore alternative responses to perceived ‘bad’ behaviour resulting in expulsion and suspensions.

There are too many scattered programs funded by too many different provincial ministries making it difficult for schools to easily access special programs.

In the immediate however, the Task Force recommends that the Toronto District School Board appeal to the Ministry of Children and Youth Services to coordinate all school board/local organization partnerships with an emphasis on programs that focus on students returning to the school system.

Timeline Sept., 2005 Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program

Recommendation 11:5

Given that all students need to have educational experiences and the opportunity to learn or do homework in a safe place, the task force recommends:

- (i) That appropriate mandatory programs be created with sufficient capacity to service both suspended and expelled students.**
- (j) That the Board of Trustees immediately arrange to negotiate the funding of these programs by the Government of Ontario.**

Timeline Sept., 2004 Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program and Safe Schools Dept

Expulsion and suspension processes

It is no surprise that expulsion and suspension processes brought the most vehement response from both parents, students and their advocates. Complaints were heard frequently throughout the consultation that administrators were refusing to speak to community representatives, were failing to provide translators, and that parents were being treated with contempt or ignored altogether. Some parents felt that their children were at risk for more severe punishment as a result of the parent speaking up. Others felt bewilderment at trying to maneuver through a system they did not understand often in a language that was not their first language.

Students complained that they were never given a chance to have their side heard. One student observed that “There is a disconnect between the administration and the student”. As one advocate group stated, “From a legal perspective, the current policy denies the student natural justice and fairness. From a pedagogical perspective, the student is more likely to consider the process fair, to internalize the seriousness of the right to education, and to accept responsibility for the results of a process in which the student has participated fully.”

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
Report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools

Parents at every consultation meeting echoed one parent's opinion. "There should be a process that involves the parent, child, principal, teacher and other parties to talk about the problem before the child is suspended. The principal should call the parent and attempt to consult with them prior to a suspension".

Parent after parent spoke about students being sent home without the proper paper work and without parents being told. Advocates reported that too many "informal" suspensions or suspensions without paperwork were being issued. Advocates pointed out that there is no authority under the *Education Act* to remove a child from school premises without proper documentation and due process.

"What I want to know is why are children in kindergarten being suspended or expelled under the *Safe School Act*?" asked a parent. This was raised at each public consultation meeting. The child in each account was either black or had a disability.

Parents of and advocates for students with disabilities complained that students with disabilities were being suspended for behaviour directly related to the student's disability. In one case, a student with Tourette's Syndrome was suspended for swearing, a symptom of the condition.

Furthermore, it appeared that in a number of instances, failure to accommodate a student with a disability led to behaviour directly related to the disability, for which the student was then suspended.

While the principal's manual includes a reference to the fact the principals should consider the effect of a student's disability before imposing discipline, it does not make it clear that disciplining a student for conduct associated with a disability is discrimination and illegal, unless the student has been accommodated to the point of undue hardship", pointed out an advocate group in their submission.

Recommendation 11:6

The calls for due process by parents and advocates necessitates the Work Group to further investigate ways to make the expulsion process more transparent and inclusionary. The Task Force recommends the following:

- (a) **That there be a thorough review of the expulsion procedures including the appeal process to make sure that everyone has a voice**

Timeline Sept., 2004 Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program and Safe School Workgroup and Safe Schools Dept

- (b) **That a protocol be established and advertised that delineates the support for students which must have been enlisted prior to suspension being applied. In extreme circumstances the protocol may be waived but is subject to mandatory review by the Board of Trustees.**
- (c) **That TDSB policies be changed to require a review of mitigating factors when considering discretionary suspension/expulsion.**

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
Report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools

- (d) **That appeals on suspensions must be heard within 48 hours.**
- (e) **That there be reinstatement of special education classes in some locations.**
- (f) **That there be no expulsions from kindergarten to grade three.**
- (g) **That no “informal” suspensions or suspensions without the appropriate paperwork be issued.**
- (h) **That the template used for suspensions or expulsions list the mitigating factors that administrators review when considering a suspension or expulsion.**
- (i) **That the student to be subjected to discipline be a party to his or her own hearing including his/her own representative.**
- (j) **That Toronto District School Board establishes a standing committee with permanent members for Expulsion Hearings and that the Toronto District Schools petition the provincial government make these committee positions paid per diem.**

Timeline for sections b) to h) Sept., 2004 Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program and Safe Schools Dept

Recommendation 11:7

In the consultations with families and community members there were repeated comments about the need to have objectivity, impartiality and timely responses to the issues concerning *Safe School Policy* Implementation. Those who discussed this expressed their concern that existing Safe School personnel were not able to be impartial and were working for the TDSB staff. They also felt that some people were not impartial with students when they returned.

Therefore it is recommended that the Toronto District Schools establish a separate office for concerns and issues about Safe Schools (and other areas of community interaction) during the transition period to more preventative measures, in the form of an 'ombudsperson office' with staff who are funded by the TDSB, but who report directly to the Chair's Committee of the Board of Trustees. It will be the mandate of this office and to vet complaints and advocate on behalf of students and their families. There should be an assessment of this office after two years.

Timeline: School Year 2004/2005 Responsibility: Board of Trustees

The Task Force's survey at the Student Equity Conference confirmed that the *Safe School Policy* is not well communicated to the parents and students. Parents from racialized and disadvantaged communities in particular expressed feelings of alienation and identified language and cultural barriers as the two most important factors influencing the teacher/parent, principal/parent relationship. Parents of children with disabilities identified a lack of understanding of their children's disabilities and the desire by the administration to warehouse their children as an ongoing source of frustration.

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
 Report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools

Parents expressed frustration about the lack of communication about their child's performance at school. "My child did not attend school for three months and no one contacted me and told me", said one parent. Another parent stated that "Because parents don't have time to come in to the school because they are working, the administration says these parents don't care."

It appears from what was said to the task force that lots of parents do not know that they have the option to appeal. Many parents said that the letter comes in English only, and sometimes by the time they get the letter the child is back in school.

The issuance of trespass letters was seen as yet another way to avoid parents who advocate on behalf of their children. The process itself is mired in difficulties, which serve to support the view that the TDSB administration is not interested in community or parental input.

Many parents and advocates pointed out that trespass letters and notices of suspension or expulsion are written only in English, and that translators never seem to be available for meetings between parents and TDSB staff.

Recommendation 11:8

The Task Force found that many families and community members did not fully understand the *Safe Schools Policy*. Therefore the Task Force recommends:

- (a) **That a *Rights and Responsibilities* document for staff, families, communities and students that is consistent with human rights policy and equity foundation statements be made available by TDSB administration.**

Timelines: Sept. 2004 Responsibility: Legal Department and Safe School Department

- (b) **That all documents referencing *Safe Schools Policy* be written in plain language and be translated into the appropriate languages.**

Timelines: Sept. 2004 Responsibility: Legal Department and Safe Schools Department

- (c) **That a pamphlet be written, translated and distributed to schools and all families and students which addresses the rights and responsibilities of students and their families in regard to suspensions and expulsions and other legal disciplinary actions within the Board.**

Timeline Sept., 2004 Responsibility: Legal Services and Safe Schools Department

- (d) **That the process for the removal of such disciplinary actions as letters of trespass, cease and desist, and other correspondence be part of the original letter and conditions.**

Timeline Sept., 2004 Responsibility: Legal Department and Safe Schools Department

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
 Report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools

- (e) That schools be directed to hold community information sessions to encourage every member of the community to be informed about the *Safe School Policy and Procedures***

Timeline Sept to Dec 2004 Responsibility: School Administrators

- (f) That the Safe and Compassionate Schools Working Group design a protocol on how the *Safe Schools Policy* is applied to special needs children**
- (g) That the Board of Trustees pressure the provincial government to modify the grants system for special needs students and students at risk, to allow Boards of Education to be more flexible in kinds of programming and support offered to meet the needs of all students**
- (h) That the Safe Schools department translates all relevant documents in – list languages – and distributes those to schools before Sept. 2004.**

Timeline Sept., 2004 Responsibility: Safe Schools Dept

- (i) That the Safe Schools Department ensures that school administrators access translation services available to parents and students.**

Timeline Sept., 2004 Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program

- (j) That the Safe Schools department and the Equity Department immediately create a communications strategy to outreach effectively to communities which feel most disenfranchised by the *Safe Schools Policy*.**

Timeline Sept., 2004 Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program, Equity, Human Rights and Safe Schools Dept

- (k) That the TDSB ensure that all Grade 7 – 12 students have drug abuse courses and opportunities for counselling as part of the curriculum**

Keeping our children in school

The appropriateness and availability of programs, materials and facilities was raised by current students and recent high school graduates. One high school student noted that black students feel alienated because, “The books at schools don’t relate to the kids here. Kids need books that have role models who look like them. We need more books that are about black people.”

A recent graduate said, “I tried really hard to stay out of trouble. It was a struggle for me to finish high school. You go to school and then they give you homework and its survival of the fittest.” He went on to explain that schools should be open longer than

9 – 3. He pointed out that, “Not every one has a computer at home and we all need access to computers. Computers should be available at school, after school ends for the day.” A number

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
Report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools

of recent graduates believed that they would have done better at school if they had help with their homework. In the words of one, “Kids will act out because they cannot do the work”.

Another recent graduate advocated turning schools into community centers after school hours. He pointed out that if kids had programs like basketball to go to after school, they would not get involved in street life.

Recommendation 11:9

In order to assist students who may not have appropriate supports outside of formal school hours to assist them in their studies, the Task Force recommends that the Safe and Compassionate Schools Work Group collaborate with appropriate Board committees to identify ways study support can be given to students after school hours.

Timeline: School year 2004/2005 Responsibility: Board of Trustees

12.and Finally

We know from our consultations that we have heard from many people who are disenfranchised, marginalized or represent clients who feel this way. We also realize that these people are concerned about a small number.

Because of our partnership with the Ontario Public School Boards Association there will be a seminar to discuss the report at the Annual General Meeting on June 4. In addition, the Human Rights Commission has asked for a copy of the report. Various groups are deliberating Safe Schools policies. The Task Force hopes that this report will become part of the deliberations of the Ontario Provincial government safe schools review that is underway.

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
 Decision re Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools Report

Board Decision re Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools Report

As presented in Report No. 4 of the Program and School Services Committee (see page 375) and amended by the Board (see page 336).

The Board decided:

- (a) That the report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools be referred to the Chair's Committee:
 - (i) to establish the work group as recommended in Recommendation 5:1 of the report (see A. below);
 - (ii) to review and report back to the Board by September 2004 regarding implementation of the recommendations;
- (b) That recommendations 7:1 , 9:1 , 11:2 (a) only, 11:3 (f) and (h) only, 11:5 , 11:6 (b) only and 11:8 (a) to (e) and (h) only (see below) from the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools report be approved and that staff report to the Board in June on how these recommendations can be implemented;
- (c) That staff be requested to prepare an analysis and recommendations with regard to the report of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools.

A. The following recommendation of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools relates to Part (a)(i) of the Board decision of May 19, 2004.

Recommendation 5:1

The creation of the task force has stimulated a notable upsurge in data collection and analysis of various legal, social and human rights aspects both within the Toronto District School Board and within other boards and communities. Much of this information will not be available until after the task force reports to the Board. To say, therefore that the task force has been able to get the full picture, is not reasonable.

Therefore, it is recommended that a new reference group called the Safe and Compassionate Schools Work Group consisting of Board Trustees, community, students and staff, is established to monitor Safe Schools Policy implementation. The Work Group will hold regular reviews and be given the power to make recommendations to the Program and School Services standing committee of the Board for consideration, additions and modification to the Safe Schools policy and its implementation. The composition and detailed mandate will be brought to the board of Trustees in June 2004. The mandate will include but not be limited to the following areas: monitoring the implementation of any recommendations accepted by the Board; ensuring annual reviews of the Safe School policy; overseeing the collection of statistical information and the dissemination of such information to schools and the public; effecting prominent use of preventative measures such as peer counselling and restorative justice; and continuing the consultation

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
Decision re Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools Report

work begun by the task force including exploring the linkages between our schools and other societal institutions to create potential collaborative relationships. The workgroup will also liaise with school-based safe school committees.

Timeline Sept., 2004 Responsibility: Office of Associate Director and Program and School Services

B. The following recommendations of the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools relate to Part (b) of the Board decision of May 19, 2004.

Recommendation 7:1

The manual itself is very comprehensive but in its present form is not user friendly. The task force found that no attention was given to prevention and intervention techniques and that linkages between safe school policies and other Board policies, especially the Equity Foundation Policy and Procedure, Human Rights Policy and Procedures and Guidelines and Procedures for the Accommodation of Religious Requirements, Practices and Observances were not emphasized.

Given that the manual is the primary tool used by administrators in the implementation of the Safe School Policy, the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

- (a) That the Safe School Procedures manual be reorganized to facilitate easy access by principals and vice-principals. This would include an executive summary in checklist fashion, of a description of consequences, routines, and protocols which would be placed at the front of the manual.
- (b) That the documents that detail these procedures be referenced as appendices.
- (c) That the remainder of the manual focus equally on prevention and intervention techniques and that a separate section of the binder relate to the creation of and tasks related to safe schools committees.
- (d) That linkages between the Safe School Policy and other Board policies such as Equity Foundation Policy and Procedure, Human Rights Policy and Procedures and Guidelines and Procedures for the Accommodation of Religious Requirements, Practices and Observances be more clearly defined and fully integrated.

Timeline Sept. 2004: Responsibility: Safe Schools Department

Recommendation 9:1

The Task Force notes an upsurge in research in the area of Safe School policies. The Task Force also notes that the information held by the Board about this research is minimal. The Task Force also notes that work is just beginning on the compilation of best practices in Toronto and in other jurisdictions.

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
Decision re Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools Report

Timeline: School year 2004/2005: Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program

Therefore the Task Force recommends

- (a) That the Board's research department report back to the working group with a project plan designed to compile research on an ongoing basis including but not limited to: an ongoing review of new research pertaining to safe schools policy implementation; a comprehensive listing of preventative and anti-bullying programs being offered within the Board and an evaluation of those programs including best practices; a comprehensive listing of preventative and anti-bullying programs being offered by community groups and agencies and an evaluation of those programs including best practices; a comprehensive listing of preventative and anti-bullying best practices in other jurisdictions including other provinces and territories, the United States, Britain and Australia.
- (b) That the Board work with other research institutes, like the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and York University, to undertake research to study the impact of current safe school policies on people with disabilities and people from racial minorities

Recommendation 11:2 (a):

The Task Force found that the perception of discrimination against students from racialized and marginalized communities and students with disabilities must be addressed. Therefore the Task Force recommends:

- (b) That the Safe Schools policy be reviewed to ensure that it is consistent with the Human Rights and Equity Foundation statements and policies of the Toronto District Schools Board and ensure that all disciplinary actions are consistent with these policies

Recommendation 11:3 (f) and (h)

The Task Force has concluded that preventative measures and support for at-risk children and youth must be given priority to ensure that students remain in the school. This means having adults in place who understand youth culture in general as well as the cultures of individual youths themselves. Principals and teachers work in the best interests of the student and want to do what is best for all students however; they have not been given the supports needed to fulfill these obligations. Support for students has been identified by staff, parents and students as crucial in assisting students with problems and helping students in their development. These supports are seen as pivotal in preventing crises, which currently often lead, to suspension or expulsion. The task force therefore recommends:

- (f) That it be made mandatory that each school implement an 'anti-bullying' program as part of the School Improvement Plan.

Timeline Sept., 2004: Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program and Safe Schools Dept

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
 Decision re Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools Report

- (h) That safe school audits be enforced.

Timeline Sept., 2004: Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program and Safe Schools Dept

Recommendation 11:5

Given that all students need to have educational experiences and the opportunity to learn or do homework in a safe place, the task force recommends:

- (a) That appropriate mandatory programs be created with sufficient capacity to service both suspended and expelled students.
- (b) That the Board of Trustees immediately arrange to negotiate the funding of these programs by the Government of Ontario.

Timeline Sept., 2004: Responsibility: Office of Associate Director - Program and Safe Schools Dept

Recommendation 11:6 (b)

The calls for due process by parents and advocates necessitates the Work Group to further investigate ways to make the expulsion process more transparent and inclusionary. The Task Force recommends the following:

- (a) That a protocol be established and advertised that delineates the support for students which must have been enlisted prior to suspension being applied. In extreme circumstances the protocol may be waived but is subject to mandatory review by the Board of Trustees.

Recommendation 11:8 (a) to (e) and (h)

The Task Force found that many families and community members did not fully understand the Safe Schools policy. Therefore the Task Force recommends:

- (a) That a Rights and Responsibilities document for staff, families, communities and students that is consistent with human rights policy and equity foundation statements be made available by Board administration;

Timelines: Sept. 2004 Responsibility: Legal Department and Safe School Department

- (b) That all documents referencing Safe Schools policy be written in plain language and be translated into the appropriate languages;

Timelines: Sept. 2004: Responsibility: Legal Department and Safe Schools Department

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
Decision re Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools Report

- (c) That a pamphlet be written, translated and distributed to schools and all families and students which addresses the rights and responsibilities of students and their families in regard to suspensions and expulsions and other legal disciplinary actions within the Board;

Timeline Sept., 2004: Responsibility: Legal Services and Safe Schools Department

- (d) That the process for the removal of such disciplinary actions as letters of trespass, cease and desist, and other correspondence be part of the original letter and conditions;

Timeline Sept., 2004: Responsibility: Legal Department and Safe Schools Department

- (e) That schools be directed to hold community information sessions to encourage every member of the community to be informed about the Safe School Policy and Procedures;

Timeline Sept to Dec 2004:

Responsibility: School Administrators

- (h) That the Safe Schools department translates all relevant documents in – list languages – and distributes those to schools before Sept. 2004.

Timeline Sept., 2004: Responsibility: Safe Schools Dept

For the Board's decision (see page 420).

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
Building Bridges for Youth At Risk Pilot Project (05-04-0522)

Building Bridges for Youth At Risk Pilot Project (05-04-0522)

As presented to the Program and School Services Committee May 11, 2004 (see page 375).

In March 2004, the Board developed an innovative model for a school board to develop the capacity to coordinate and provide a comprehensive program of supports for students at risk of dropping out. The model integrates school and community-based supports for students and their communities. Discussions began between the Ministry of Education and the Board to fund a pilot project to support at risk students. Testing the model will assist the Ministry in determining whether, and to what extent, the model could be replicated elsewhere in Ontario.

Alan King identified that 25% of students are at risk of leaving school. In Toronto, the numbers are consistent with these findings.

For many at risk students, the true challenge is not contending with the academic requirements of secondary school but coping with their own social/emotional, personal and/or behavioural issues. Students dealing with life on the street, poverty, family instability, poor English skills, violence, bullying and those with behavioural and mental health problems are not likely focused on school. These students and their families may also have trouble accessing existing school and community resources and supports. School Improvement Plans, submitted to the Board from high needs schools identify a pressing need for additional specialized staff on site to support, mentor and build bridges for these students and for staff to engage the students' communities to bridge the gap between school and community based resources.

This Pilot Project will test approaches to help students increase their resilience and develop coping strategies and competencies to prevent school drop out and reach their full potential academically. This model will explore approaches that support students' social and academic needs and by doing so, will provide an alternative to the negative peer structures that persist in many at risk communities. Further, this model will assess how best to enable at risk students, their families, and their communities, to benefit from existing community-based resources.

The Pilot Project will begin September 2004 and operate for two school years, ending June 2006.

Key requirements of the Pilot Project are:

- School-Based Support;
- Community-Based Support;
- Integration of School and Community-Based Supports;
- Quality of Program;
- Accessibility of Program;
- Communication with/Engagement of Families;
- Program Evaluation.

Measurable outcomes are:

- Reduced drop out rates;
- Improved school attendance;

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
Building Bridges for Youth At Risk Pilot Project (05-04-0522)

- Higher academic achievement;
- Safer and more positive schools and school cultures;
- Increased secondary school completion rates;
- Effective coordination and use of resources – community/student/family and school board;
- Positive attitudes among students – less depression and self defeating behaviour;
- More effective interpersonal, problem solving and conflict resolution skills among students and staff;
- Successful, meaningful and timely transition to other school programs and resources.

An Implementation Advisory Committee (IAC) consisting of trustees and staff has been established to provide advice on the implementation of the Project. The IAC will provide direction for the implementation prior to start up of the Project and will receive staff updates for consideration during the life of the Project.

Consultation has begun with a group of community resource persons and will be extended throughout the life of the project.

The Building Bridges for Youth At Risk Pilot Project Implementation Plan is attached (Appendix 1).

Note: The appendix mentioned in the report will be maintained in Board Services for a limited time.

For the Board's decision see page 375.

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
 Building Bridges for Youth At Risk Pilot Project, Staff Memorandum

Building Bridges for Youth At Risk Pilot Project

(Information presented by staff at the Board meeting held on May 19, 2004, see page 337)

The purpose of this Blue Information Report is to provide information in response to a motion by Trustee Cary-Meagher at the Program and School Services Committee meeting held on 13 April 2004. At the meeting, the Program and School Services Committee decided to recommend (see Board agenda, page 33).

- (a) That the Building Bridges for Youth At Risk Pilot Project include: 17 Child and Youth Workers, 8 Community Support Workers;
- (b) That the qualifications for Child and Youth Workers include a Bachelor of Arts degree in child and youth care;
- (c) That staff report to the regular meeting of May 19, 2004, on additional funds required to support the program beyond those provided by the Provincial Government.

Trustees requested a cost estimate of the Building Bridges for Youth At Risk Pilot Project based on the \$2.2 million funding from the Ministry of Education.

The salary and benefits costs and the analysis are shown below:

Building Bridges for Youth At Risk Pilot Project: Salary and Benefit Costs¹

Child and Youth Worker (with diploma qualifications) Based on category V step 4 (\$36,954.)	\$44,344 per year
Child and Youth Worker (with degree qualifications) (per Trustee Motion) Based on category IV step 4 (\$49,763.)	\$59,715 per year
Community Support Worker Based on \$30.15 per hour/35 hrs/wk/43 weeks	\$54,451 per year

Building Bridges Pilot Project Cost Projection: Based on Ministry of Education Approved Proposal (\$2.2 million)

15 Child and Youth Workers (diploma qualified) and 8 Community Support Workers

Child and Youth Workers (15)	\$665,160.
Community Support Workers (8)	\$435,608.
Total	\$1,100,768.
Total for two employee groups for 2 years	\$2,201,536.
Government funding	\$2,200,000.
Funding Shortfall	(\$1,536.)

¹ * Benefits estimated at 20% of total salary

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 7, May 11, 2004
Building Bridges for Youth At Risk Pilot Project, Staff Memorandum

This does not include additional costs estimated to be \$ 60,000. per year (\$40,000 for admin support and \$20,000. for transportation).

Costing Projection 2: Based on Trustee Motion to Hire Additional Staff with Additional Qualifications

17 Child and Youth Workers (degree qualified) and 8 Community Support Workers

Child and Youth Workers	\$1,015,155.
Community Support Workers (8)	\$435,608.
Total	\$1,450,763.
Total for two employee groups for 2 years	\$2,901,526.
Government funding	\$2,200,000.
Funding Shortfall	(\$701,526.)

This does not include additional costs estimated to be \$ 60,000. per year (\$40,000 for admin support and \$20,000. for transportation).

Special Education Advisory Committee

Report No. 6

May 10, 2004

A meeting of the Special Education Advisory Committee convened this day, at 7:10 p.m., in the Boardroom, 5050 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario, with Michelle Worley, Co-Chair, presiding.

The following committee members were present: Scott Bridges (Co-Chair), Merle Fedirchuk, Elizabeth Fisher, Dr. Norm Forman, Charlotte James, Ann Martindale, Susan Musgrave, Debbie Philips, Pat Sparks, Michelle Worley (Co-Chair) and Trustees Chris Bolton (Vice Chair) and Bruce Davis. Alternates Tina Shier and Sharon Watt, were also present.

Regrets were received from Nancy Cooper, Sherron Grant, Kym Kristalie, Mara Meikle, Mary Weedon and Trustee Elizabeth Hill.

1. Presentations

The Kids on the Block Disability Awareness Program

Rose Weinberg, Leslie Johnson, Stacy Schubert, Judy Egelnick and Geoff Bobb, made a presentation about The Kids on the Block Disability Awareness Program. They demonstrated, with their troupe of disabled and non-disabled puppets, how they teach Grades 1 – 6 students about disabilities and accepting differences, in an entertaining way. They have been taking this program to schools throughout Toronto for the last 20 years.

The program is sponsored through community groups. Although the program is available at no charge, a donation of \$150.00 per show is suggested to ensure the program's ongoing success.

D. Rowan will issue a communication about this program to all elementary schools in August. However, whether the program is invited to the school is at the discretion of the school principal. In addition, D. Rowan will explore central funding options, to ensure equity throughout the system.

2. Approval of the Agenda

Elizabeth Fisher, seconded by Debbie Philips moved: That the agenda be approved.

The motion was carried.

3. Confirmation of the Minutes

Merle Fedirchuk, seconded by Elizabeth Fisher, moved: That the minutes of the SEAC meeting held on April 19, 2004, be confirmed.

The motion was carried.

Special Education Advisory Committee, Report No. 6, May 10, 2004

4. Business Arising from the Minutes of April 19, 2004

Special Education Advisory Committee Web site (Page 1, Item 1)

D. Rowan advised that the Ministry of Education SEAC Web site is now available at www.seaclearning.ca

Process to Address Special Incidence Portion (SIP) Claims (Page 4, Item 11)

The letter to the Ministry has been postponed until the provincial budget and the GLGs are available.

5. Correspondence Received by the Chair

Spina Bifida and Hydrocephalus Association of Ontario

Letter of April 22, 2004, confirming the Board's SEAC representative and alternate for the Association. The organization endorses Joan Booth as Committee alternate, replacing Shirley Edwards.

Merle Fedirchuk, seconded by Elizabeth Fisher, moved that: Joan Booth be appointed alternate member of SEAC, representing the Spina Bifida Association.

The motion was carried.

Ministry of Education

A letter from Sarah Bell, for the Minister of Education, dated April 19, 2004, to Michelle Worley and Scott Bridges, Co-chairs, acknowledging receipt of SEAC's correspondence dated March 9, 2004, re Special Education Tribunals. The letter also advises that Minister Gerard Kennedy will be responding to SEAC's letter in the near future.

Campaign for Public Education

April 26, 2004, e-mail from Stephen Eaborn, Summit Coordinator, on behalf of Campaign for Public Education, inviting SEAC to participate in the summit on June 6, 2004.

Toronto Family Network

Letter dated May 4, 2004, from Janis Jaffe-White, Coordinator and Reva Schafer, Resource Parent, from Toronto Family Network, with copy of presentation given at the CAPSLE conference held recently in Ottawa.

Community Living Toronto

The Committee accepted verbal communication that Sherron Grant will be replacing Sharon Watt as Committee Alternate representing Community Living Toronto. A letter from Community Living Toronto will follow shortly confirming this appointment.

Special Education Advisory Committee, Report No. 6, May 10, 2004

Pat Sparks, seconded by Elizabeth Fisher, moved: That Sherron Grant be appointed to SEAC as an alternate member representing Community Living Toronto.

The motion was carried.

6. Executive Superintendent's Report

Budget

The provincial budget will not be announced until May 18, after which an in-service will be held with SEAC members. D. Rowan will invite D. Higgins, Executive Superintendent of Business Services, to facilitate. Trustee Davis, seconded by Debbie Philips, moved: That the budget update be the focus of the next regularly scheduled SEAC meeting, on June 7, 2004, at 6:00 p.m. (Dinner will be provided.)

The motion was carried.

Trustee Bolton also recommended that Local SEAC Association reports be presented in writing (rather than verbally) to ensure that the budget issue is adequately addressed.

Retirements

D. Rowan advised that Brian Ellerker, Central Coordinating Principal, and Sharon Schad, Supervising Principal, will be retiring at the end of June. Applications to fill these two vital positions are being received.

Provincial Autism Workshop

The Provincial government allotted the Board 12 positions to attend the Provincial Autism Workshop. In addition, D. Rowan advised that the Special Education Department is endorsing 97 participants to attend the workshop.

E-Learning Opportunity through Queen's University

Queen's University is offering a program to help students with learning disabilities prepare for university via a 4-week, on-line course called "On-Line to Success". The course is designed to:

- Help students understand the way they learn best.
- Offer learning strategies and adaptive technology suited to their individual needs.
- Suggest ways for students to advocate for themselves.

Tuition is \$200, which includes all materials. Students who successfully complete the course will receive a \$150 refund from the university.

Trailblazing Parenting – A Workshop for Parents

This full-day workshop by Stephen Dubrofsky will be held on Saturday, June 5, 2004. At North Toronto Community Centre, 200 Eglinton Avenue (Yonge and Eglinton), Toronto. The cost is

Special Education Advisory Committee, Report No. 6, May 10, 2004

\$135 per person, or \$250 per couple. Details and registration information may be obtained from Abigail Cuckier at (905) 578-6802.

An Evening with Barbara Coloroso

“Just Because It’s Not Wrong Doesn’t Make It Right...From Toddlers to Teens – Teaching Kids to Think and Act Ethically”. This two-hour event, packed with solid practical advice for parents and educators, will be held on Thursday, May 13, 2004, at 7:00 p.m., at Central Technical School, 725 Bathurst Street, Toronto. Tickets are available at the door and cost \$35 per person.

TDSB Disability/Accessibility Information Survey

In accordance with The Ontarians with Disabilities Act, the TDSB Accessibility Working Group has undertaken to survey staff, and students where appropriate, through the Board Intranet with regard to accessibility issues. The closing date for returns is Friday, May 14. The Committee will then reconvene and review the results and devise the next Accessibility Plan for the Board.

The Research and Information Department of the Board have been invaluable in formatting and in gathering this information. As well, Kudos to Adrienne Johnson, Board’s SEAC Liaison, and Facility Services for their contribution. Job well done!

Copies of the survey have been made available to SEAC members for information and completion, if they wish. Completed surveys to be returned to Adrienne Johnson, at 5050 Yonge Street.

Special Education Plan Amendments

D. Rowan advised that, as this is a non-review year, the Board will be submitting only changes made over the course of the year. These may include an elaboration of the sections dealing with Community Based Resource Model Evaluation update, and some minor typos that should be addressed.

May is Speech, Language and Hearing Month

A reminder notice has been sent to the system.

7. Reports/Updates from Representatives on TDSB and Other Committees

Safe and Compassionate Schools Task Force

Trustee Bolton and Dr. Forman presented a report from the Task Force on Safe and Compassionate Schools Task Force. The purpose of the task force was to:

- Assess the effectiveness of the current Board’s Safe Schools Policy and its implementation.
- Assess whether race, gender, sexual orientation, mother tongue of students, disability, socio-economic status, or other dimensions of diversity has any impact on the application of the Safe Schools Policy and, if so, what the impact is.
- Make recommendations to the Board based on the findings.

Special Education Advisory Committee, Report No. 6, May 10, 2004

This report will be presented to the Program and School Services Committee at its meeting on May 11, 2004, and to the Board on May 19, 2004.

Parent, Community Involvement Policy Review Committee

Ann Martindale presented a report covering the meetings of the Working Group held on March 31 and April 19, 2004. The establishment of the Working Group was approved by the Board at its meeting of January 28, 2004. Its mandate is to review the current policy on Parent, Community and Student Involvement and make appropriate recommendations to the Board. The target completion date is June 2004.

Optional Attendance Task Force

Merle Fedirchuk advised that the Task Force met on May 5. Draft recommendations from the Child Care Subcommittee have been received and reviewed. A glossary of terminology used (i.e. home school, closed school, limited, lottery, etc.) is being compiled for clarification of certain terms. The next meeting of the Task Force is scheduled for May 25, 2004, at 5050 Yonge Street.

8. Subcommittee on Implementation of Special Education Community Based Resource Model (CBRM)

An outside firm conducted a survey, of which approx. 400 have been returned. Approximately 40 principals attended a week-long focus group, as per Sharon Watt. The group is also working with the Ontario Principals' Council to continue this project into next year. Communication plan is a major item for the next meeting.

9. Local SEAC Association Reports

Association for Bright Children

Michelle Worley advised that, recently, Minister Gerard Kennedy was a guest on the CBC television program, Ontario Today <http://ottawa.cbc.ca/ontariotoday/>. Minister Kennedy took questions directly from the public and affirmed that programs for gifted students will continue to be funded.

Community Living Toronto

Pat Sparks acknowledged Anna Germain's efforts with her son's education and her fight re Grade 10 standardized testing.

Ontario Brain Injury Association

Merle Fedirchuk reminded that June is Brain Injury Awareness month.

Special Education Advisory Committee, Report No. 6, May 10, 2004

10. Trustees' Report

Trustee Chris Bolton

Ontario Public School Boards' Association (OPSBA) met on May 7 and 8. The first item on their agenda, addressed by the Director of the Halton Board of Education, was regarding special education.

Trustee Bruce Davis

The Ministry of Education is conducting a pilot project for research purposes and will fund an Early Intervention Program for 10,000 grades 1-5 students not meeting expectations in literacy. Schools will receive tutoring before and after school, as well as summer school (127 summer schools, 22 summer camps). The feedback received is that special needs children requirements are not being met.

The Special Education Advisory Committee in Trustee Davis' Ward (3) held a joint meeting with Ward 2 parents. The focus was how to find the right school for your child. Feedback from parents was very positive. Suggests that SEAC consider holding this type of discussion next spring.

11. Gifted Program Area Review Team

At its meeting held on April 21, 2004, the Board referred Trustee Harrison's motion to SEAC for advice back to the Program and School Services Committee, as follows:

Whereas, there is only one elementary Gifted program location in the former Scarborough area; and

Whereas, to attend this program some students must be transported a considerable distance;

Therefore, be it resolved that a Program Area Review Team be established to harmonize the Gifted program delivery across the city and improve the transportation issues related to the Gifted programs.

Trustee Bolton, seconded by Michelle Worley, moved: That consideration of this issue be deferred to September 2004.

The motion was carried.

12. Adjournment

At 10:00 p.m., Trustee Davis, seconded by Elizabeth Fisher, moved: That the meeting be adjourned.

The motion was carried.

Michelle Worley
Co-Chair of the Committee

Scott Bridges
Co-Chair of the Committee

Adopted May 19, 2004

Intergovernmental and Community Relations Committee

Report No. 3

May 4, 2004

A meeting of the Intergovernmental and Community Relations Committee convened on Thursday, May 4, 2004, from 6:45 to 10:50 p.m. in Committee Room A, 5050 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario, with Josh Matlow presiding.

Committee members present: Trustees Josh Matlow (Chair), Chris Bolton, Michael Coteau, Scott Harrison, Sheine Mankovsky and Maria Rodrigues. Also present were Trustee Howard Goodman and Student Trustees Alison Wong and William Wong.

The Committee decided to report and recommend as follows:

PART A: COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Parent, Community and Student Involvement Policy Review: Update (as amended by the Board, see page 339)

Staff provided an oral update on the progress of the committee and subcommittees that have been established to accomplish the review of the Parent, Community and Student Involvement Policy as directed by the Board. Staff also provided information about the activities of the committee, including the consultation process and timelines for completion of the task as requested by the Board.

- (a) On a motion of Trustee Goodman, the Intergovernmental and Community Relations Committee recommended that the School Council Working Group (subgroup of the Parent, Community and Student Involvement Policy Review committee) be requested to work with trustees and staff to circulate to school councils a survey on their activities and effectiveness by the end of May, to be returned by the end of June; and that the subgroup continue to work through the summer analyzing the data from this survey and present a report of their findings and recommendations to the Intergovernmental and Community Relations Committee in October 2004.
- (b) And, on a motion of Trustee Bolton, the Intergovernmental and Community Relations Committee recommended that the existing structures for parent, community and student involvement remain in place for the 2004-05 school year and that any change take place in September 2005.

The Board adopted Part (b) and referred Part (a) back to the Intergovernmental and Community Relations Committee (see page 339).

At the Committee meeting, staff undertook to provide information about the feasibility of translating the materials into different languages.

Intergovernmental and Community Relations Committee, Report No. 3, May 4, 2004

Staff also undertook to provide an update on the feasibility of providing e-mail accounts for all members of school councils and student councils.

PART B: INFORMATION ONLY

2. Delegations

The Committee heard the following delegations in accordance with the Board's procedure for hearing delegations:

re Memorials Following Death of Student

- James Hymas

Winter Break

- Sharon Doucette
Darlene Scott
re Parent Involvement

- Margo Cowie, Parent
- Mary Lee Halverson, Parent

The following written submissions in lieu of oral delegation were received:

re Winter Break

- Members of the Evangel Temple
- Vivek Rao, Rexdale Cross Culture Committee

3. Written Notices of Motion

The following written notice of motion was presented for consideration at a future meeting of the Committee.

E-mail Accounts for School Council and Student Council Members (Trustee Bolton)

- (i) That e-mail accounts be established for school councils and student councils;
- (ii) That every member of school councils and student councils be provided with a Board e-mail account if they do not have or are unwilling to use their personal e-mail address;

That information on the cost of the above be provided to trustees.

Intergovernmental and Community Relations Committee, Report No. 3, May 4, 2004

PART C: ONGOING MATTERS

4. Mandate of the Committee

On a motion of Trustee Bolton, the Intergovernmental and Community Relations Committee decided to postpone consideration of this matter to a future meeting.

5. Report of the Foundation Committee of the Student SuperCouncil

The Committee considered the recommendations of the Foundation Committee as presented by the Student SuperCouncil. Student Trustee William Wong informed the Committee that the report presented was in fact the Foundation Committee's recommendations which had been altered substantially by the SuperCouncil.

On a motion of Trustee Harrison, the Intergovernmental and Community Relations Committee referred the matter to staff for a briefing at the next meeting of the Intergovernmental and Community Relations Committee.

6. Individual School Calendars

The Committee considered a motion of Trustee Harrison re individual school calendars.

On a motion of Trustee Bolton, the Intergovernmental and Community Relations Committee referred the following to the Community Equity Reference Group for advice back to the Intergovernmental and Community Relations Committee:

- (i) That schools be instructed to publish their individual school calendars including statutory holidays in accordance with Regulation 304, School Year Calendar, section 2 (4);
- (ii) That schools publish religious holy days and other days of significance in consultation with school councils and according to the needs of the school community.

Note: The Chair of the Intergovernmental and Community Relations Committee also referred the matter of renaming the Christmas Break (Winter Break) to the CERG.

7. Deferred Agenda Items

- Mandate of the Committee

Josh Matlow
Chair of the Committee

Adopted, as amended, May 19, 2004

Joint Special Accountability and Finance Committee and Human Resources and Staff Development Committee, Report No. 1, May 12, 2004

Joint Special Accountability and Finance Committee and Human Resources and Staff Development Committee

Committee Report No. 1

May 12, 2004

A joint special meeting of the Accountability and Finance Committee and the Human Resources and Staff Development Committee convened on Wednesday, May 12, 2004, from 4:45 to 6:55 p.m. in Committee Room A, 5050 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario, with Elizabeth Hill presiding.

Accountability and Finance Committee members present: Trustees Howard Goodman (Chair) and John Campbell.

Human Resources and Staff Development Committee members present: Trustees Elizabeth Hill (Chair), Howard Goodman and Sheila Cary-Meagher.

The Committee decided to report and recommend as follows:

PART A: COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

No matters to report.

PART B: INFORMATION ONLY

No matters to report.

PART C: ONGOING MATTERS

1. SAP HR/Payroll (04-04-0518)

The Accountability and Finance Committee and the Human Resources and Staff Development Committee decided to postpone consideration of the matter to a June meeting in order to provide more time for trustees to review the proposal and recommendations.

Staff undertook to present a revised report providing additional information as requested by the Committee.

Elizabeth Hill and
Howard Goodman
Chairs of the Committees

Received May 19, 2004