

## Regular Meeting

March 9, 2011

A regular meeting was convened at 4:10 p.m. on Wednesday, March 9, 2011, in the Boardroom, 5050 Yonge Street, Toronto, with Chris Bolton, Chair of the Board, presiding.

The following members were present: Trustees Irene Atkinson, Chris Bolton, Sheila Cary-Meagher, Jerry Chadwick, Shaun Chen, Michael Coteau, Cathy Dandy, Gerri Gershon, Chris Glover, Howard Goodman, Pamela Gough, John Hastings, Howard Kaplan, Shelley Laskin, Elizabeth Moyer, Stephnie Payne, Maria Rodrigues, Mari Rutka, David Smith, Chris Tonks, Sheila Ward, Soo Wong and Student Trustees Zane Schwartz and Jenny Williams.

### 1. Resolution Into Committee of the Whole (Private Session)

At 4:12 p.m., on motion of Trustee Chadwick, seconded by Trustee Moyer, the regular meeting resolved into Committee of the Whole (Private Session) to consider matters on the private agenda of the Committee of the Whole.

### 2. Reconvene

At 5:55 p.m., the regular meeting reconvened.

### 3. Committee of the Whole (Private), Report No. 31, March 9, 2011 (see page 9)

Trustee Kaplan, seconded by Trustee Glover moved: **That Item 1 of Report No. 31 of the Committee of the Whole (Private) be adopted.**

The motion was carried.

### 4. Recess and Reconvene

At 5:57 p.m., on motion of Trustee Kaplan, seconded by Trustee Chadwick, the meeting recessed for dinner and reconvened at 7:05 p.m.

### 5. Board and School News

- (a) The Chair acknowledged the following principals who received the 2011 Canada's Outstanding Principals award from The Learning Partnership. The principals were at the meeting and were presented with certificates in recognition of their achievement.
  - Paul Ambrose, Sir Wilfrid Laurier Collegiate Institute
  - Domenic Giorgi, Cummer Valley Middle School
  - Ricky Goldenberg, Marc Garneau Collegiate Institute
- (b) The Director reported that the Toronto Foundation for Student Success was recognized by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and awarded its Vision Award for Immigrants.

---

Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011

- (c) The Director also reported that he received correspondence dated March 8, 2011 from the Ministry of Education commending the Board on its responsible approach to reducing its capital deficit.
- (d) Trustee Wong reported that Dr. Norman Bethune Collegiate Institute received the Dr. Bette M. Stephenson Recognition of Achievement award from the Education Quality and Accountability Office, noting it's the school's demonstrated leadership, proactive initiatives and sincere efforts to help every student succeed. Trustee Wong presented a certificate to the principal of Dr. Norman Bethune Collegiate Institute, Sandy Kaskens.
- (e) Trustee Bolton reported that the Chair, Vice-chair and the Director of Education met with the Mayor of Toronto, the Premier of Ontario and the chairs of the coterminus school boards, the first round of several meetings to move forward on issues of mutual concern, planning, coordination and integration of services.
- (f) Trustee Bolton reported also that deliberations re strategic directions have been completed and will be presented to Board following consultation with communities and other stakeholders.
- (g) Trustee Bolton reported also that a correspondence book has been started and will be available for perusal in the Trustees' Office.

## 6. Approval of the Agenda

Trustee Coteau, seconded by Trustee Kaplan, moved: **That the agenda be approved.**

Trustee Wong, seconded by Trustee Chadwick, moved in amendment: **That the matter of Onestop Media Digital Program, Phase Two, as presented in Report No. 17 of the Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee, be considered before Report No. 19 (Part 1) of the Special Education Advisory Committee.**

The amendment was carried.

Trustee Rodrigues, seconded by Trustee Payne, moved in amendment: **That the matter of the Establishment of a Task Force on Success of Students of Portuguese Heritage, be considered after Report No 19 (Part 1) of the Special Education Advisory Committee.**

The amendment was carried

The motion to approve the agenda, as amended, was carried.

## 7. Declarations of Possible Conflict of Interest

Trustee Payne declared a possible conflict of interest with regard to the matter of Staff Allocation 2011-12 as presented in Report No.20 of the Planning and Priorities Committee as her daughter is a member of CUPE, Local 4400. Trustee Payne did not participate in the discussion or vote on the matter.

## **8. Memorials**

Trustee Dandy expressed sympathy on behalf of the Board to the family of Andrew Malcolm, a teacher at Danforth Collegiate Institute who had recently died.

The Chair expressed sympathy on behalf of the Board to the families of James Jones, Ann Stevenson, Lindsay Empringham, Dawn Brathwaite, Donna Cadeau, Joanne Christie, Josefina Defend, Erlinda Eballa and Tyler McCullough, Board employees who recently died.

A moment's silence was observed in memory of those who had passed away.

## **9. Matters Decided Without Discussion**

Trustee Goodman, seconded by Trustee Rodrigues, moved: **That the following matters presented as matters to be decided without discussion be approved or received, as appropriate:**

- (a) **Confirmation of Minutes of Meeting Held on February 9, 2011**
- (b) **Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011 (see page 10)**
  - 1 Contract Awards, Facility Services [1712]**
  - 2 Paid Parking Initiative [1711]**
  - 3 Attendance Boundary Changes for Cameron Public School, Churchill Public School and Yorkview Public School [1709]**
  - 4 Construction of a New Elementary School to Serve the Meadowvale-Sheppard Community**
- (c) **Children and Youth Mental Health Committee, Report No. 2, February 22, 2011 (see page 37)**
  - 2 Professional Support Services Waiting Lists**
- (d) **Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 15, February 23, 2011 (see page 39)**
  - 1 School Year Calendars 2011-12 [1722]**
- (e) **Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee, Report No. 17, March 2, 2011 (see page 59)**
  - 1 Contract Awards [1715]**
  - 2 Annual Long Term Financing for Capital Projects Bylaw No. 15 [1724]**
- (f) **Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 19 (Part 2), January 26, 2011 (see page 73)**
  - 2 Reopening of Bluehaven Public School**

---

Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011

(g) **Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee, Report No. 16 (Part 2), January 26, 2011 (see page 75)**

**1 Contract Awards [1703]**

The motion was carried.

**10. Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee, Report No. 17, March 2, 2011 (see page 59)**

re Item 3, Onestop Media Digital Program, Phase Two [1702]<sup>1</sup> (see page 60)

Trustee Smith, seconded by Trustee Gershon, moved: **That Item 3, Onestop Media Digital Program, Phase Two, as presented in Report No. 17 of the Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee be adopted.**

Trustee Hastings, seconded by Trustee Bolton, moved: **That the matter be referred back to staff.**

The motion to refer was defeated on a recorded vote (see Recorded Vote 2, page 8). Student Trustees Schwartz and Williams voted against.

Trustee Rutka, seconded by Trustee Tonks, moved in amendment: **That any school considering the Onestop Media Digital program be required to offer media literacy courses for Grades 10-12.**

The amendment was defeated.

Trustee Ward, seconded by Trustee Tonks, moved: **That consideration of the matter be postponed pending further community consultation.**

The motion to postpone consideration was defeated.

The main motion to adopt Item 3 was defeated on a recorded vote (see Recorded Vote 3, page 8). Student Trustees Schwartz and Williams voted against.

Trustee Bolton, seconded by Trustee Moyer, moved **That in light of concerns raised by a number of trustees, the Onestop Digital Screen program currently underway in Wards 10, 13, 7, 11, 1, 19 and 18 continue in those wards, if the schools wish to proceed.**

Trustee Gershon, seconded by Trustee Moyer, moved in amendment: **That the following be added: "That if there are other wards that wish to participate they be allowed to apply to do so."**

Trustee Dandy, seconded by Trustee Hastings, moved in amendment to the amendment: **That the following be added: "That the continuation of the existing project contain no advertising."**

---

<sup>1</sup> The report will be maintained in Board Services for a limited time.

During discussion of the above, Trustee Goodman, seconded by Trustee Laskin, moved: **That the meeting recess for ten minutes.**

The motion to recess was carried.

When the Board reconvened, the Director advised that based on the discussion, staff would not move forward with the expansion of the digital signage pilot project. Therefore, the Board gave no further consideration to the matter and the motions shown above.

During consideration of the matter, Trustee Hastings, seconded by Trustee Goodman, moved: **That the regular meeting resolve into Committee of the Whole (Private Session) to continue consideration of matters on the private agenda of the Committee of the Whole.**

The motion to resolve into private was defeated.

## **11. Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 20, February 28, 2011 (see page 85)**

Trustee Goodman, seconded by Trustee Rodrigues, moved: **That Report No. 20 of the Planning and Priorities Committee be adopted.**

re Item 1, Pupil Accommodation Review Process Revisions [1726] (see page 85)

Trustee Atkinson, seconded by Trustee Chadwick, moved in amendment: **That the recommendation of the Planning and Priorities Committee be replaced with “That the staff report presenting information on the pupil accommodation process revisions be received in light of additional information provided in the briefing note, Additional Changes to Pupil Accommodation Review Process.”**

The motion was carried.

re Item 2, Staff Allocation 2011-12 [1719] (see page 85)

Trustee Atkinson, seconded by Trustee Rodrigues, moved in amendment: **That where possible, and not in violation of collective agreements, 15% of staff allocation be held back until such time as the Board’s level of funding is determined through Grants for Students Needs.**

With the permission of the meeting the trustees withdrew the motion.

Trustee Chen, seconded by Trustee Wong, moved in amendment: **That the number of FTE positions of Elementary Teacher as set out in the report be changed from 10,386.5 to 10,399, in order to permit an English as a Second Language allocation from 341 to 353.5.**

The amendment was carried on a recorded vote (See Recorded Vote 4, page 8).

The main motion, as amended, was carried.

The motion to adopt Report No. 20 of the Planning and Priorities Committee, as amended, was carried.

---

Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011

## **12. Remaining Agenda Items**

Trustee Laskin, seconded by Trustee Moyer, moved: **That the following matters be approved or received, as appropriate:**

- (a) **Special Education Advisory Committee, Report No. 19 (Part 1), February 14, 2011 (For receipt) (see page 111)**
- (b) **Human Resources and Professional Learning Committee, Report No. 14, February 16, 2011 (For receipt) (see page 114)**
- (c) **Children and Youth Mental Health Committee, Report No. 2, February 22, 2011 (see page 37)**
  - 1 **Ontario Public School Boards' Association and Children and Youth Mental Health**
- (d) **Ad Hoc Information Technology Committee, Report No. 1, January 6, 2011 (For receipt) (see page 121)**
- (e) **Special Education Advisory Committee, Report No. 18, January 17, 2011 (For receipt) (see page 122)**
- (f) **Stewardship of Fine Art Workgroup, Report No. 1, January 5, 2011 (For receipt) (see page 125)**
- (g) **Establishment of a Task Force on Success of Students of Portuguese Heritage**

Whereas, students of Portuguese heritage continue to have the highest drop out rate in the Board; and

Whereas, the necessary resources, programs and staff have not been assigned to specifically address the needs of this community of students to engage them successfully in the school system; and

Whereas, students of Portuguese heritage require significant and focused guidance and support from the Board to succeed;

Therefore, be it resolved that by April 2011 a Task Force on Success of Students of Portuguese Heritage be established as follows:

(i) Mandate

- To examine and recommend proactive solutions to increase the high school graduation rate of students of Portuguese heritage;
- To present a report before the end of October 2011;

(ii) Membership

- Leaders and role models in the community from all different sectors including education, business and community organizations.

### **13. Extension of the Meeting**

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

### **14. Resolution into Committee of the Whole**

At 11:27 p.m., Trustee Hastings, seconded by Trustee Laskin, moved: **That the regular meeting resolve into Committee of the Whole (Private Session) to continue consideration of matters on the private agenda of the Committee of the Whole.**

The motion was carried.

### **15. Reconvene**

At 12:30 a.m., Thursday, March 10, 2011, the regular meeting reconvened.

### **16. Committee of the Whole (Private), Report No. 31 March 9, 2011 (see page 9)**

Trustee Kaplan, seconded by Trustee Chen moved: **That Item 2 in Report No. 31 of the Committee of the Whole (Private), be adopted.**

The motion was carried.

### **17. Postponed Agenda Items**

Consideration of the following agenda items was postponed to the next regular meeting:

- Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee, Report No. 17, March 2, 2011  
(3) Full-Day Kindergarten, Update #10

### **18. Adjournment**

At 12:30 a.m., Thursday, March 10, 2011, on motion of Trustee Kaplan, seconded by Trustee Chen, the meeting adjourned.

Chris Bolton  
Chair

## Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011

Summary of Recorded Votes

Trustee	Recorded Vote 2 (see p. 4)	Recorded Vote 3 (see p. 4)	Recorded Vote 4 (see p. 5)
Atkinson	N	Y	Y
Bolton	Y	Y	*
Cary-Meagher	N	N	Y
Chadwick	N	N	N
Chen	N	N	Y
Coteau	N	N	Y
Dandy	N	N	Y
Gershon	N	Y	A
Glover	N	N	Y
Goodman	N	N	N
Gough	N	N	N
Hastings	Y	N	A
Kaplan	N	N	Y
Laskin	N	Y	N
Moyer	A	Y	N
Payne	N	A	A
Rodrigues	N	Y	Y
Rutka	N	N	N
Smith	N	N	Y
Tonks	Y	N	Y
Ward	Y	Y	N
Wong	N	N	Y
Total Y	4	7	11
Total N	17	14	7
Total A and C	1	1	3

**Y** Vote in favour      **N** Vote against      **A** Absent      **\*** No vote cast (the Chair). The Board's Bylaws, Section 154 states: "The chair may vote once on each motion considered by the Board."

**N\*** No vote cast. The Board's Bylaws, Section 15.3 states: A member of the Board, except the chair, who is present and who fails to vote on a motion shall be deemed to have voted against the motion.

**C** Absent due to declaration of a possible conflict of interest



## **Committee of the Whole (Private)**

### **Report No. 31, March 9, 2011**

A regular meeting of the Committee of the Whole (Private Session) was convened at 4:12 p.m., Wednesday, March 9, 2011, in the Boardroom at 5050 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario with Cathy Dandy, Vice-Chair of the Board, presiding. Chris Bolton, Chair of the Board, presided from time to time.

The following members were present for the appeal: Trustees Irene Atkinson, Chris Bolton, Sheila Cary-Meagher, Jerry Chadwick, Shaun Chen, Michael Coteau, Cathy Dandy, Gerri Gershon, Chris Glover, Howard Goodman, Pamela Gough, John Hastings, Howard Kaplan, Shelley Laskin, Elizabeth Moyer, Maria Rodrigues, Mari Rutka, David Smith, Chris Tonks and Soo Wong. Regrets were received from Trustees Stephnie Payne and Sheila Ward. Student Trustees Zane Schwartz and Jenny Williams did not participate in part of the meeting as required by the *Education Act*, sections 55 (5).

#### **1. Private Pupil Matter**

The Board considered a staff report (as shown in the private minutes of the Committee of the Whole) concerning a private pupil matter.

The Committee of the Whole (Private) **RECOMMENDS** that a private pupil matter as contained in the private minutes of the Committee of the Whole (Private) be approved.

#### **2. Staff Changes**

The Committee considered a report from staff presenting staff changes (as shown in the private minutes of the Committee of the Whole).

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

#### **3. Rise and Report**

At 12:30 a.m., Thursday, March 10, 2011, the meeting rose and reported.

Cathy Dandy  
Chair

**Adopted March 9, 2011 (see pages 1 and 7)**

Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011

## Operations and Facilities Management Committee

### Report No. 20, February 16, 2011

A meeting of the Operations and Facilities Management Committee convened on Wednesday, February 16, 2011, from 4:02 to 6:23 p.m., in Committee Room A, 5050 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario, with Trustee Soo Wong presiding.

The following members were present: Trustees Soo Wong (Chair), Shaun Chen, Chris Glover, Pamela Gough and John Hastings. Also present were Trustees Sheila Cary-Meagher, Jerry Chadwick, Gerri Gershon, Howard Goodman and Mari Rutka.

The Committee decided to report and recommend as follows:

<u>Part A: Committee Recommendations</u>
--

#### 1. Contract Awards, Facility Services [1712]

The Committee considered a staff report (see page 13) presenting contract awards. The Committee received the contracts in Chart 1 and approved the contracts in Chart 2.

Committee's recommendation or action regarding the staff recommendation:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concur<br><input type="checkbox"/> Amend<br><input type="checkbox"/> Disregard | <input type="checkbox"/> Refer<br><input type="checkbox"/> Postpone consideration (defer)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Other |
|--|---|

On motion of Trustee Chen, the Operations and Facilities Management Committee **RECOMMENDS** that the contracts in Chart 3 be approved.

#### 2. Paid Parking Initiative [1711]

The Committee considered a staff report (see page 18) providing information on the Board's parking management strategy.

Committee's recommendation or action regarding the staff recommendation:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Concur<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amend<br><input type="checkbox"/> Disregard | <input type="checkbox"/> Refer<br><input type="checkbox"/> Postpone consideration (defer)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Other |
|--|---|

On motion of Trustee Hastings, amended by Trustee Hastings, the Operations and Facilities Management Committee **RECOMMENDS**:

- (a) That the parking management agreement with ParkSmart be terminated;

---

Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011

- (b) That staff be authorized to enter into discussions with Toronto Parking Authority to establish commercial parking on approximately 20 Board sites, locations to be determined, and that staff report back to Board with a temporary agreement for approval, and include certain specific parameters for consideration.

At the Committee meeting, on amendment of Trustee Hastings “and that staff report back to Board with a temporary agreement for approval and include specific parameters for consideration” was added to Part (b).

### **3. Attendance Boundary Changes for Cameron Public School, Churchill Public School and Yorkview Public School [1709]**

The Committee considered a staff report (see page 24) presenting information on attendance boundary changes for Cameron Public School, Churchill Public School and Yorkview Public School.

Committee’s recommendation or action regarding the staff recommendation:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concur | <input type="checkbox"/> Refer                          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Amend             | <input type="checkbox"/> Postpone consideration (defer) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Disregard         | <input type="checkbox"/> Other                          |

On motion of Trustee Gough, the Operations and Facilities Management Committee **RECOMMENDS** that attendance boundary changes for Cameron Public School, Churchill Public School and Yorkview Public School, as presented in the report, be approved.

### **4. Construction of a New Elementary School to Serve the Meadowvale-Sheppard Community**

On motion of Trustee Chen, the Operations and Facilities Management Committee **RECOMMENDS:**

- (a) That a report be presented with details with respect to timelines for the design and construction of a new elementary school to serve the Meadowvale-Sheppard community;
- (b) That a public consultation meeting be held in the Meadowvale-Sheppard community to provide information with regard to the design and construction timelines for the new school and to initiate the local design process.

Part B: Information Only
--------------------------

### **5. Quarterly Construction Update, September 1 to November 30, 2010 [1710]**

On motion of Trustee Gough, the Committee received a staff report (see page 25) presenting an update on construction projects for the period September 1 to November 30, 2010.

---

Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011

**6. Facility Services and Strategic Building and Renewal Review: Update on Implementation of the Recommendations [1713]**

On motion of Trustee Gough, the Committee received a staff report (see page 27) providing an update on the implementation of the recommendations regarding the Facility Services and Strategic Building and Renewal Review.

**7. Agincourt Collegiate Institute: Rental of a Generator versus Purchasing**

On motion of Trustee Hastings, the Committee received a staff report (see page 36) providing information with respect to the rental of a generator to respond to an emergency at Agincourt Collegiate Institute versus purchasing a generator for use in such situations.

<u>Part C: Ongoing Matters</u>
--------------------------------

No matters to report

Trustee Soo Wong  
Chair of the Committee

**Adopted March 9, 2011 (see page 3)**

---

Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011  
Contract Awards, Facility Services [1712]

### Contract Awards, Facility Services [1712]

*As presented to the Operations and Facilities Management Committee on February 16, 2011 (see page 10).*

In accordance with the Board's policy P017, Purchasing, the attached charts present contracts for receipt or approval, as appropriate.

The recommended suppliers and the term of each contract are shown in the attached charts. Chart 1 outlines contract awards provided for information; Chart 2 outlines contracts requiring Operations and Facilities Management Committee approval; and Chart 3 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.

Chart 4 is a summary of contract awards for selected Facility Service projects for the period September 2006 to date.

Funding sources are identified for each award listed.

#### The Process

Contractors bidding on Board construction/maintenance projects must be pre-qualified. Consideration is given to bonding ability, financial stability, depth of experience, references, on-site safety record, and proof of union affiliation (applies to projects less than \$1.5 million or additions less than 500 square feet). Issuing a market call to pre-qualify is periodically advertised in Daily Commercial News and two electronic bulletin boards (Merx and BiddinGo) 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.

Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011  
 Contract Awards, Facility Services [1712]

**Chart 1: Facilities Contract Awards Provided for Information (over \$50,000 and up to \$250,000)**

	User/Budget Holder School/Department	Products/Services Details	Ward	Recommended Supplier	Low Bid	Objections	No. of Bids Rec'd	Estimated Annual Amount	Projected Start/End Date of Contract	Customer Involvement	Funding Source
<b>SWIMMING POOLS</b>											
1	Strategic Building and Renewal	Pool Revitalization at Kensington Community School STM11-057T Upgrade the pool to make it operational	10	Gorbern Mechanical	Yes	No	7	\$135,535	June 6, 2011/ August 31, 2011	Strategic Building and Renewal	Capital Pool Rehabilitation Grant
2	Strategic Building and Renewal	Pool Revitalization at Winona Drive Public School STM11-057T Upgrade the pool to make it operational	11	Gimco Ltd.	Yes	No	7	\$140,260	June 6, 2011/ August 31, 2011	Strategic Building and Renewal	Capital Pool Rehabilitation Grant
<b>MINISTRY GRANT – PRIMARY CLASS SIZE CAP</b>											
	Nil Items										
<b>OTHER</b>											
3	Strategic Building and Renewal	Asbestos Abatement at Nelson Mandela Park Public School.. Abatement is necessary to prepare for the deep retrofit renovation project starting in March 2011.	14	RBG Environmental Inc.	Yes	No	5	\$224,375	December 13, 2010/ February 15, 2011	Strategic Building and Renewal	Capital
4	Strategic Building and Renewal	Gym Ceiling Restoration at Etobicoke CI. CN11-051T. The collapsed gym ceiling needs to be restored prior to occupancy. Refer to note below	2	Centrum Renovation & Repair Inc.	Yes	No	4 <sup>1</sup>	\$158,346	December, 2010/ March 18, 2011	Strategic Building and Renewal	Good Places to Learn
5	Strategic Building and Renewal	Stage Lift at Park Lawn JMS STM11-053Q Provide Barrier Free access to the existing stage	3	Greco Construction	Yes	No	7	\$133,600	January, 2011/ June 30, 2011	Strategic Building and Renewal	Revitalization Program (SFRMP-Capital

4. Emergency restoration project: Phase I: Demolition contract approved by Board, February 9, 2011 and Phase II: Restoration Contract

Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011  
 Contract Awards, Facility Services [1712]

Chart 2: Facilities Contracts Requiring Operations and Facilities Management Committee Approval (over \$250,000 and up to \$500,000)

	User/Budget Holder School/Department	Products/Services Details	Ward	Recommended Supplier	Low Bid	Objections	No. of Bids Rec'd	Estimated Annual Amount	Projected Start/End Date of Contract	Customer Involvement	Funding Source
<b>SWIMMING POOLS</b>											
1	Strategic Building and Renewal	Pool Rehabilitation at Monarch Park CI. CN11-055T Upgrade the pool to make it operational.	15	Gorbern Mechanical	Yes	No	7	\$448,850	February 17, 2011/ August 15, 2011	Strategic Building and Renewal	Capital Pool Rehabilitation Grant
2	Strategic Building and Renewal	Swimming Pool Upgrade at <b>George Harvey C.I.</b> STM11-058T Upgrade pool to make it operational	6	West Metro Contracting	Yes	No	4 <sup>2</sup>	\$376,930	February 17, 2011/ August 15, 2011	Strategic Building and Renewal	<b>Capital Pool Rehabilitation Grant</b>
3	Strategic Building and Renewal	Swimming Pool Retrofit at <b>Carleton Village Jr &amp; Sr. PS</b> CN11-061T Upgrades Pools to make them operational.	9	Centrum Renovation & Repair Inc.	Yes	No	7	\$271,430	February 17, 2011/ August 15, 2011	Strategic Building and Renewal	<b>Capital Pool Rehabilitation Grant</b>
4	Strategic Building and Renewal	Swimming Pool Retrofit at <b>Western Tech C.I.</b> RB11-060T Upgrade the pool to make it operational	7	Centrum Renovation & Repair Inc	Yes	No	6	\$256,123	February 17, 2011/ August 15, 2011	Strategic Building and Renewal	Capital Pool Rehabilitation Grant
5	Strategic Building and Renewal	Swimming Pool Upgrades at <b>Earl Grey P.S.</b> RB11-059T Upgrade the pool to make it operational	15	Lisgar Construction	Yes	No	4 <sup>2</sup>	\$372,000	February 17, 2011/ August 15, 2011	Strategic Building and Renewal	Capital Pool Rehabilitation Grant
<b>MINISTRY GRANT – PRIMARY CLASS SIZE CAP</b>											
	Nil Items										
<b>OTHER</b>											
6	Strategic Building and Renewal	<b>Northview Heights S.S.</b> upgrade dust collector system RB11-054T 30 year old system is beyond repair	5	Stellar Mechanical	Yes	No	3 <sup>3</sup>	\$255,000	February 17, 2011/ April 13, 2011	Strategic Building and Renewal	Revitalization Program (SFRMP-Capital)

2 Seven (7) contractors invited to bid; four (4) bid responses received

3 Seven (7) contractors invited to bid; three (3) bid responses received

Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011  
 Contract Awards, Facility Services [1712]

**Chart 3: Facilities Contracts Requiring Board Approval (over \$500,000 and Consulting Services over \$50,000)**

	User/Budget Holder School/Department	Products/Services Details	Ward	Recommended Supplier	Low Bid	Objections	No. of Bids Rec'd	Estimated Annual Amount	Projected Start/End Date of Contract	Customer Involvement	Funding Source
<b>SWIMMING POOLS</b>											
1	Strategic Building and Renewal	Pool Revitalization at SATEC/WA Porter C.I. RB11-062T. Upgrade the pool to make it operational. Scope includes replacing the pool ventilation system along with the structural support for the new air handling unit; new duct work; upgrading the lighting; extensive replacement of floor & wall ceramic tiles; painting the entire pool including ancillary rooms; replacing lifeguard chairs, providing new hairdryers and extensive structural repairs to the wooden beams.	18	Steelcore Construction	Yes	No	4 <sup>4</sup>	\$665,500	March, 2011/ August 15, 2011	Strategic Building and Renewal	Capital Pool Rehabilitation Grant
<b>MINISTRY GRANT – PRIMARY CLASS SIZE CAP</b>											
	Nil Items										
<b>OTHER</b>											
2	Strategic Building and Renewal	Building Separation, R.H. McGregor P.S. and TEGH 840 Coxwell Ave STM11-045T Separation of building services in order to finalize the sale of the portion of building currently leased by the Toronto East General Hospital at 840 Coxwell Ave	15	Lisgar Construction	Yes	No	6	\$1,296,000	March, 2011/ September 30, 2011	Strategic Building and Renewal	Proceeds of Disposition
3	Facility Services/ Strategic Building and Renewal	Supply of Window Coverings – Blinds, Drapery & Roller Shades MJ10-156T	N/A	Solarfective Products Art Venetian Cleanol Ser-	Yes	No	6	\$1,700,000 (in total for all suppliers)	March, 2011/ March, 2014	Facility Services/ Strategic Building and Renewal	Good Places to Learn, Renewal and Facilities Op-



Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011  
 Contract Awards, Facility Services [1712]

User/Budget Holder School/Department	Products/Services Details	Ward	Recommended Supplier	Low Bid	Objections	No. of Bids Rec'd	Estimated Annual Amount	Projected Start/End Date of Contract	Customer Involvement	Funding Source
			Services Drape Master							Operations

4 Seven (7) contractors invited to bid; four (4) bid responses received

Chart 4: Summary of Select Facilities Contracts: (September 1, 2010 to Present)

<u>Classification</u>	<u>Total Expenditures For this Report</u>	<u>Total Number of Projects for this Report</u>	<u>Total Number of Projects 2010/11 to date</u>	<u>Total 2010/11 Contract Awards Reported to Date</u>	<u>Total Number of Projects 2009/10</u>	<u>Total 2009/10 Contract Awards</u>
Boilers	\$0	0	0	\$0	2	\$669,900
Roofing	\$0	0	8	\$1,044,304	18	\$2,418,604
Building Automation Systems (BAS)	\$0	0	4	\$474,955	8	\$1,432,720
Heating Ventilation Air Conditioning (HVAC)	\$0	0	4	\$397,790	2	\$330,000
Swimming Pools – Ministry Funded 2010-2011 \$7.6M Total	\$2,666,628	8	8	\$2,666,628	28	\$8,442,356
Ministry Grant – Primary Class Size Cap	\$0	0	0	\$0	0	\$0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,666,628</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>\$4,583,677</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>\$13,293,580</b>

*For the Board's decision see page 10.*

---

Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011  
Paid Parking Initiative [1711]

### Paid Parking Initiative [1711]

*As presented to the Operations and Facilities Management Committee on February 16, 2011 (see page 10).*

#### Parking Parking Strategy

On June 27, 2007 the Board approved a Parking Management Strategy that included a pilot project with ParkSmart for the management and operation of paid parking at the following ten schools:

- Balmy Beach Community School, Ward 16
- Bedford Park Junior PS, Ward 13
- Davisville Jr. PS & The Metro School for the Deaf, Ward 11
- Howard PS, Ward 7
- John Fisher Junior PS, Ward 13
- Kew Beach Junior PS, Ward 16
- McKee PS, Ward 12
- R.H. McGregor ES, Ward 15
- Ryerson Junior & Senior PS, Ward 10
- Education Centre 140 Borough Drive, Ward 19

#### Discussions with the City of Toronto

Discussions with City staff regarding this proposal were held throughout 2007, with Board staff supplying information on each of the proposed sites. In June, 2008, City Planning advised that the City would only consider permitting paid parking only in accordance with a Temporary Use By-law.

Under existing by-laws the Board could only get approval for visitor parking lot designation. Before being permitted to operate commercial parking, the Board would have had to submit to an exhaustive planning approval process with no certainty of success. Staff concluded that visitor paid parking was the viable alternative.

#### Pilot Project—Visitor Paid Parking in School Parking Lots

In June, 2009, the Board approved implementation of visitor paid parking at the ten pilot sites. A Parking Management Agreement was signed in July with ParkSmart for the implementation of a one year pilot project intended to:

- Generate a revenue stream for the Board and participating schools;
- Improve safety and security of the parking lots for schools and local communities through enforcement measures implemented with paid parking;
- Provide school administrators with support in responding to a variety of parking issues which detract school administrators from their responsibility to students; and

---

Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011  
Paid Parking Initiative [1711]

- Maximize the availability of existing parking infrastructure on school sites to serve local neighbourhoods with limited parking.
- Pay-and-display machines and associated visitor parking signage were installed and operations began in October 2009.

The City has issued violation notices to the Board respecting various visitor parking pilot sites, stating the use of the school property for paid parking by users who do not visit the school is contrary to the City's by-law, and, at Bedford Park Jr PS, has charged the Board with illegally operating a commercial parking lot on the property.

#### Pilot Project Evaluation

The one-year pilot project term ended on July 30, 2010. At the end of the term the pilot project was evaluated against criteria set out in the Parking Management Agreement.

Revenues from the visitor paid parking fell far short of projections. Projections had been based on commercial parking which City planning policies rendered unachievable. The visitor paid parking pilot project achieved 22% (\$5,257) of total projected commercial paid parking revenues (\$23,473) and 9% (\$362) of projected permit revenue (\$4,027).

#### Alternative for Paid Parking Lots at Schools: City of Toronto's Parking Authority

The City has confirmed that Toronto Parking Authority (TPA) can implement commercial parking without a municipal approval process in the old Cities of Toronto and York. The TPA has expressed interest through past paid parking RFPs in operating approximately twenty Board sites.

Upon approval of this report, staff will enter into discussions with Toronto Parking Authority to establish commercial parking on twenty Board sites (to be determined).

Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011  
 Paid Parking Initiative [1711]

	<u>14 Pine Ave</u>	<u>81 Ranleigh Ave</u>	<u>43 Millwood Rd</u>	<u>140 Borough Dr</u>	<u>30 Marmaduke St</u>	<u>40 Erskine Ave</u>	<u>101 Kippendavie Ave</u>	<u>35 Church Ave</u>	<u>555 Mortimer Ave</u>	<u>96 Denison Ave</u>	
<u>Month</u>	<u>Balmy Beach Junior Public School</u>	<u>Bedford Park Junior Public School</u>	<u>Davisville Junior Public School</u>	<u>Education Centre</u>	<u>Howard Junior Public School</u>	<u>John Fisher Junior Public School</u>	<u>Kew Beach Junior Public School</u>	<u>McKee Public School</u>	<u>RH McGregor Elementary School</u>	<u>Ryerson Junior &amp; Senior Public School</u>	<u>Total</u>
<b>P&amp;D Visitor</b>											
Jul-09			375		145	68	1,196	9	546	174	2,512
Aug-09	26		1,783		918	639	3,849	222	3,749	1,596	12,781
Sep-09	127	706	630	3	1,189	248	1,777	127	121	549	5,476
Oct-09	102	1,126	719	339	1,032	199	660	119	338	642	5,276
Nov-09	48	703	512	476	673	97	825	35	150	644	4,162
Dec-09	34	414	851	490	583	140	619	32	149	554	3,867
Jan-10	6	395	345	757	622	170	479	30	50	438	3,290
Feb-10	16	332	164	656	414	149	457	44	39	498	2,770
Mar-10	24	415	493	453	652	151	1,029	18	84	669	3,989
Apr-10	112	695	335	391	515	263	934	12	40	801	4,098
May-10	97	710	607	633	370	259	1,702	5	116	837	5,335
Jun-10	27	522	470	390	391	160	1,334	21	184	692	4,190
Jul-10	10	1,062	1,410	676	420	167	3,672	376	1,038	1,465	10,295
Aug-10		808	1,496	838	843	174	2,404	271	663	1,709	9,206
Sep-10		609	595	260	452	111	901	32	75	699	3,734
Oct-10		1,080	560	219	607	177	713	42	84	831	4,312
Total P&D Visitor	628	9,578	11,345	6,581	9,825	3,171	22,549	1,394	7,427	12,797	85,294
Avg Monthly P&D Visitor	52	684	731	506	645	207	1,409	92	464	842	5,633

**Permit**

Jul-09			-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aug-09	441		-		-	-	-	-	-	-	441
Sep-09	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oct-09	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	226	-	-	226

Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011  
 Paid Parking Initiative [1711]

	<u>14 Pine Ave</u>	<u>81 Ranleigh Ave</u>	<u>43 Millwood Rd</u>	<u>140 Borough Dr</u>	<u>30 Marmaduke St</u>	<u>40 Erskine Ave</u>	<u>101 Kippendavie Ave</u>	<u>35 Church Ave</u>	<u>555 Mortimer Ave</u>	<u>96 Denison Ave</u>	
<u>Month</u>	<u>Balmy Beach Junior Public School</u>	<u>Bedford Park Junior Public School</u>	<u>Davisville Junior Public School</u>	<u>Education Centre</u>	<u>Howard Junior Public School</u>	<u>John Fisher Junior Public School</u>	<u>Kew Beach Junior Public School</u>	<u>McKee Public School</u>	<u>RH McGregor Elementary School</u>	<u>Ryerson Junior &amp; Senior Public School</u>	<u>Total</u>
Nov-09	-	254	-	-	-	-	-	226	-	-	480
Dec-09	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	226	-	-	226
Jan-10	-	339	-	-	-	-	-	226	-	-	565
Feb-10	-	254	-	-	-	-	-	226	-	-	480
Mar-10	-	170	-	-	-	-	-	226	-	-	396
Apr-10	-	254	-	-	-	-	-	226	-	-	480
May-10	-	339	-	-	-	-	-	226	-	-	565
Jun-10	-	339	-	-	-	-	-	226	-	-	565
Jul-10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	226	-	-	226
Aug-10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	226	-	-	226
Sep-10	-	254	-	-	-	-	-	226	-	-	480
Oct-10	-	339	-	-	-	-	-	226	-	-	565
Total Permit	441	2,543	-	-	-	-	-	2,938	-	-	5,922
Avg Monthly Permit	37	182	-	-	-	-	-	196	-	-	414

<b>P&amp;D Visitor &amp; Permit</b>											
Jul-09	-	-	375	-	145	68	1,196	9	546	174	2,512
Aug-09	467	-	1,783	-	918	639	3,849	222	3,749	1,596	13,222
Sep-09	127	706	630	3	1,189	248	1,777	127	121	549	5,476
Oct-09	102	1,126	719	339	1,032	199	660	345	338	642	5,502
Nov-09	48	958	512	476	673	97	825	261	150	644	4,643
Dec-09	34	414	851	490	583	140	619	258	149	554	4,093
Jan-10	6	734	345	757	622	170	479	256	50	438	3,855
Feb-10	16	587	164	656	414	149	457	270	39	498	3,250
Mar-10	24	585	493	453	652	151	1,029	244	84	669	4,385
Apr-10	112	950	335	391	515	263	934	238	40	801	4,578

Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011  
 Paid Parking Initiative [1711]

	<u>14 Pine Ave</u>	<u>81 Ranleigh Ave</u>	<u>43 Millwood Rd</u>	<u>140 Borough Dr</u>	<u>30 Marmaduke St</u>	<u>40 Erskine Ave</u>	<u>101 Kippendavie Ave</u>	<u>35 Church Ave</u>	<u>555 Mortimer Ave</u>	<u>96 Denison Ave</u>	
<u>Month</u>	<u>Balmy Beach Junior Public School</u>	<u>Bedford Park Junior Public School</u>	<u>Davisville Junior Public School</u>	<u>Education Centre</u>	<u>Howard Junior Public School</u>	<u>John Fisher Junior Public School</u>	<u>Kew Beach Junior Public School</u>	<u>McKee Public School</u>	<u>RH McGregor Elementary School</u>	<u>Ryerson Junior &amp; Senior Public School</u>	<u>Total</u>
May-10	97	1,049	607	633	370	259	1,702	231	116	837	5,900
Jun-10	27	861	470	390	391	160	1,334	247	184	692	4,755
Jul-10	10	1,062	1,410	676	420	167	3,672	602	1,038	1,465	10,521
Aug-10		808	1,496	838	843	174	2,404	497	663	1,709	9,432
Sep-10		864	595	260	452	111	901	258	75	699	4,214
Oct-10		1,419	560	219	607	177	713	268	84	831	4,877
Total P&D Visitor & Permit	1,069	12,121	11,345	6,581	9,825	3,171	22,549	4,332	7,427	12,797	91,215
Avg Mnly P&D Visitor & Permit	89	866	731	506	645	207	1,409	288	464	842	6,048

**Projected Annual (net of taxes)**

P&D Visitor Rev	28,521	31,824	31,303	5,885	27,042	29,261	35,782	28,151	44,454	19,454	281,677
Permit Rev	1,479	5,176	3,697	19,115	2,958	739	2,218	1,849	5,546	5,546	48,323
Total P&D Visitor & Permits	30,000	37,000	35,000	25,000	30,000	30,000	38,000	30,000	50,000	25,000	330,000

**Projected Monthly (net of taxes)**

P&D Visitor Rev	2,377	2,652	2,609	490	2,254	2,438	2,982	2,346	3,705	1,621	23,473
Permit Rev	123	431	308	1,593	247	62	185	154	462	462	4,027
Total P&D Visitor & Permits	2,500	3,083	2,917	2,083	2,500	2,500	3,167	2,500	4,167	2,083	27,500

Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011  
 Paid Parking Initiative [1711]

	<u>14 Pine Ave</u>	<u>81 Ranleigh Ave</u>	<u>43 Millwood Rd</u>	<u>140 Borough Dr</u>	<u>30 Marmaduke St</u>	<u>40 Erskine Ave</u>	<u>101 Kippendavie Ave</u>	<u>35 Church Ave</u>	<u>555 Mortimer Ave</u>	<u>96 Denison Ave</u>	
<u>Month</u>	<u>Balmy Beach Junior Public School</u>	<u>Bedford Park Junior Public School</u>	<u>Davisville Junior Public School</u>	<u>Education Centre</u>	<u>Howard Junior Public School</u>	<u>John Fisher Junior Public School</u>	<u>Kew Beach Junior Public School</u>	<u>McKee Public School</u>	<u>RH McGregor Elementary School</u>	<u>Ryerson Junior &amp; Senior Public School</u>	<u>Total</u>

**Actual Monthly (net of taxes)**

P&D Visitor Rev	46	605	647	448	571	183	1,247	82	411	745	4,985
Permit Rev	33	161	-	-	-	-	-	173	-	-	367
Total P&D Visitor & Permits	79	766	647	448	571	183	1,247	255	411	745	5,352

**Actual + Projected**

P&D Visitor Rev	1.9%	22.8%	24.8%	91.3%	25.3%	7.5%	41.8%	3.5%	11.1%	45.9%	21.2%
Permit Rev	26.4%	37.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	112.5%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%
Total P&D Visitor & Permits	3.2%	24.8%	22.2%	21.5%	22.8%	7.3%	39.4%	10.2%	9.9%	35.7%	19.5%

*For the Board's decision see page 10.*

---

Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011  
Attendance Boundary Changes for Cameron Public School, Churchill Public School and Yorkview Public School [1709]

Attendance Boundary Changes for Cameron Public School, Churchill Public School and Yorkview Public School [1709]

*As presented to the Operations and Facilities Management Committee on February 16, 2011 (see page 11).*

The purpose of this report is to obtain approval from the Board to make attendance boundary changes impacting Cameron Public School, Churchill Public School and Yorkview Public School. The three schools are located in Ward 12 (Trustee Rutka).

In November 2008, the Ministry of Education approved the allocation of Prohibitive to Repair (PTR) funding to retrofit and expand Churchill Public School. This deep retrofit project will increase school capacity from 316 pupil places to 456 pupil places.

PTR funding from the Ministry was contingent upon balancing enrolments among Churchill PS, Cameron PS and Yorkview PS.

A Local Feasibility Team was formed to consider the attendance boundaries in the area. The Local Feasibility Team's report can be found in Appendix A. A public meeting was held on January 20, 2011 and the attendees supported the proposed changes.

A change in current attendance boundaries would coincide with the completion of the Churchill PS expansion.

Board-approved attendance boundary recommendations will be implemented once the deep retrofit and addition at Churchill Public School have been completed. The anticipated timing is 2013.

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

*For the Board's decision see page 11.*



Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011  
 Quarterly Construction Update, September 1 to November 30, 2010 [1710]

Quarterly Construction Update, September 1 to November 30, 2010 [1710]

*As received by the Operations and Facilities Management Committee on February 16, 2011 (see page 11)*

Each year, Strategic Building and Renewal undertakes a number of construction projects varying in size, scope and funding. Funding sources for the various programs are identified in the chart below and include the Ministry, the City and proceeds from disposition of surplus property.

<u>Program</u>	<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>2010-2011 Capital Pro- jects Cost (\$ Millions)</u>	<u>Actual Expenditure in Q1 (\$ Millions)</u>
Good Places to Learn - 1	Ministry	\$1.4	\$0.78
Good Places to Learn - 2	Ministry	\$1.2	\$0.71
Good Places to Learn - 3	Ministry	\$5.7	\$1.81
Good Places to Learn - 4	Ministry	\$36.7	\$3.49
Leased Premises Renewal	Proceeds of Disposition	\$1.6	\$0.13
School Facilities Revitalization Master Plan I- North Toronto	Proceeds of Disposition	\$6.0	\$0.81
School Facilities Revitalization Master Plan II and III	Proceeds of Disposition	\$9.5	\$1.66
*School Facilities Revitalization Master Plan IV	Proceeds of Disposition	\$15.7	\$0.00
Primary Class Size	Ministry	\$1.9	\$0.03
Energy -Phase VI	Proceeds of Disposition	\$0.2	\$0.12
Energy Efficient Schools	Ministry	\$18.1	\$4.07
School Energy Generation Grant	Ministry	\$0.2	\$0.00
Green Schools Pilot Initiatives	Ministry	\$0.14	\$0.13
Renewable Energy Program for Schools (REFS)	Ministry	\$4.0	\$0.05
Jesse Ketchum-Playground Improvements	City	\$0.9	\$0.63
SCAS @ Midland	Proceeds of Disposition	\$0.5	\$0.22
Chester Le - Child Care (City Funded)	City	\$3.1	\$0.27
Thorncliffe-New School	Ministry	\$2.4	\$0.28
Thorncliffe - Child Care	City	\$0.5	\$0.00
Nelson Mandela-Deep Retrofit & Addition	Ministry	\$4.1	\$0.24
Nelson Mandela-Child Care (City Funded)	City	\$0.9	\$0.00

---

 Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011  
 Quarterly Construction Update, September 1 to November 30, 2010 [1710]

<u>Program</u>	<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>2010-2011 Capital Pro- jects Cost (\$ Millions)</u>	<u>Actual Expenditure in Q1 (\$ Millions)</u>
Churchill-Deep Retrofit & Addition	Ministry	\$0.3	\$0.00
Full Day Learning Kindergarten(FDK) Phase I	Ministry	\$1.2	\$0.40
Pool Rehabilitation	Ministry	\$7.6	\$1.20
*ARC	Ministry	\$11.3	\$0.05
*Other Capital funded from Proceeds of Disposition(Essex, SSF move to Bathurst, Givins Shaw Separation and Coxwell Separation)	Proceeds of Disposition	\$2.50	\$0.04
Renewal Funded from Capital	Ministry	\$0.3	\$0.29
<hr/>			
Grand Total		\$137.9	\$17.41

---

\* Pending Ministry Approval

---

Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011  
Facility Services and Strategic Building and Renewal Review: Update on Implementation of the Recommendations [1713]

Facility Services and Strategic Building and Renewal Review: Update on Implementation of the Recommendations [1713]

*As received by the Operations and Facilities Management Committee on February 16, 2011 (see page 12)*

The Director's plan for realignment of staff duties and responsibilities is underway in Facility Services and Strategic Building and Renewal.

This update is provided to you with an overview of the work and actions taken to support the Director's vision to improve services to Schools, Community and the Board.

Project Development

Key events of this project:

1. An external Facility Services Review Report was submitted May 10 2010 with recommendations for improving services.
2. Realignment of Facility Services into 2 units, Strategic Building and Renewal (SBR) and Facility Services (FS) is underway.
3. Recommendations from the review report submitted in May 2010 are being implemented.

Role of the Facility Services Review Steering Team

The roles and responsibilities of the Facility Services Implementation Plan Steering Team are as follows:

- To provide support, advice and resources to the project teams and project manager;
- To receive regular reports from the project manager and project leads to update the work of the teams;
- To assist in the resolution of issues, project and scope changes;
- To ensure Project Team recommendations achieve the goal(s) of the Improve Service Delivery and Increased Customer Satisfaction initiatives;
- To approve Project Team recommendations; and
- To make recommendations to the System-wide Improving Services Committee, who will ensure that the recommendations are consistent with and reflect the overall directions of the organization.

Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011  
 Facility Services and Strategic Building and Renewal Review: Update on Implementation of the Recommendations [1713]

### Managing Approved Project Team Recommendations

Recommendations approved by the Facility Services Review Implementation Steering Team that were received from the Project Teams have been returned to FS and SBR for implementation.

This report provides an update on the status of implementation of the recommendations from the external review of the former Facility Services Department by Facility Services Operations (FS) and Strategic Building and Renewal (SBR) staff.

### Improving Services To Schools Through Planned Results

<u>Blackstone Recommendation</u>	<u>Status Report</u>
1. FS & SBR ensures that schools are fully informed and involved during all stages of project work.  5. FS ensures that work is completed without disruption to schools  Combined into one Project Team.	FS has implemented the School Leadership Team  The team consisting of the site principal, family team leader, and head caretaker meet monthly to review work in progress and schedule planned projects.  As part of the SBR reorganization a Project Management Office (PMO) will be created, staff will ensure regular contact with schools prior to work commencing, during the work to address issues and at the end of work during close out meetings including a Post Occupancy Evaluation.  Ten working days notice will be provided in order to ensure attendance by principals, family team leaders, head caretakers or their designates at scheduled project related meetings (i.e. pre-design, preconstruction, sign-off, handover mtgs.).
8. FS & SBR do not charge schools for emergency, urgent, routine maintenance, renewal and capital construction	Charges to schools for urgent, routine repairs, maintenance, regular renewal and capital construction have been eliminated.
9. FS staff supports schools by identifying and addressing maintenance needs.	As noted above, the School Leadership Team monthly meetings have been implemented to proactively address routine maintenance issues at all school sites.
10. FS & SBR ensures that surveys and consultative sessions are effective and	In the SBR reorganization a unit has been assigned to coordinate communications and consul-

Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011  
 Facility Services and Strategic Building and Renewal Review: Update on Implementation of the Recommendations [1713]

<u>Blackstone Recommendation</u>	<u>Status Report</u>
well received.	tations.
<p>8. Customer satisfaction standards have been developed, implemented, monitored and reported.</p> <p>9. Customer service is a key element of FS &amp; SBR service delivery.</p> <p>Combined into one Project Team.</p>	<p>A draft Client Service Model has been created and will be piloted in SBR Sustainability Office. This includes sections on Performance Measurement, Information Management and Service Level Agreements.</p> <p>An Improved Service Delivery model, for all stakeholders, is key to the success of FS and SBR. Representatives of our stakeholder groups, Labour Management, TSAA Liaison committee, Family of Schools Leadership team, provide feedback on a regular basis that is used to reflect changes, as appropriate, in our service delivery to meet customer satisfaction standards.</p>
<p>8. Emergency work orders are responded to in the agreed upon time.</p>	<p>One of the highest priorities for FS and SBR is to respond to emergencies at school sites. Response times have been established and communicated to all staff and stakeholders. FS and SBR are committed to responding to emergencies within the prescribed response time including any ancillary work associated with the emergency.</p>
<p>9. Service delivery for site funded improvements satisfies school needs.</p>	<p>Site Funded Improvement work will have:</p> <p>clearly defined and communicated start and finish dates.</p> <p>unusual complexities, associated costs and/or changing conditions explained</p> <p>a periodic review conducted to ensure that customer needs have been met.</p> <p>Resources are such that only those site funded improvements that are (a) fully funded by the site and (b) are necessary to support the delivery of program are undertaken at this time. This is currently under review with Business Services.</p>

Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011  
 Facility Services and Strategic Building and Renewal Review: Update on Implementation of the Recommendations [1713]

<u>Blackstone Recommendation</u>	<u>Status Report</u>
	The ongoing delivery of site funded improvement work will be a part of the Service Level Agreement between FS and SBR.
10. Schools are satisfied with washrooms that are graffiti free, operate properly and are clean.	<p>The Washroom Cleanliness Program and check list along with standards for supplies and regular monitoring have been implemented. Through consultation with site principals, the effectiveness of this program is being monitored. In the majority of sites, a significant improvement in the maintenance and cleanliness of washrooms has been reported. Work is ongoing in this area, including piloting the use of a washroom monitoring program.</p> <p>Communiqué was sent to all caretaker staff outlining the use of Priority 1 and 2 for washroom repairs.</p>
11. SBR resources are allocated between in-house construction trades and contractors, that are cost-effective, maximize effective project delivery and ensure safe and secure school operations.	In responding to program and school needs SBR will continue to monitor project performance of in-house staff and external contractors to ensure the delivery of cost efficient and effective delivery of project work in a timely manner.
12. Maintenance work requests are effectively prioritized, scheduled and completed.	family team leaders review and prioritize all work requests in order to expedite and complete essential work to meet the needs of delivering school programs. FS is developing a customer communication tool to advise school principals of the status of maintenance projects at their schools.
13. Maintenance productivity is increased.	<p>This goal is tied to the FS reorganization.</p> <p>It is proposed to have a consultant review the maintenance practises regarding purchasing of materials and work allocation in order to provide recommendations for increasing productivity.</p>

Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011  
 Facility Services and Strategic Building and Renewal Review: Update on Implementation of the Recommendations [1713]

<u>Blackstone Recommendation</u>	<u>Status Report</u>
14. Caretaking, building, and grounds maintenance activities are balanced to meet customer needs and are cost-effective.	Family team leaders in consultation with the School Leadership Team review building condition and maintenance requirements on a monthly basis. This provides an opportunity to make adjustments in service delivery to address deficiencies in all areas of facility and grounds maintenance.
15. Preventive maintenance is effectively and efficiently implemented.	Preventive Maintenance is tracked and monitored by the FS Computerized Maintenance Management System. Work is assigned to ensure compliance with existing standards.
16. Key FS information is readily available.	A FS/SBR Web review team was established to redesign the FS and SBR website to support the recent restructuring. The new website will continue to provide access to key stakeholders, such as Trustee's, principals, superintendents, caretakers, trades and other FS/SBR staff.
17. Major renewal projects are integrated into the long-term capital plan.	A significant Capital Building program is under review and development with Trustee's to deep retrofit TDSB schools in 15 years.  A Sustainable Built Environment Strategy is being developed and coordinated with Strategy and Planning.
18. FS Performance measures and targets are established and monitored.  19. A performance measurement system is in place at the Corporate, FS Departmental, and Divisional levels that identifies measures and targets with a monitoring / reporting mechanism.  Combined into one Project Team.	Performance measurement is an integral part of a Client Service Model (see item 6&7)  Performance measures are being developed in the Service Level Agreement between FS and SBR.

Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011  
 Facility Services and Strategic Building and Renewal Review: Update on Implementation of the Recommendations [1713]

<u>Blackstone Recommendation</u>	<u>Status Report</u>
20. Protocols for addressing school-specific operational issues raised by individual trustees have been developed, implemented, and monitored for effectiveness.	<p>The existing Standing Committee process for dealing with Trustee requests continues to address system-wide concerns/requests.</p> <p>The FS Operations Unit restructuring includes a position with the responsibility for receiving and responding to Trustee requests.</p>
21. Cost allocation practices conform to policy requirements.	<p>Policy and Practice for intra-departmental and interdepartmental cost allocation and fee for services along with guiding principles will be discussed and agreed to by the Chief Facilities Officer, Director Strategic Building and Renewal and the Chief Financial Officer.</p>
22. Service Level Agreements with Business Services, Employee Services, and School Services to support Facility Services (FS) and Strategic Building and Renewal business needs have been developed, implemented, and monitored for effectiveness.	<p>A Service Level Agreement is being developed between FS and SBR, outlining roles and responsibilities, funding and the services and service levels being provided to schools.</p> <p>The FS and Business Services Service Level Agreement is with Business Services for review and response.</p> <p>A Service Level Agreement with FS, SBR and Employee Services will be developed once the restructuring of their respective departments is complete.</p>
23. “One Stop Shopping” FS is organized around Families of Schools and the Quadrant.	<p>FS has implemented the family team leader as the “Single Point of Contact” for all schools/sites it mirrors, the academic Family of Schools Model and Families are clustered by the appropriate quadrant. The SBR reorganization supports the model.</p>
25. Employee needs are met.	<p>A Supplier Feedback form has been created and placed on the FS/SBR website for staff to provide comments on products, equipment, materials etc.</p> <p>Service Delivery Standards will be part of the Service Level Agreement and the Client Service</p>



Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011  
 Facility Services and Strategic Building and Renewal Review: Update on Implementation of the Recommendations [1713]

<u>Blackstone Recommendation</u>	<u>Status Report</u>
	<p>Model</p> <p>Equipment maintenance records are kept to inform the procurement/selection process.</p> <p>FS/SBR Management meets with representatives from CUPE, MCSTC and TSAA to share information.</p> <p>This is an ongoing Corporate Initiative.</p>
<p>26. The concerns of employees are heard and addressed in a manner satisfactory to the employer and employee.</p>	<p>An in-depth review and analysis of the existing Labour Management Committee Process will be conducted and acted upon in order to identify improvement opportunities.</p> <p>Issues related to the Collective Agreement Process including but not limited to; grievance and negotiations be explored acted upon by a team lead by Employee Services and supported by CUPE, MCSTC, and FS/SBR management</p> <p>This is an ongoing Corporate Initiative.</p>
<p>27. Adequate staffing is provided, within approved budget, to meet the system requirements.</p>	<p>The FS department reviews its staffing requirements annually and makes submissions to the Staff Allocation Committee for consideration.</p>
<p>28. Systems and processes are in place to ensure that the health and safety of FS employees is not compromised.</p>	<p>FS and SBR work closely with the manager of Health and Safety and the Occupational, Health and Safety Committees to address health and safety concerns as they arise.</p> <p>The “Electronic Inspection Process” including any hardware and software needs be developed and implemented. CUPE, MCSTC, the manager of Health and Safety and others as needed, will be involved in the development and implementation of this process.</p>

Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011  
 Facility Services and Strategic Building and Renewal Review: Update on Implementation of the Recommendations [1713]

<u>Blackstone Recommendation</u>	<u>Status Report</u>
29. The TDSB corporately develops a robust communication plan to inform the senior management team and the Trustees' about the status of the Capital Planning process.	Responsibility has been assigned to Strategy and Planning.
30. Ensures the Executive Officer has direct accountability for the client service delivery model through the direct reporting of Regional Managers to the Executive Officer.	Resolved. Regional Managers report directly to the Chief Facilities Officer.
31. TDSB review the long-term capital planning process to ensure the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Actively sponsored by the Board and Senior Team</li> <li>• Resourced effectively: members and skills</li> <li>• Positioned within the organization to minimize disruption to operations</li> </ul>	Responsibility has been assigned to Strategy and Planning.
32. TDSB corporately outlines the roles and responsibilities, scope, committee structure and interdependencies, work plan and deliverables of the Capital Planning Process and that these are updated as the plan is continually developed and implemented	Responsibility has been assigned to Strategy and Planning.
33. Create a unit to support Facility Services organizational performance processes which would include resources to support the following activities: performance measurement and management, quality initiatives and innovation, leading practice and benchmarking, project and change management, issues management, communication and stakeholder consultation.	Has been assigned to a Quality Improvement Unit.

Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011  
 Facility Services and Strategic Building and Renewal Review: Update on Implementation of the Recommendations [1713]

<u>Blackstone Recommendation</u>	<u>Status Report</u>
34. Consolidate Facility Services planning with other enabling portfolios such as design, standards, environment and energy.	Will be coordinated through FS and SBR
35. Re-evaluate the number of Regional Managers and scope of responsibility to ensure this position is well designed to achieve the client service and performance targets. These positions should align to the system level TDSB structure to enhance TDSB collaboration.	Resolved in FS reorganization.
36. Restructure the Real Estate portfolio to build strategic competency, which includes planning, process and people, focused on managing this unique asset to maximize the Return on Asset (ROA).	Resolved with the formation of the Toronto Lands Corporation.
37. Conduct a detailed review of the span of control for all positions within FS & SBR including a review of the number of levels required to ensure compliance to TDSB goals.	Is resolved with Directors realignment and FS/SBR reorganization a balanced portfolio of responsibilities is achieved with the reorganization.

---

Operations and Facilities Management Committee, Report No. 20, February 16, 2011  
Agincourt Collegiate Institute: Rental of a Generator versus Purchasing

Agincourt Collegiate Institute: Rental of a Generator versus Purchasing

*As received by the Operations and Facilities Management Committee on February 16, 2011 (see page 12)*

The following information is provided in response to questions arising from January 12, 2011 Operations and Facilities Management Committee meeting.

The response to the power supply failure at Agincourt CI in November, 2010 required the immediate rental of a replacement generator and transformer while repairs were being done. The initial assessment for the cause of the power loss was a failed cable that fed the power from Toronto Hydro. These power supply cables are housed in concrete duct banks that run from the school building to the street. When the crew started their repair work it was further discovered that the duct bank had collapsed, greatly increasing the work and time needed to restore power to the school.

The rental cost for the generator that kept the power on at Agincourt during the six weeks required for building a new duct bank and replacing the cable was \$75,000. (Fuel costs were a still larger cost at \$102,121 at \$1.20/litre. Cost of delivery and pick-up was \$900; labour and service \$7,958 for a total of \$186,849.) The second quote submitted for the same rental service from another supplier was \$222 higher. In the last four years the total cost of rental *and* fuel from this supplier to deal with miscellaneous power interruption problems was \$308,456.

***Purchasing a generator and transformer:*** The purchase cost would be \$700,000 plus \$35,000 for a tractor to transport the equipment. The cost of fuel for each job is typically a larger amount than the one-time rental cost itself. Other costs if the Board owned a generator/transformer would include set-up, dismantling, preventative maintenance, and Electrical Safety Authority (ESA) inspection.

The useful life of a generator/transformer is 20,000 hours. With regard to the availability of alternative fuels, the natural gas option is limited in industry. Within North America, 1-2 units are available, but only 480V, not the 600V required. The supplier advised that there is no local availability.

## Children and Youth Mental Health Committee

### Report No. 2, February 22, 2011

A meeting of the Children and Youth Mental Health Committee was convened on Tuesday, February 22, 2011, from 4:36 to 6:22 p.m., in the Executive Meeting Room, Fifth Floor, 5050 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario, with Trustee Cathy Dandy presiding.

The following committee members were present: Trustees Cathy Dandy (Chair), Pamela Gough and Student Trustees Zane Schwartz and Jenny Williams. Also present was Trustee Chris Glover.

The following external members were also present: Andrea Boulden, Vincenza Pietropalo, Paul O'Connell and Wendy Shaw.

The Committee decided to report and recommend as follows:

#### Part A: Committee Recommendations

### 1. Ontario Public School Boards' Association and Children and Youth Mental Health Resources

Trustee Dandy informed the Committee about the involvement of the Ontario Public School Boards' Association in supporting the mental health coalition and its mandate.

On motion of Trustee Dandy, the Children and Youth Mental Health Committee

#### **RECOMMENDS:**

- (a) That the Ontario Public School Boards' Association's campaign be endorsed;
- (b) That the Board join the Children and Youth Mental Health Coalition.

### 2. Professional Support Services Waiting Lists

Staff presented an oral report on the status of the current wait list within Professional Support Services.

On motion of Trustee Gough, the Children and Youth Mental Health Committee **RECOMMENDS** that a communication be sent from the Chair of the Board to the president of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education informing them of the Board's need for qualified school psychologists and requesting that consideration be given to discussions regarding increasing the number of students enrolled in the certification program and entering into an internship program with the Board to support the training and development of school psychologists.

### **3. Scan Subcommittee**

Karen Gravitis provided an oral report concerning a brain-storming teleconference meeting that took place with members of the subcommittee. Staff presented two documents: Continuum of Needs-Based Services and the survey re Supports and Promotion of Health and Well-Being at the Board.

### **4. Children and Youth Mental Health Week**

Staff provided an oral update on the activities planned for Mental Health Week, May 2 to 6, 2011.

### **5. Liaison With the Board's Health Committee**

Staff presented information on a health strategy which had been presented to the Health Committee on February 14, 2011 and suggested there might be benefit of the Children and Youth Mental Health Committee and the Health Committee working together or sharing members on some initiatives.

### **6. Student Quadrant Meetings**

The student trustees informed the meeting about consultation underway which will engage pupils on the subject of mental health and offered to provide details of the consultations such as dates, times and locations.

Part C: Ongoing Matters
-------------------------

No matters to report

Cathy Dandy  
Chair of the Committee

**Adopted March 9, 2011 (see pages 3 and 6)**

---

 Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 15, February 23, 2011

## Program and School Services Committee

### Report No. 15, February 23, 2011

A meeting of the Program and School Services Committee convened on Wednesday February 23, 2011, from 6:41 to 8:57 p.m., in Committee Room A, 5050 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario, with Trustee Michael Coteau presiding.

The following members were present: Trustees Michael Coteau (Chair), Howard Kaplan, Shelley Laskin, Maria Rodrigues, Mari Rutka and Student Trustees Zane Schwartz and Jenny Williams. Also present were Trustees Gerri Gershon, Chris Glover and Soo Wong.

The Committee decided to report and recommend as follows:

<u>Part A: Committee Recommendations</u>
--

#### 1. School Year Calendars 2011-12 [1722]

The Committee considered a staff report presenting the school year calendars for 2011-12 for elementary, secondary and year round alternative schools.

Committee's recommendation or action regarding the staff recommendation:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concur<br><input type="checkbox"/> Amend<br><input type="checkbox"/> Disregard | <input type="checkbox"/> Refer<br><input type="checkbox"/> Postpone consideration (defer)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Other |
|--|---|

On motion of Trustee Laskin, the Program and School Services Committee **RECOMMENDS that the school calendars for elementary, secondary, and year round alternative schools be approved.**

Note: The school year calendar will be submitted to the Ministry of Education for approval then posted on the Board's website.

<u>Part B: Information Only</u>
---------------------------------

#### 2. Delegations

The Committee heard the following oral delegation in accordance with the Board's procedure for hearing delegations: re Fundraising: Diane Dyson and Nadia Heyd

---

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 15, February 23, 2011

### **3. Transition to Digital Resources/Textbooks**

On motion of Trustee Rutka, the Committee received a staff briefing note (see page 41) providing information regarding the transition to digital resources/textbooks.

### **4. Student and Parent Census 2011-2012**

On motion of Trustee Laskin, the Committee received a staff briefing note (see page 53) providing information with respect to the student and parent census 2011-2012.

### **5. Learning Opportunities Index Update**

The Committee received an oral update from staff with regard to the Learning Opportunities Index.

<u>Part C: Ongoing Matters</u>
--------------------------------

No matters to report

Trustee Michael Coteau  
Chair of the Committee

**Adopted March 9, 2011 (see page 3)**



---

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 15, February 23, 2011  
Transition to Digital Resources/Textbooks and Development of Curriculum Content [1716]

Transition to Digital Resources/Textbooks and Development of Curriculum Content [1716]

*As received by the Program and School Services Committee on February 23, 2011 (see page 40).*

PART A: Transition To Digital Resources/Textbooks

This part is presented in response to the following Board resolution:

That the Director present a plan by January 2011 to increase access to digital course material content in middle and secondary schools;

Digital Resource/Textbook Landscape

In Canada, the digital resource/textbook is in its infancy. Products range from free school learning materials to exact digital copies of an existing textbook in Portable Document Format (PDF) form to interactive and engaging web based resources that enable teachers to edit and adjust content for the needs of their students. The majority of resources at the current time are in the former category.

A small number of established, traditional print publishers (Pearson Canada and Nelson Education Ltd.) are active in creating interactive electronic content along with vendors currently providing online resources in the form of encyclopedias, databases and other reference type material including video (Discovery Education, Gale Cengage Learning).

Pearson and Nelson have digital versions of many of their current print textbooks available and are beginning to make these resources more interactive through the incorporation of web links and additional tools for teachers and students, e.g. ability to make small notes and highlight important information. Pearson is currently active in seven districts across Canada with digital text material, not including small pilots.

Discovery Education and Gale Cengage are utilizing existing reference type material and creating customized content packages for a specific purpose, e.g. Grade 7 Science, Grade 12 World Issues Geography. These vendors have significantly more experience in web based resources and, as such, their products are more interactive and engaging incorporating a wide variety of digital images and video and allowing teachers to edit and adjust content to meet the needs of their students. Some products include assessment tools.

An initial scan of other Ontario school districts indicates many are interested in digital resources/textbooks, some are actively investigating and planning but none are at the implementation stage.

Benefits and Challenges

A number of benefits may be realized with a shift to digital resources/textbooks over time including:

- Students provided with 24/7 access to learning materials.

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 15, February 23, 2011  
Transition to Digital Resources/Textbooks and Development of Curriculum Content [1716]

- Teachers' ability to update content as needed to reflect world events.
- Increased engagement through the use of technology.
- Potential cost benefits if purchasing of resources is done at the district level.
- Health benefits of students not carrying multiple, heavy textbooks in their backpacks.
- Possible environmental gains through less reliance on paper – both resources/textbooks and photocopying.

There are also potential challenges involved with a shift to digital resources/textbooks over time including:

- Cost of devices to access online digital content.
- Increased IT infrastructure and network costs to provide reliable access to online content.
- Increased costs to support and maintain new devices used to access online content.
- Utilization of school assets outside of the school (taking devices home).
- Potential class management issues as students have continual internet access during class.

#### Types of Digital Resources/Textbooks

There are at least three different types of digital resources/textbooks in the market today. Each serves a purpose and is focused on a different student engagement, and offers a different experience. The interactive version offers the most engaging learning experience and maximizes communication and collaboration between students and teachers.

#### Types of Digital Media

<u>Types</u>	<u>Digital Resource/ Textbook</u>	<u>Online Digital Resources/Textbooks</u>	<u>Interactive Online Digital Resources/Textbooks</u>
Content Description	Some school learning materials as well as electronic copies of existing textbook, normally in a PDF format.	Electronic copy of a resource/textbook with audio / video, updated yearly, live web links	A resource/textbook fully integrated into a web based version, updated regularly, teacher editable with audio, video imbedded in content  along with interactive assessment and communication tools
Devices	e-Book Readers Any computer, SMART phones capable of reading PDF files.	Desktop, laptop computers SMART phones and wireless devices, e.g. tablets	Desktop, laptop computers SMART phones and wireless devices, e.g. tablets
Student Use & Engagement	Primarily reading, small note taking, highlighting.	Some connection to current, updated information via the web. Increased engagement.  Reliable, current content.	Completely interactive and collaborative. Students able to read, process, evaluate information and construct knowledge. Assessment tools provide quick feedback.

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 15, February 23, 2011  
Transition to Digital Resources/Textbooks and Development of Curriculum Content [1716]

### Digital Resources/Textbooks Licensing Models

There are a number of different licensing models in the marketplace today. They can be as simple as purchasing an electronic version of an existing textbook to a more interactive model where users are able to use pieces of the book and add to it or subtract from it. Some allow users to “own” the book, while others simply allow it to be read for a set period of time.

### Licensing Approach

<u>Publisher / Textbook</u>	<u>Printed Textbook</u>	<u>Digital Resources/ Textbook</u>	<u>Online Digital Resources/Textbooks</u>	<u>Interactive Online Digital Resources/Textbook</u>
Purchase Model	Textbooks purchased individually.	Digital resources/textbooks purchased individually on a CD or downloaded to a device.	Purchased in combination with the print version of resource/ textbook for additional fee.  **OR**  Purchased without print version of resource/textbook.	Accounts purchased at student, school or district level to access one or more resources/textbooks depending on the agreement.
Cost	\$25 - \$100+ depending on grade and subject.	Free for some school learning materials.  Publishers are indicating the cost of a PDF version on a CD will be similar to a printed resource/textbook of \$25 - \$100+ depending on grade and subject.	\$2 - \$10 per student plus the cost of the printed resource/ textbook.  ** OR **  Online only for regular cost of resource/ textbook, \$25 - \$100+ depending on grade and subject.	Discounts available if purchases made in quantity at school, FOS or district level and could range from \$2 - \$100 per student depending on the publisher.  **OR**  Individual student account cost similar to print resource/ textbook of \$25 - \$100+ depending on grade and subject.
Terms	Textbooks purchased on 5 – 8 year cycle. Content owned in perpetuity.	Digital resources/textbooks purchased on shorter cycle than printed version to maximize benefit of digital format.	Access to online digital resources/  textbooks purchased on a yearly basis either with or without print textbook purchase.	Accounts purchased and renewed on a yearly basis.  Multiyear options available.

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 15, February 23, 2011  
Transition to Digital Resources/Textbooks and Development of Curriculum Content [1716]

### Usage and Availability of Digital Textbooks

By comparison to the existing hardcopy textbook market, digital textbooks are in their infancy stage; both in the development and availability. The number of large active players in Canada is four, but growing each day. Table 3. indicates the relative market presence of the four major vendors for each of the market segments. The participation in the digital area is small by comparison to hardcover textbooks.

#### Market Presence

<u>Company</u>	<u>Printed Textbook</u>	<u>Digital Textbooks</u>	<u>Online Digital Textbooks</u>	<u>Interactive Online Digital Textbooks</u>
Discovery Education	N/A	N/A	Low	Low
Gale Cengage Learning	Very Low	Low	Low	Low
Nelson Education	Very High	Medium	Low	Very Low
Pearson Canada	Very High	Medium	Low	Very Low

#### Textbook Title Availability

This table represents a relative comparison of the number of textbook offerings (titles) that are available to school districts at the current time. Available digital titles are also small by comparison to hardcover textbooks.

<u>Company</u>	<u>Printed Textbook</u>	<u>Digital Textbooks</u>	<u>Online Digital Textbooks</u>	<u>Interactive Online Digital Textbooks</u>
Discovery Education	N/A	N/A	<100	<100
Gale Cengage Learning	<10	<100	<100	<100
Nelson Education	>10,000	<1,000	<100	<10
Pearson Canada	>10,000	<1,000	<100	<10

An initial scan of Ontario school districts indicates significant interest in digital textbooks. Some are actively investigating and planning, a few have undertaken pilots but none are at the implementation stage such as the Simcoe County District School Board Digital Materials Pilot Project). The U.S. initiative in Florida's schools has also been reviewed. Table 5. depicts the usage / adoption of digital textbooks vs. printed textbooks in Canada.

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 15, February 23, 2011  
Transition to Digital Resources/Textbooks and Development of Curriculum Content [1716]

### Ontario Usage / Adoption

<u>Publisher / Textbook</u>	<u>Printed Textbook</u>	<u>Digital Textbook</u>	<u>Online Digital Textbook</u>	<u>Interactive Online Digital Textbook</u>
Post Secondary (Universities/Colleges)	Established Norm	Significant Usage	Increasing adoption	Increasing adoption
Grades 7-12	Established Norm	Some private schools usage	Pilot phase only	Pilot Phase only

### Implementation Considerations

#### *Devices*

There are many implementation considerations for this objective. If the ability to play multimedia content is not a requirement or the content does not require user interaction, e-Readers such as Kobo or Kindle may be alternatives. These types of devices are generally designed for viewing of content previously available in print. Most interactive course material and multimedia content are not suited for e-Readers due to the additional software and hardware requirements on the user device. However, this does not mean that a laptop or netbook running either Windows or Mac OSX are necessarily compatible with all e-books as vendors may create proprietary formats for the purpose of copyright protection.

Additionally, as content becomes more interactive and involves the use of multi-media material including video and audio this will necessitate the installation of client software such as flash plug-ins and Codecs for various videos file formats such as MPEG, MP3, or QuickTime player. Additional user hardware can include sound card and video card.

Students will require a mechanism to access digital resources/textbooks while at school. Existing school computers may be utilized but many more devices will be needed. Table 6. illustrates the current industry costs of a variety of access devices.

#### *Infrastructure, Network and Professional Learning Considerations*

Each of the digital resources/textbooks require additional internet bandwidth or system resources for their operation. As a result, enhancements to the current infrastructure will be required in order to enable this technology. Table 7. highlights a few of the major implications that arise as the content becomes more interactive, thus requiring more resources and bandwidth.

Device	Industry Cost
iPad	\$549 entry model
Kindle	\$228
Kobo	\$149
Sony Reader	\$249
Laptop	\$400-\$1200 plus

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 15, February 23, 2011  
 Transition to Digital Resources/Textbooks and Development of Curriculum Content [1716]

Netbook	\$300-\$500
---------	-------------

### Infrastructure Impacts

<u>Considerations</u>	<u>Digital Resources/Textbooks</u>	<u>Online Digital Resources/Textbooks</u>	<u>Interactive Online Digital Resources/Textbooks</u>
Network Considerations	Mechanism to upload and install large volume PDF “textbooks.” Minimal impact on wired/wireless internet connectivity.	Accessing online digital resource/textbook at a district level requires increased network capacity.	Robust network required to provide reliable and responsive internet access to online digital resource/textbook and features within.
Storage Considerations	Increased storage required for PDF copies of e-resources/textbooks and downloading of content to devices.	If the digital course material is hosted by the vendor, there will be minimal impact on storage. If the digital course material is hosted by the TDSB, additional storage will be required.	Additional storage will be required if the digital course material, such as PDF, is hosted by the TDSB. Additional multimedia and application servers such as web servers will be required to host interactive content.
Support Considerations	Increased support for devices - repairs, failures and use. Service beyond the school day will need to be available to teachers and students.	Increased support for access devices - repairs, failures and use. Increased support for use of resource, how to access, navigation passwords for teachers and students. Service beyond the school day will need to be available to teachers and students.	Increased support for access devices - repairs, failures and use. Increased support for use of resource, how to access, navigation passwords for teachers and students. Service beyond the school day will need to be available to teachers and students.
Teacher Professional Learning	Professional Learning required familiarizing teachers with access devices, use of digital text material both pedagogical and general usage.	Professional Learning required familiarizing teachers with access devices, use of digital resource/textbook material including pedagogical & how to edit material, incorporating world events into existing reference material.	Professional Learning required familiarizing teachers with access devices, use of digital resource/ textbook material, pedagogical how to edit material, incorporating world events into existing reference material. Support required to facilitate effective assessment, communication and collaboration strategies into course resources.

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 15, February 23, 2011  
Transition to Digital Resources/Textbooks and Development of Curriculum Content [1716]

### Digital Resources/Textbooks Expansion Plan

A six year plan is required to meet part “a.” of the resolution. The plan would begin with the implementation of digital resources/textbooks to all Grade 12 students (approximately 27,000) and would then extend to the balance of the secondary school grades, then into the middle schools grades following the same process of initial enablement of available texts, with expansion to digital resources/textbooks as they become available.

#### *Assumptions*

The proposed plan is predicated on the information provided by Canadian publishers, and on the digital products that are available today, and the experience of other school boards.

1. Grade 12 students will have access to digital resources/textbooks the first year.
2. There are 27,000 Grade 12 students:
3. It is assumed that 7,000 students currently have access to a device in their school.
4. 20,000 new devices are needed. (For this report, we are making the assumption that 20,000 are needed at each grade level.)
5. This report assumes that, of the existing 12 hard copy textbooks used by Grade 12 students, four will be available as digital for Math, English, History and Geography.
6. This report assumes a yearly cost of \$10 per student for each of the four digital resources/textbooks (for a total of \$40 per student) based on initial conversations with various publishers.
7. It is also assumed that the technology and costs of materials, such as software licenses, will be subject to change over time.

#### *Dependencies*

Before the use of digital resources/textbooks begins in TDSB in any significant way, a number of infrastructural upgrades must be completed:

- Increasing the Internet bandwidth
- Completion of full wireless enablement for schools.

#### *Annual Costs*

The chart below outlines the required annual costs to implement the use of four digital resources/textbooks by Grade 12 students.

Item	Costs
Network	\$4.1M initial investment and set-up

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 15, February 23, 2011  
 Transition to Digital Resources/Textbooks and Development of Curriculum Content [1716]

Increasing Internet bandwidth (from 1 Gbps to 15 Gbps)	\$2.6M on-going cost per grade level after installation
Digital Resources/Textbooks Assuming annual license/subscription of \$10 per digital text, per student	Free for some digital content and up to \$1.08M (\$10 per book x 4 subjects x 27,000 students)
Devices Laptop, iPad, Netbook (Estimated average cost of \$650 per unit)	\$13.0M (\$650 per unit x 20,000)
Teacher Professional Learning Support for teachers to effectively utilize digital resources/textbooks for student learning for one grade per year across the system.	\$0.4M (1 day of training = 100 schools x 20 teachers x \$200 per day). Assuming 10 days of training per year = \$4.0M

### *Annual and On-Going Costs*

The chart below indicates the annual investment required to increase the use of digital resources/textbooks and the on-going costs after implementation.

	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-20-17	Steady State
Network	\$4.1M	\$6.7M	\$9.3M	\$11.9M	\$14.5M	\$16.2M	\$16.2M
Grade 12	\$14.5M						
Grade 11		\$14.5M					
Grade 10			\$14.5M				
Grade 9				\$14.5M			
Grade 8					\$14.5M		
Grade 7						\$14.5M	
Total	\$18.6M	\$21.2M	\$23.8M	\$26.4M	\$29.0M	\$30.7M	\$16.2M

### *Benefits*

The financial benefits associated with this plan would be minimal until the entire system is enabled and until ALL resources/textbooks are available in digital format. There are a number of intangible benefits to the student, such as increased engagement, increased access to resources/textbooks and learning material, increased ability to communicate and collaborate with teachers and peers, ability to use benefits of technology to assist with preferred learning style, potentially increased attendance and achievement, as indicated in the Simcoe County District School Board Digital Materials Pilot report.

### *Risks*

There are inherent risks with any new venture, and digital media is no different. The market place is very immature, and the investment is significant, especially for a school district the size of the Board. Adoption to this technology has been slow for this reason across Canada and the U.S..



Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 15, February 23, 2011  
Transition to Digital Resources/Textbooks and Development of Curriculum Content [1716]

### Current Board Pilots

There are a number of individual pilots currently underway within the Board testing a variety of different approaches and implementation strategies. Table 10. indicates some of these initiatives. These pilots are either just starting or still in process. Review and evaluation will be done upon their completion

School / FOS	Owner(s)	Pilot Focus	Partner	Timeframe
3 FOSs: SE2, SE4 and SE5	Kerry-Lynn Stadnyk	Student Engagement/ Teacher Capacity	Nelson Education	2011-2012
George Harvey CI/ NW4	Jeff Hainbuch	Student Engagement	Nelson Education	2011-2012
Sir Adam Beck JS/SW1	Nardaya Dipchand	Student Engagement	Pearson Canada	2010-2011
Stephen Leacock CI/ NE3	George Benedek	Student Engagement	Pearson Canada	2010-2011

### Summary

The adoption of digital resources/textbooks has many potential advantages for teachers, students and how they are used in teaching and learning. It is still to be determined if cost savings will be realized on the cost of the actual resources/textbooks. There is vast amount of uncertainty in the digital resource/ textbook marketplace. The Board should be cautious as with any new technology, there are risks. One of the greatest is the license model that will be employed for each resource/textbook, and the conditions around this license. For example, if the Board is required to purchase the hard cover textbook in order to be able to utilize the digital version, there will not be any cost savings, but rather an initial investment and ongoing expense to support the infrastructure cost, the educational resource side, and devices.

The other controlling factor is the rate and pace with which digital resources/textbooks become available to the Board. For the system to realize the full benefits, it must have 100% digital resources/textbooks for the system or a segment of the system such as all resources/textbooks for Grade 12. It is anticipated that cost savings may only be realized if a particular version of a digital online resource/textbook is deployed across the district for all schools and students, i.e. Grade 12 calculus. Given this market is in its infancy, moving slowly to ensure good sound decisions are made in conjunction with other school boards, the Ministry, and the industry as a whole would be suggested.

### PART B: Development of Curriculum Content

The Board decided: “That the Director conduct a feasibility study that examines the creation of curriculum content that can be made readily available for digital distribution using both external and internal development.”

### Types of Learning Resources in Ontario Schools

There are two types of resources used in Ontario schools: textbooks and supplementary resources.

---

 Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 15, February 23, 2011  
 Transition to Digital Resources/Textbooks and Development of Curriculum Content [1716]

“A *textbook* is defined as a comprehensive learning resource that is in print or electronic form, or that consists of any combination of print, electronic, and non-print materials collectively designed to support a substantial portion of the Ontario curriculum expectations for a specific grade and subject in elementary school or for a course in secondary school, or a substantial portion of the expectations for a learning area in the Ontario Kindergarten program. Such a resource is intended for use by an entire class or group of students.

A *supplementary resource* is defined as a resource that supports only a limited number of curriculum expectations, or the curriculum expectations in a single strand, outlined in the curriculum policy document for a specific subject or course, or a limited number of expectations for a Kindergarten learning area. Such a resource may be intended for use by an entire class or group of students. Examples are readers, novels, spelling programs, dictionaries, atlases, and computer software and instructional guides.” (Guidelines for the Approval of Textbooks, page 4.)

The Ministry of Education has clear policies and procedures around the selection, approval and use of these resources in Guidelines for Approval of Textbooks and Ministry Approved Textbooks – Secondary outlining the “policies on determining the eligibility of textbooks for evaluation by the Ministry, as well as the criteria for approval of textbooks.”

The chart below outlines possible options for sole or partnership created material along with pros, cons and considerations.

<u>Content Source</u>	<u>Advantages</u>	<u>Disadvantages</u>	<u>Considerations</u>
Vendors & Publishers	Trusted content – accurate, aligned with Ontario curriculum and Canadian content. Relationship if problems arise. Potential partner for content creation.	Cost of licensing digital textbooks from TDSB approved vendors.	Publishers currently host all or much of their digital content – eliminating the costs associated with TDSB doing so.
Open Education Movement (CK12)	Some material available at low to no cost. Opportunity use content and information from other school districts.	Potential misalignment with Ontario curriculum and lack of Canadian content. Reliability of information from an accuracy and availability perspective.	Reliance on material created by a wide variety of people and the hosting service of an organization with no direct relationship with TDSB. TDSB responsible for obtaining Ministry Approval.
TDSB Created	Trusted content – accurate, aligned with Ontario curriculum and Canadian content. Potential for revenue generation.	Cost of staff to create, locate and evaluate resources.	System to store, manage and provide content. Staff to create, edit, update and provide content. TDSB responsible for obtaining Ministry Approval.
Publisher/ Board Partnership	Potential for lower cost textbook available to schools. Potential for revenue	Cost of staff seconded to research and write material. Successfully completing	Content management system required to provision and manage digital learning material. Policy required on legal ownership

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 15, February 23, 2011  
Transition to Digital Resources/Textbooks and Development of Curriculum Content [1716]

	generation/sharing Potential for focused content to support needs of TDSB students.	Ministry approval for textbooks	of content jointly developed.
--	--	------------------------------------	-------------------------------

### Licensing, Creative Commons

If the Board was to attempt to create its own digital textbooks, how this material is licensed requires consideration. The resolution references Creative Commons. Creative Commons is a non-profit organization that provides a legal mechanism to share digital material, [www.creativecommons.org](http://www.creativecommons.org)

The question of intellectual property also required consideration. When a staff member creates material during the school day, or after the school day whom does it belong to, the Board, the teacher or both?

### Open Education Movement

There is a growing movement in the United States to provide core course content learning material through an “open” model where publishers do not control content or access to it. There are a number of individuals, organizations and institutions participating in this movement, perhaps the best known is the CK-12 Foundation - [www.ck12.org](http://www.ck12.org)

CK-12 provides open content learning objects and course materials, through “FlexBook” downloadable textbooks. Materials are focused on Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics but learning objects are available in the following quantities and subject areas:

- Arts (797)
- Business (169)
- Humanities (3436)
- Mathematics (1315)
- Science & Technology (7327)
- Social Sciences (1975)

These materials are at the secondary and post secondary level and currently are more of the online textbook variety than the online interactive resource incorporating video, audio, etc. Before any of this material may be utilized as a textbook in Ontario, approval from the Ministry of Education is required.

### Utilization and Adoption

In Ontario, many districts have created supplementary resources but in our research to date none of these received approval at the provincial level and were not added to the Trillium List (list of Ministry approved textbooks) - <http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/trilliumlist>

In Canada, Pearson Education partnered with Alberta Learning in the creation of a textbook. A teacher was seconded to Pearson for a school year at Alberta Learning’s cost. Upon completion

---

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 15, February 23, 2011  
Transition to Digital Resources/Textbooks and Development of Curriculum Content [1716]

the resource passed provincial approval and was sold both inside and outside Alberta by Pearson. Alberta Learning retained rights on new content and received the resource at a discounted price.

Successful approval has historically been granted when a publisher worked at the provincial level in jurisdictions across Canada.

### Considerations of Implementation

If the Board chooses to create textbooks both teacher willingness and system readiness should be considered:

- Will central staff or school based teachers be expected to create, evaluate, monitor and update textbooks or supplementary material?
- To what degree are teachers, students, parents and other schools staff ready to begin a shift away from print textbooks to digital?

A plan for teacher professional development for those who are creators and those who are users of digital textbooks will be needed. Teachers will need to learn how to use access devices, plan and manipulate digital textbook material. It is suggested to start small in a focused subject area within a specific grade and structured geographic area of the district with the required resources necessary to support this work.

Any material developed, created or collected by TDSB staff would require a mechanism to store and present the learning objects and material to students and teachers, a content management system. This material would require evaluation, editing, and regular checking to ensure web links are valid, information accurate as world events unfold. Direct TDSB involvement with content creation and management will require both staff and infrastructure investment on an ongoing basis to ensure reliability, compliance, support and availability of material. Development of the learning resources would also need to take into account Operational Procedure PR.531 CUR – Selection and Approval of Learning Resources as needed.

### Summary

The initial feasibility study would indicate that creation of curriculum content, both externally and internally developed could be done within the TDSB. Once the operation considerations have been addressed some policy questions require attention:

- Is there a need for this type of content and where is the need the greatest?
- What is the author's motivation and how will the author be compensated?
- Will this process be completed during school hours or outside of school hours?
- How will compensation and/or teacher release be facilitated and funded?

While there are a number of areas to explore further, it is possible to accomplish this within the TDSB, given adequate resourcing and necessary policy development.

---

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 15, February 23, 2011  
Student and Parent Census 2011-12

### Student and Parent Census 2011-12

*As received by the Program and School Services Committee on February 23, 2011 (see page 40).*

The purpose of the report is to provide information on initial plans for conducting the 2011-12 Student and Parent Census.

In 2006-07 and 2007-08 the TDSB conducted its first comprehensive Student Census and Parent Census respectively.

This initiative resulted from a decision of the Board in December 2005 to conduct a research project which would help the Board to “identify the factors within the school system which may inhibit student achievement, such factors to include but not limited to differences in gender, race, ethnicity, mother tongue, income and place of residence”.

An advisory committee of external experts and trustees was established to advise on the nature and scope of the project. The following goals for the research were established:

- (a) to assess the effectiveness of existing programs and services.
- (b) to develop more effective programs to meet the specific needs of students who were not being successful.
- (c) to identify and remove systemic barriers to student success.
- (d) to allocate resources where they are most needed, and
- (e) to advocate for funding and resources for students, families and communities to meet their needs.

The Student Census and Parent Census were designed as questionnaires which asked for information related to demographic factors such as racial background of the student, aboriginal status, first language, country of origin of student and parent, family structure, parent occupation, family income and parent education, sexual orientation (for Gr-9-12 students only), and several questions about the students’ and parents’ perceptions of school life and experiences.

The Student Census had 50 questions. These relate to the student’s background including family circumstances and the student’s perception of their school experiences and their experiences outside of school. The Parent Census had questions on demographic data and questions about parents’ perceptions of their children’s experiences in school and outside of school. The Parent Census was available in 22 languages.

Each questionnaire contained a student-specific number which allowed for linking of this data with student-specific achievement data. The Student Census questionnaire is completed by students in their classrooms; the Parent Census is completed by the parent at home and returned to the school.

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 15, February 23, 2011  
Student and Parent Census 2011-12

Response rates were positive: 92% of Grade 7-8 and 81% of Grade 9-12 students, and 68% of K-6 parents completed the surveys. Data reports capturing the TDSB system wide profiles and various disaggregated reports flowing from this data have been prepared and disseminated to schools, superintendents of education and central departments. School staff and central staff continue to use this data to inform program planning and development to serve students.

After considering the value of this data from the initial Student and Parent Census, the Board, in May 2009, decided that “the Student Census and Parent Survey be implemented on a five-year cycle and that the next Student Census and Parent Survey be conducted in school year 2011-12”.

A staff committee has been convened to begin the dialogue, planning and implementation processes for the Student Census, Grade 7-12 in November 2011, and the Parent Census, JK- Grade 6, in April 2012. The committee has established a proposed critical path identifying actions to be taken, including consultation with various stakeholders.

#### Next Steps

1. Provide background information to Senior Team members and Trustees.
2. Establish a broader Student and Parent Census 2011-12 steering committee.
3. Review and further refine the proposed critical path.
4. Provide information to stakeholder groups, and seek input on the process and content for the Student and Parent Census materials for 2011-12.
5. Respond to requests for involvement from external groups (e.g. Toronto Public Health, Ministry of Community & Youth Services and Ministry of Education).
6. Develop a budget and confirm a funding source.

<u>Time Frame</u>	<u>Actions</u>
January 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepare critical path [Completed]</li> <li>• Prepare proposed budget [In progress]</li> <li>• Present Briefing Note to Academic Council (includes background, critical path, budget) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>Academic Council January 14 [Completed]</i></b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
February 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Present Briefing Note to Senior Team Council</li> <li>• <b><i>Senior Team Council February 7 [Completed]</i></b></li> <li>• Present Briefing Note to Administrative Council</li> <li>• <b><i>Administrative Council February 8 [Completed]</i></b></li> <li>• Prepare Statement of Key Messages/Fact Sheet re: purpose and value of the Census for internal and external stakeholders, including how data has/is being used in the TDSB</li> </ul>

---

 Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 15, February 23, 2011  
 Student and Parent Census 2011-12

<u>Time Frame</u>	<u>Actions</u>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide Briefing Note and Key Messages/Fact Sheet to Board</li> <li>• <b><i>Trustee Package February 18</i></b></li> <li>• <b><i>Program School Services agenda item February 23</i></b></li> </ul>
March 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convene focus group of principals, superintendents, central staff, parents, PIAC, EPAC, ICAC, Aboriginal Advisory reps, Student Super-Council and Trustee representatives to provide input to the process and Student and Parent Census questionnaires</li> <li>• Prepare draft student/parent census based on input provided</li> </ul>
April - May 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure approved budget for Census</li> <li>• Conduct field test of Student Census in 4 schools (2 middle, 2 secondary) and of Parent Census (with a focus group of parents)</li> <li>• Amend Student Census and Parent Census content where necessary based on the field tests</li> <li>• Update and finalize accompanying Census (student/parent) materials: Student Promotional Poster, Parent Flyer, Instructions for Teachers</li> <li>• Present draft Student Census and Parent Census to PIAC, EPAC, ICAC, Aboriginal Advisory and other CACs as needed for final review and feedback.</li> </ul>
September 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publish a Census pre-announcement for school dissemination (via school newsletter) and TDSB website communication: TDSB Student and Parent Census 2011-1012 is Coming! (with key details). Link Web Announcement to a Q and A</li> <li>• Communication to principals for GR7-12 students alerting them of the November Student Census Week, and what to expect.</li> </ul>
October 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Census Staff committee meets to review all final details</li> <li>• Organize all arrangements for printing, packaging and labelling of Census forms and information documents for the Grade 7-12 Census, in readiness for fall implementation</li> <li>• Provide Trustees with final information package</li> <li>• TDSB web announces Student Census and provides links to all relevant accompanying information including updated Q and A.</li> </ul>

---

 Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 15, February 23, 2011  
 Student and Parent Census 2011-12

<u>Time Frame</u>	<u>Actions</u>
November 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student Census Week – Implementation of Grade 7- 12 Student Census – November 21 – 25, 2011</li> </ul>
January - March 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organize all arrangements for translations, printing, packaging and labelling of Parent Census forms, and related information documents, in readiness for April 2012 implementation</li> <li>• Communication to principals for K-6 students alerting them of the April Parent Census Week, and what to expect.</li> <li>• Communication home to parents reminding them of the Parent Census in April (via school newsletter, or flyer in report card)</li> </ul>
April 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parent Census Weeks – Implementation of JK-6 Parent Census</li> <li>• <i>Specific weeks to be determined</i></li> </ul>
September 2012 - June 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Begin phased reporting of Census Results</li> </ul>

### Questions and Answers

#### *What is the purpose of the TDSB's Census?*

The purpose of the Census is to collect data that will help the TDSB and its schools to improve achievement levels for all students while closing the achievement gap for students in need. The analysis of the data allows us to:

- Identify and eliminate systemic barriers to student achievement;
- Reallocate resources to where they are most needed;
- Establish effective programs and interventions to help our most vulnerable students; and
- Advocate for resources and funding from external partners to support students and schools who require such support

#### *When was the last Census?*

The TDSB conducted its first comprehensive Census for Grade 7-12 students in November 2006 and for parents of K-Grade 6 students in April 2008.

#### *How have we used the results?*

This data has provided the Board with hard evidence for:



---

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 15, February 23, 2011  
Student and Parent Census 2011-12

- Needs identification – identifying achievement gaps and determining barriers to achievement;
- Programming and intervention – reviewing and implementing systems, supports and initiatives across the system to better meet the needs of students; and
- Accountability – establishing a baseline of data to measure improvement.

There are many examples of how the results have had an impact in the classroom. To see some, please refer to the Fact Sheet.

*Why are we doing another Census?*

After considering the value of the data from the first Student and Parent Census, the Board, in May 2009, decided that the Student and Parent Census should be implemented on a five year cycle with the next Census conducted in the school year 2011-12.

*What is the cost of the Census?*

Collecting detailed information from more than 250,000 individual students and parents is a complex process. This is our second time conducting the Census, and we have found ways to streamline the process to reduce costs. Most of the costs are related to administering the surveys and processing the large volume of data for analysis. We estimate that it will cost about \$1 per student.

*Why is the Student Census not conducted online?*

Most TDSB schools have limited computer hardware and internet capabilities. As a result, an online student survey could not be completed technically for many schools and would cause significant disruption to schools. Currently with the use of a paper version, a whole school can easily complete the Census during one class period with minimal disruption to students and staff.

*Who completes the Census?*

Every student in a Grade 7-12 classroom across the TDSB will be invited to complete the Census. Parents of K-6 students will be invited to complete the Parent Census.

*When are you doing the next Census?*

Students in Grade 7-12 will be invited to complete the Census in November 2011 and the Parent Census for students in JK – Grade 6 will be conducted in April 2012.

*Is completing the Census mandatory?*

No. A student or parent does not have to complete the Census if he or she does not wish to. However, the usefulness and reliability of the data will depend on how complete and accurate responses are. All Grade 7-12 students and parents of K-6 students are invited to participate and will be given an opportunity to complete the Census at a convenient time during Census Week. A student or parent can also complete part of the Census, but skip a particular question if he or she does not wish to answer it.

---

Program and School Services Committee, Report No. 15, February 23, 2011  
Student and Parent Census 2011-12

*Is parental consent required before students complete the Census?*

No. Formal consent from parents or guardians is not required under relevant legislation regarding participation of students in a survey. However, all parents or guardians will be informed about the purpose of the Census, the collection procedures, and access and disclosure safeguards. In the event that a parent or guardian does not wish to have their child complete the Census, the parent will inform the school and appropriate arrangements will be made.

*Is the Census anonymous?*

The Student and Parent Census is confidential but not anonymous. The student's name and student number are not identified on the completed Census; the completed form will have a special code however which allows the Research Department to link the Census information to individual student achievement data.

*What security procedures are in place to ensure confidentiality of the data and who will have access to it?*

The Census forms are not identifiable by student name or student number. After the forms are returned to the Research Department, they will be scanned and processed electronically into a database, which will be stored, maintained, kept confidential, and accessed by the Research Department only for analysis and research purposes.

We will comply with the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (MFIPPA), which requires that the Board protect the privacy of an individual student's personal information existing in the Board's records. By law the TDSB cannot reveal individualized information for any student who completes the Census.

*Does the collection of personal information (such as racial and ethnic background) violate the Human Rights Code?*

No. It is the position of the Ontario Human Rights Commission that the Ontario Human Rights Code permits the collection and analysis of data based on enumerated grounds such as race, disability or sex as long as it is for legitimate purposes and not contrary to the Code. Legitimate purposes under the Code include identifying and removing systemic barriers, preventing disadvantage or promoting substantive equality.

## **Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee**

### **Report No. 17 (Part 1), March 2, 2011**

A meeting of the Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee convened on Wednesday, March 2, 2011, from 5:01 to 8:01 p.m., in Committee Room A, 5050 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario, with Trustee David Smith presiding.

The following members were present: Trustees David Smith (Chair), Irene Atkinson, Chris Bolton, Sheila Cary-Meagher, Gerri Gershon, Chris Tonks and Student Trustees Zane Schwartz and Jenny Williams. Also present were Trustees Michael Coteau and Chris Glover. Trustees Coteau and Tonks participated by electronic means.

The Committee decided to report and recommend as follows:

<u>Part A: Committee Recommendations</u>
--

#### **1. Contract Awards [1715]**

The Committee considered a staff report (see page 62) presenting contract awards. The Committee received the contract on Chart A.

Committee's recommendation or action regarding the staff recommendation:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concur | <input type="checkbox"/> Refer                          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Amend             | <input type="checkbox"/> Postpone consideration (defer) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Disregard         | <input type="checkbox"/> Other                          |

On motion of Trustee Atkinson, the Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee **RECOMMENDS** that the contracts on Chart B be approved.

#### **2. Annual Long Term Financing for Capital Projects [1724]**

The Committee considered a staff report (see page 64) seeking bylaw approval from the Board to support long-term financing through the Ontario Financing Authority for capital projects.

Committee's recommendation or action regarding the staff recommendation:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concur | <input type="checkbox"/> Refer                          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Amend             | <input type="checkbox"/> Postpone consideration (defer) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Disregard         | <input type="checkbox"/> Other                          |

On motion of Trustee Cary-Meagher, the Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee **RECOMMENDS** that Bylaw No. 15, as presented in the report, be approved.

### 3. Onestop Media Digital Program, Phase Two [1702] (not adopted by the Board)

On motion of Trustee Cary-Meagher, the Committee considered a staff report providing information about the expansion of the Digital Signage Pilot Project.

Committee's recommendation or action regarding the staff recommendation:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Concur           | <input type="checkbox"/> Refer                          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amend | <input type="checkbox"/> Postpone consideration (defer) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Disregard        | <input type="checkbox"/> Other                          |

On a motion of Trustee Cary-Meagher, amended by Trustee Gershon, the Program and School Services Committee recommended (not adopted by the Board, see page 4) that staff present a report to the Board at the regular meeting scheduled for March 9, 2011 with advice regarding voluntary participation in the program in consultation with the school community including Parent and School Councils.

Staff recommended that the report be received.

Note: The Board did not adopt the matter (see page 4).

### 4. Full Day Kindergarten, Update #10: Establishment of Full-Day Kindergarten Implementation Workgroup

The Board postponed consideration of the matter to the next regular meeting.

<u>Part B: Information Only</u>
---------------------------------

### 5. Delegations

re Full Day Kindergarten

- John Weatherup

re Onestop Media Digital Program

- Lynn Murphy
- Jane Chong
- Sue McLeod
- Jayme Turney
- Trevor Norris
- Sabrina Zuniga

**6. Collaborative Ventures 2009-10 [1705]**

On motion of Trustee Atkinson, the Committee received a staff report (see page 68) providing an annual report on all collaborative ventures entered into by the Board during the previous fiscal year, including the measurements and effectiveness of existing collaborative ventures.

<u>Part C: Ongoing Matters</u>
--------------------------------

No matters to report

Trustee David Smith  
Chair of the Committee

**Adopted March 9, 2011 (see pages 3 and 4)**

---

Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee, Report No. 17 (Part 1), March 2, 2011  
Contract Awards [1715]

### Contract Awards [1715]

*As presented to the Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee on March 2, 2011 (see page 59).*

In accordance with the Board's policy P017, Purchasing, the attached charts present contracts for receipt or approval, as appropriate.

Contracts related to the Board's Facility Services function are presented separately to the Operations and Facilities Management Committee.

The recommended suppliers and the term of each contract are shown in the attached charts. Chart 1 outlines contract awards provided for information, Chart 2 outlines contracts requiring Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee approval, and Chart 3 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.

Funding sources are identified for each award listed.

#### The Process

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 BiddinGo) 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.

Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee, Report No. 17 (Part 1), March 2, 2011  
 Contract Awards [1715]

**Chart 1: Contract Awards Provided for Information (contracts over \$50,000 and up to \$175,000)**

	User/Budget Holder School/Department	Products/Services Details	Ward	Recommended Supplier	Low Bid	Objections	No. of Bids Rec'd	Estimated Annual Amount	Projected Start/End Date of Contract	Customer Involvement
1	All Schools & Departments	Adhesive Products – for Distribution Centre JL11-042T <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Baldwin School Supplies	Yes	No	9	\$33,040 <sup>1</sup>	April, 2011/ March, 2014	Purchasing and Distribution Centre staff

**Chart 2: Contracts Requiring Board Approval (contracts over \$250,000 and Consulting Services over \$50,000)**

	User/Budget Holder School/Department	Products/Services Details	Ward	Recommended Supplier	Low Bid	Objections	No. of Bids Rec'd	Estimated Annual Amount	Projected Start/End Date of Contract	Customer Involvement
1	All Schools & Departments	Adhesive Products – for Distribution Centre JL11-042T <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Business Stations	No <sup>2</sup>	No	9	\$198,533 <sup>3</sup>	April, 2011/ March, 2014	Purchasing and Distribution Centre staff
2	All Schools & Departments	Area Carpets – MCS11-022P	N/A	All Seasons Floorcovering <sup>4</sup>	No <sup>4</sup>	No	6	\$73,000 <sup>5</sup>	April 2011 / March 2015	Purchasing staff

*For the Board's decision see page 59.*

<sup>1</sup> Represents a 2.8 % saving over last contract award.

<sup>2</sup> Nine non-low bid items selected were due to quality reasons or vendors failure to provide a sample

<sup>3</sup> Represents a 30 % saving over last contract award.

<sup>4</sup> Lower Bidder unable to provide relevant references or product sample

<sup>5</sup> Proposed contract prices approximately 7% higher than current contract, attributed to increase in raw materials (petroleum costs) and additional labour costs to ensure satisfactory edge binding

Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee, Report No. 17 (Part 1), March 2, 2011  
Annual Long-Term Financing for Capital Projects [1724]

Annual Long Term Financing for Capital Projects [1724]

*As presented to the Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee on March 2, 2011 (see page 59).*

This report seeks bylaw approval from the Board to support long-term financing through the Ontario Financing Authority (OFA) for capital projects. This long-term financing arrangement will provide permanent financing for construction costs incurred by boards for capital projects involving Good Places to Learn (GPL) and Primary Class Size (PCS).

On October 24, 2008 the Ministry of Education provided a process for boards to transition capital projects to long-term financing through the Ontario Financing Authority (OFA).

The Ministry is putting these arrangements in place to develop effective long-term school capital financing. This financing system will reduce the cost of financing capital projects enabling boards to make the most efficient use of capital funds and allows boards to meet their students' needs within a sustainable financial framework.

The capital programs that are eligible for this long-term financing through the OFA are as follows:

Good Places to Learn(GPL) Stages 1, 2, 3 and 4	\$33,916,337
Primary Class Size (PCS) Capital	\$14,460,706
Total Financing	<u>\$48,377,043</u>

The annual debt service costs relating to this financing will be funded by the Ministry. The "Schedules" referred to in the Loan Agreement are available in the office of the Chief Financial Officer, Business Services.

Bylaw Number 15

A by-law to authorize a loan from the Ontario Financing Authority in the principal amount of \$48,377,043 pursuant to a loan agreement under section 7 of Ontario Regulation 41/10

WHEREAS subsection 247 (1) of the *Education Act* R.S.O. 1990, c. E.2, as amended (the "*Education Act*") and the regulations made thereunder, provides that, subject to any other provision of the *Education Act* and, specifically, the regulations made under subsection 247 (3) of the *Education Act*, a district school board may by by-law borrow money or incur debt for permanent improvements and may issue or execute any instrument prescribed under clause 247 (3) (f) of the *Education Act* in respect of the money borrowed or the debt incurred;

AND WHEREAS section 7 of Ontario Regulation 41/10 (the "**Regulation**"), provides that (1) a board may by by-law borrow money for permanent improvements by way of a loan with an initial maturity of more than one year from the Ontario Financing Authority and that (2) a board



---

Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee, Report No. 17 (Part 1), March 2, 2011  
Annual Long-Term Financing for Capital Projects [1724]

that obtains a loan described in section 7 of the Regulation shall ensure that the proceeds of it are used for permanent improvements;

AND WHEREAS the Toronto District School Board, which under the *Education Act* constitutes a district school board (the “Board”), has undertaken urgent and high priority renewal projects at schools of the Board listed in any one or more of: (i) Appendix B of the document entitled “Good Places to Learn: Stage 1 Funding Allocation”; (ii) Appendix C of the document entitled “Good Places to Learn: Stage 2 Funding Allocation”; (iii) Appendix B of the document entitled “Good Places to Learn: Stage 3 Funding Allocation”; and (iv) Appendix B of the document entitled “Good Places to Learn: Stage 4 Funding Allocation”, in accordance with the maximum allocations listed in columns 2, 3, 4 and 5, respectively, opposite the name of the Board in Table 25 of Ontario Regulation 196/10, some of which projects are described in Schedule “A” attached to the Loan Agreement, as hereinafter defined (individually a “GPL Eligible Project”, collectively the “GPL Eligible Projects”) and pursuant to Ontario Regulation 196/10, each GPL Eligible Project constitutes a “permanent improvement” as defined in subsection 1(1) of the *Education Act*. In the event that the Board will borrow the principal amount specified in paragraph 2.1 under the said Loan Agreement in respect of a single GPL Eligible Project, the term “GPL Eligible Projects” means that GPL Eligible Project;

AND WHEREAS the Board, has undertaken capital projects required for primary class size reduction for the purpose of addressing the reduction in primary class size to 20 or fewer students, some of which projects are described in Schedule “A-1” attached to the Loan Agreement, as hereinafter defined (individually a “PCS Eligible Project”, collectively the “PCS Eligible Projects”) and each PCS Eligible Project constitutes a “permanent improvement” as defined in subsection 1(1) of the *Education Act*. In the event that the Board will borrow the principal amount specified in paragraph 2.1 under the said Loan Agreement in respect of a single PCS Eligible Project, the term “PCS Eligible Projects” means that PCS Eligible Project;

AND WHEREAS the GPL Eligible Projects and the PCS Eligible Projects are collectively referred to as the “Eligible Projects”. In the event that the Board will borrow the principal amount specified in paragraph 2.1 under the said Loan Agreement in respect of a single Eligible Project, the term “Eligible Projects” means that Eligible Project;

AND WHEREAS the Board has in part financed the Eligible Projects by way of temporary borrowing from a financial institution or from a reserve account of the Board and the Board intends to borrow money from the Ontario Financing Authority for the purpose of financing the Eligible Projects on a long-term basis, and in this connection the Board intends to borrow by way of a loan with an initial maturity of more than one year from the Ontario Financing Authority the principal amount of \$48,377,043 (the “Loan”) pursuant to a loan agreement in the form attached hereto as Schedule “A” (the “Loan Agreement”) which Loan Agreement constitutes an instrument prescribed under clause 247 (3) (f) of the *Education Act* and which sets out the terms and conditions on which the Ontario Financing Authority will make the Loan available to the Board;

NOW THEREFORE THE TORONTO DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

---

Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee, Report No. 17 (Part 1), March 2, 2011  
Annual Long-Term Financing for Capital Projects [1724]

1. The Board hereby authorizes the Loan on the basis that it constitutes a loan under section 7 of the Regulation and authorizes the entering into of the Loan Agreement that is prescribed for the purposes of clause 247(3)(f) of the *Education Act*.
2. The Board is hereby authorized to enter into the Loan Agreement pursuant to which the Loan will be made available to the Board and the Chair of the Board and the Treasurer of the Board are hereby authorized to execute for and on behalf of the Board the Loan Agreement which provides for instalments of interest only and of combined (blended) principal and interest as hereinafter set forth, substantially in the form of Schedule "A", with such changes thereto as may be suggested by the Ontario Financing Authority and as such authorized officials of the Board shall approve.
3. The Director of Education of the Board, the Treasurer of the Board and any other financial officer of the Board are hereby each individually authorized generally to do all things and execute all other documents, instruments and agreements in the name of the Board in order to give effect to the Loan Agreement.
4. The Loan shall be paid in instalments of interest only and of combined (blended) principal and interest over a 25 year amortization period on the specified dates set out in Schedule "B" to the Loan Agreement with the first interest only payment on May 15, 2011 and thereafter instalments of combined (blended) principal and interest to November 15, 2035 in each of the years during the currency of the Loan as set forth in such schedule with the final payment on March 11, 2036. The Loan shall bear interest at the rate of 4.833% on the outstanding principal amount owing thereunder from time to time from the date thereof, which interest shall be payable in arrears as part of the instalments of interest only and of combined (blended) principal and interest payable on such days in each year of the currency of the Loan as are set out in Schedule "B" to the Loan Agreement.
5. In accordance with the provisions of the *Education Act* and the regulations made thereunder, during the currency of the Loan, the Board shall provide in its estimates for each fiscal year for the setting aside out of its general revenue in the fiscal year the amount necessary to pay the principal and interest coming due on the Loan in the fiscal year and, on or before each due date in each such year, the Board shall pay out of its general revenue the principal and interest coming due on the Loan in the year. Such sums of principal and interest payable on the Loan shall be provided for in accordance with subsection 247(5) of the *Education Act*. Subject to the foregoing, on or before each due date in each year during the currency of the Loan, the Board shall pay out of its general revenue the amount necessary to pay the specific sums of principal and interest payable on the Loan shown for the respective year as set forth in Schedule "B" to the Loan Agreement; but such amount shall be paid out of the Board's general revenue only to the extent required after taking into account funds available from other sources.
6. Any amounts payable by the Board in respect of the Loan including interest on overdue principal and interest in respect of the Loan together with fees and other amounts payable by the Board under the Loan Agreement, if applicable, shall be paid out of the Board's general revenue or any other available funds.

Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee, Report No. 17 (Part 1), March 2, 2011  
Annual Long-Term Financing for Capital Projects [1724]

7. The proceeds of the Loan, shall be used to finance the Eligible Expenditures, as defined in the Loan Agreement, in respect of the Eligible Projects on a long-term basis and for no other purpose except as permitted by the *Education Act* and the regulations made thereunder.

*For the Board's decision see page 59.*

---

Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee, Report No. 17 (Part 1), March 2, 2011  
Collaborative Ventures 2009-10 [1705]

### Collaborative Ventures 2009-10 [1705]

*As received by the Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee on March 2, 2011  
(see page 61).*

#### Ontario Education Collaborative Marketplace (OECM)

In 2004, the Province announced funding to promote efficiencies by implementing Supply Chain Management practices across the broader based public sector including school boards, colleges, universities and hospitals.

In 2006, OECM was formed as a not-for-profit corporation and conceived by representatives from Ontario school boards (TDSB), colleges and universities to provide strategic sourcing services to the public education sector. Its Founding institutions and the Ministry of Finance (OntarioBuys) approved a business strategy for the deployment of these services to all 116 publicly-funded educational institutions in Ontario, as well as their on-going operation.

With the support of the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities, OECM received funding from OntarioBuys, Ministry of Finance in March 2008. The funding enables OECM to work with Founding Institutions to create a collaborative strategic sourcing practice.

Deployment to the rest of the sector will be self-funded from OECM's operational cash flow supported by revenue it collects from a share of strategic sourcing savings paid directly by suppliers. Full deployment throughout the sector is expected to take five years, from early 2010 to mid-2015. No additional public funding or any financial support from Institutions is contemplated.

At its May 2008 Annual General Meeting, a new Board of Directors was elected. Representing school boards are Carol McAulay (Simcoe County DSB) and John Sabo (York Catholic DSB).

An advisory group, comprised of senior business officials from various school boards across the province, was established in April, 2009 to shape the way OECM would support the school board sector. Chief Financial Officer Rego is an active member of this committee.

#### *Sourcing Events*

During 2009/10, Board staff participated in the following OECM sourcing events:

- Copy Paper;
- Office Supplies;
- Classroom Furniture.

---

Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee, Report No. 17 (Part 1), March 2, 2011  
Collaborative Ventures 2009-10 [1705]

### Expansion of Distribution Centre's Services

The Board's central warehouse operations continue to expand its sales of products to the City of Toronto Parks and Recreation Department and Daycares and other religious schools across the GTA.

### Printing Services

The Board's Print Services section continues to promote its quality and competitive services to external organizations such as CUPE 4400, Elementary Teachers' Federation of Ontario, and is pursuing potential opportunities with Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation District 12 and Retired Teachers of Ontario.

### Other Collaborative Initiatives

The Board continues to collaborate with external organizations to maximize its opportunities to increase efficiencies and reduce costs by pooling requirements with other institutions. The following initiatives are currently in place and additional details appear in the chart below:

- Toronto Catholic District School Board;
- Catholic School Boards Services Association;
- City of Toronto;
- Education Municipal Purchasing Group;
- Ontario Association of School Business Officials;
- Governments Incorporating Procurement Practices which are Environmentally Responsible (GIPPER); and
- Ministry of Government Services.

Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee, Report No. 17 (Part 1), March 2, 2011  
 Collaborative Ventures 2009-10 [1705]

Collaborative Ventures 2009-10

<u>Type of Collaboration</u>	<u>Other Participants</u>	<u>Lead Agency</u>	<u>Benefits for the Board</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<u>Exchange of Information</u>				
Purchasing Issues	OASBO Purchasing Committee Members	Rotating Chair	Increased knowledge base Reduced Administrative Costs	Currently working on a number of projects which include: Policies/procedures for consideration by other boards to promote the purchase of environmentally responsible products; Expanding opportunities of working together; PD sessions on Tax and Legal Issues; Expanded use of technology
Purchasing Issues	Across Ontario, Canada and the USA	Reciprocal exchange of information	Increased knowledge base Reduced Administrative Costs	In most cases the Board is providing the information to others
<u>Access to Other Public Organizations' Contracts</u>				
Next-day Courier Service	City of Toronto, University of Toronto, York University, various hospitals, other school boards	Province of Ontario, Ministry of Government Services	Lowest available next-day courier cost anywhere in Ontario	Used only as needed. Majority of internal courier service is provided by Board staff
<u>Co-operative Tendering</u>				
Bulk Winter Salt and Sand	City of Toronto	City of Toronto	Reduced Cost Better Accessibility to products (yard pick-ups) Reduced Tender Administration Costs	City's volumes are much higher than the Board's resulting in savings for the Board
Gasoline and Diesel Fuel Tender	City of Toronto	City of Toronto	Reduced Cost Reduced Tender Administration Costs	City's volumes are much higher than the Board's resulting in savings for the Board
Grass Seed and Fertilizer	City of Toronto, University of Toronto, York University	City of Toronto	Reduced product and administrative costs	Pooling of requirements resulted in cost reductions for participating members.
Telephone Services	Toronto Catholic DSB, French Catholic District School Board	City of Toronto	Reduced Cost Reduced Tender Administrative Costs	City of Toronto 's volumes are much higher and includes requirements of its Boards and Agencies
Electricity	Catholic School Boards Services Association (CSBSA). 47 participating boards	CSBSA	Reduced Costs Reduced Tender Administration Costs	Pooling of requirements resulted in cost reductions for all members. Sharing of legal/consulting costs by all participants.
<u>Fee for Service</u>				
Sale of Warehoused Products	Religious schools Daycare Centres City of Toronto Parks and Recreation	TDSB (Distribution Centre)	Revenue from sales (approx. \$150,000) Supporting daycare centres and others with cost effective supplies	Sale of stock items
<u>Other Ventures</u>				

Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee, Report No. 17 (Part 1), March 2, 2011  
 Collaborative Ventures 2009-10 [1705]

<u>Type of Collaboration</u>	<u>Other Participants</u>	<u>Lead Agency</u>	<u>Benefits for the Board</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Ontario Educational Collaborative Marketplace (OECM) <a href="http://www.oecm.ca">www.oecm.ca</a>	All Ontario school boards, colleges and universities invited to participate in all sourcing events.	Board of Directors comprised of representatives from the education and private sectors	Development of a common marketplace for broader public sector organizations, funded by the Ministry of Finance and supported by the Ministry of Education, will provide cost savings for all members from volume consolidation & increased standardization.	Pooling of anticipated requirements for a number of sourcing events including: copy paper; office supplies; science supplies; audio visual supplies and equipment; computer hardware and peripherals; caretaking supplies; staff uniforms. TDSB is currently participating in contracts for copy paper and office supplies.
Education Municipal Purchasing Group	University of Toronto McMaster University Ryerson University Trent University York University City of Toronto Humber College	Rotating Chair	Pooling of requirements such as grass seed and fertilizer, gasoline and diesel fuels resulted in lower Tender Administration Costs and Prices Piggy-back provisions included in TDSB tenders for chalk, A/V lamps and bulbs resulted in lower costs for participating member agencies.	Review of all common interest areas
PDS is a member of Governments Incorporating Procurement Practices which are Environmentally Responsible (GIPPER)	City of Toronto Canadian Standards Association Region of York City of Kitchener LCBO City of Pickering Ontario Ministry of the Environment Public Works and Gov't. Services Canada	TDSB (Acting Chair)	Keep abreast of environmental issues and influence environmentally responsible procurement policy development	Board staff is also the OASBO Purchasing Committee representative at GIPPER
Program Development	Recycling Council of Ontario (RCO) Lamp Manufacturers Wolf Electric (Distributor) Ministry of the Environment	RCO	Environmental Stewardship - All spent lighting (lamps/bulbs) from TDSB is removed by the supplier for appropriate recycling. The recycler processes the mercury, phosphor, glass and metal diverting 98% of the lamps from landfill.	The RCO approached TDSB to pilot this Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) model which puts the onus on manufacturers/suppliers to take responsibility for the management of their products after their useful lifespan. Following the pilot, RCO successfully launched their "Take Back the Light" program. According to the RCO, the TDSB was the first organization in Ontario to include the mandatory take-back of spent lamps in their tender documents. The successful bidder was required to participate in the Take Back the Light program. To

Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee, Report No. 17 (Part 1), March 2, 2011  
 Collaborative Ventures 2009-10 [1705]

<u>Type of Collaboration</u>	<u>Other Participants</u>	<u>Lead Agency</u>	<u>Benefits for the Board</u>	<u>Comments</u>
				date, the TDSB has recycled over 112,000 spent lamps.
Resource Development	Ministry of Education York Catholic District School Board Dufferin Peel Catholic DSB Niagara DSB Thames Valley DSB CUPE	Ministry of Education	An additional tool for the ongoing pursuit of more environmentally preferable cleaning solutions.	The Ministry of Education assembled a group of School Board purchasing representatives to assist in the development of a Green Cleaning Resource Guide, released in March 2010.



---

Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 19 (Part 2), January 26, 2011

## **Planning and Priorities Committee**

### **Report No. 19 (Part 2), January 26, 2011**

A meeting of the Planning and Priorities Committee convened on Wednesday, January, 26, 2011, from 7:13 to 9:09 p.m., in the Boardroom, 5050 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario, with Cathy Dandy, Chair pro tem, presiding.

The following committee members were present: Trustees Cathy Dandy, Michael Coteau, Gerri Gershon, Howard Goodman, Pamela Gough, Elizabeth Moyer, Maria Rodrigues, David Smith and Soo Wong. Regrets were received from Trustee Chris Bolton. Also present were Trustees Irene Atkinson, Sheila Cary-Meagher, Jerry Chadwick, Shaun Chen, Chris Glover, Shelley Laskin, Stephnie Payne and Student Trustees Zane Schwartz and Jenny Williams. Trustees Atkinson and Glover participated by electronic means.

The Committee decided to report and recommend as follows:

Part A: Committee Recommendations
-----------------------------------

**1. Accommodation Review of Blacksmith Public School, Gosford Public School, Driftwood Public School, Shoreham Public School and Brookview Middle School – Response to Recommendations of Accommodation Review Committee [1690]**

The matter was considered on February 9, 2011.

**2. Surplus Declaration: West Toronto Collegiate Institute [1663]**

The matter was considered on February 9, 2011.

**3. Reopening of Bluehaven Public School**

On motion of Trustee Rodrigues, and amended by Trustee Goodman, the Planning and Priorities Committee **RECOMMENDS** that a report be presented by the April cycle of meetings, on the possible reopening of Bluehaven Public School.

At the Committee meeting, on amendment of Trustee Goodman “that the reopening of Bluehaven Public School be added as a priority matter for consideration by the Board as part of the 2011-12 capital building program.” was replaced with “that a report be presented by the April cycle of meetings, on the possible reopening of Bluehaven Public School.”

---

Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 19 (Part 2), January 26, 2011

**4. Appointment of Additional Members to the Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC)**

The matter was considered on February 9, 2011.

**5. Video to Demonstrate Expulsion Hearing and Suspension Appeal Meetings**

The matter was considered on February 9, 2011.

Part B: Information Only

Part B matters were received on February 9, 2011.

Part C: Ongoing Matters

No matters to report

Cathy Dandy  
Chair pro tem

**Adopted March 9, 2011 (see page 3)**

## **Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee**

### **Report No. 16 (Part 2), January 26, 2011**

A meeting of the Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee was convened on Wednesday, January 26, 2011, from 5:08 to 7:12 p.m., in Committee Room A, 5050 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario, with David Smith presiding.

The following members were present: Trustees David Smith (Chair), Irene Atkinson, Sheila Cary-Meagher, Gerri Gershon, Chris Tonks and Student Trustees Zane Schwartz and Jenny Williams. Also present were Trustees Jerry Chadwick, Shaun Chen, Michael Coteau, Cathy Dandy, Chris Glover, Howard Goodman, Pamela Gough, John Hastings, Howard Kaplan, Shelley Laskin, Elizabeth Moyer and Sheila Ward. Trustees Atkinson and Glover participated by electronic means.

The Committee decided to report and recommend as follows:

<u>Part A: Committee Recommendations</u>
--

#### **1. Contract Awards [1703]**

The Committee considered a staff report (see page 77) presenting contracts for products and/or services used by schools and administrative departments. The Committee received the contracts in Charts A and B.

Committee's recommendation or action regarding the staff recommendation:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Concur<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amend<br><input type="checkbox"/> Disregard | <input type="checkbox"/> Refer<br><input type="checkbox"/> Postpone consideration (defer)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Other |
|--|---|

On motion of Trustee Atkinson, the Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee **RECOMMENDS** that the contract in Chart C for telephone services be referred back to staff for further information.

#### **2. Student Transportation Consortium [1660]**

The matter was considered on February 9, 2011.

<u>Part B: Information Only</u>
---------------------------------

**3. Declarations of Possible Conflict of Interest**

Trustee Tonks declared a possible conflict of interest re the matter of contract awards for telephone services [Contract Awards (1703)] because his spouse works for Rogers Telecommunications and did not participate in the discussion or vote on the matter.

<u>Part C: Ongoing Matters</u>
--------------------------------

**4. Postponed Matters**

Part C matters were received on February 9, 2011.

David Smith  
Chair of the Committee

**Adopted March 9, 2011 (see page 4)**

---

Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee, Report No. 16 (Part 2), January 26, 2011  
Contract Awards [1703]

### Contract Awards [1703]

*As presented to the Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee on January 26, 2011 (see page 75).*

In accordance with the Board's policy P017, Purchasing, the attached charts present contracts for receipt or approval, as appropriate.

Contracts related to the Board's Facility Services function are presented separately to the Operations and Facilities Management Committee.

The recommended suppliers and the term of each contract are shown in the attached charts. Chart 1 outlines contract awards provided for information, Chart 2 outlines contracts requiring Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee approval, and Chart 3 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.

Funding sources are identified for each award listed.

#### The Process

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 BiddinGo) 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.

Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee, Report No. 16 (Part 2), January 26, 2011  
 Contract Awards [1703]

**Chart 1: Contract Awards Provided for Information (contracts over \$50,000 and up to \$175,000)**

	User/Budget Holder School/Department	Products/Services Details	Ward	Recommended Supplier	Low Bid	Objections	No. of Bids Rec'd	Estimated Annual Amount	Projected Start/End Date of Contract	Customer Involvement
1	IT Services	Cognos Software Licenses to support the Enterprise Data Warehouse (see note below)	N/A	IBM Canada	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$143,936 <sup>1</sup>	December, 2010 / December 2011	ITS
2	Psychological Services	WIAT-III (Wechsler Individual Achievement Test) kits 3 <sup>rd</sup> edition. (see note below)	N/A	Pearson Educational	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$111,780 <sup>1</sup>	December, 2010	N/A

1 Sole Source Vendor

**Chart 2: Contracts Requiring Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee Approval (contracts over \$175,000 and up to \$250,000)**

	User/Budget Holder School/Department	Products/Services Details	Ward	Recommended Supplier	Low Bid	Objections	No. of Bids Rec'd	Estimated Annual Amount	Projected Start/End Date of Contract	Customer Involvement
1	IT Services	Citrix Software Licenses – virtualization pilot project at George Harvey CI (see note below)	6	Citrix Systems	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$183,070	February, 2011/ January, 2012	N/A

Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee, Report No. 16 (Part 2), January 26, 2011  
 Contract Awards [1703]

Chart 3: Contracts Requiring Board Approval (contracts over \$250,000 and Consulting Services over \$50,000)

	User/Budget Holder School/Department	Products/Services Details	Ward	Recommended Supplier	Low Bid	Objections	No. of Bids Rec'd	Estimated Annual Amount	Projected Start/End Date of Contract	Customer Involvement
1	All Schools and Departments	Telephone Services (see note below)	N/A	Bell Canada	Yes	N/A	8 <sup>2</sup>	\$2,574,457 <sup>3</sup>	March, 2011 / January 14, 2016	ITS

- a. Request for Proposal issued by City of Toronto
- b. Proposed contracts will result in annual savings of approximately \$512,000 compared to existing agreement

Cognos Licensing to Support Enterprise Student Success Dashboard

The Director’s Office set out a strategic goal in the School Effectiveness Program where decisions supporting the improvement of student success would be data driven.

An objective was established in the Business Improvement Plan to build a student dashboard (which is the user interface of a data warehouse application; it displays graphical measurements of student and school performance using the data stored in the warehouse) to funnel all the key performance indicators (such as EQAO scores, Report Card results, ‘At Risk’ students, student Attendance and Suspension, etc.) and informational reporting to each school to support the annual Student Improvement Planning process.

The project began in May 2010. A planning phase was developed and approved where the requirements were documented and an architectural assessment was completed to evaluate and recommend a solution.

A current consortium comprised of twenty (20) school boards, known as NOEL-York Collaboration (NYC) (Northern Ontario Education Leaders (NOEL) and York Region District School Board, have developed and are using a solution that was purchased prebuilt by TDSB in August 2010 (reported to Board for information September 7, 2010).

Key components of this prebuilt solution from the NOEL/York Collaboration, which requires appropriate licensing for the Cognos software, are:

---

Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee, Report No. 16 (Part 2), January 26, 2011  
Contract Awards [1703]

1. It is a prebuilt, and ready to use, Enterprise Data Warehouse. The Data Warehouse (DW) is housed on a Microsoft SQL Server 64 bit environment. All data transformation is done via Cognos Data Manager. It is through this application, Cognos Data manager, that the NYC solution manages the Data Warehouse by pulling information from the source systems (extract); make the necessary changes in the structure of this data in order to fit the DW model (transform); and finally insert or update the data in the DW with the incoming information (Load).
2. A robust front end solution (using Cognos 8 as its main engine) that will allow users within TDSB to gather, analyze, and interpret, the information they need to support evidence based decision making.

The TDSB requires 560 trade-up licenses at a cost of \$128,638 and 40 additional new licenses at a cost of \$15,298 for a total of \$143,936.

IBM has become the sole source for Cognos software since purchasing Cognos in November 2007.

### WIAT-III 3<sup>rd</sup> edition kits

The Wechsler Independent Assessment Test (WIAT) is a standardized assessment measure that is used as part of an assessment battery by all Psychology staff at the TDSB.

The WIAT-III is an updated, upgraded and more comprehensive tool that uses current norms when assessing individual children. It is a tool that will allow Psychology staff to complete assessments using current information and will provide a wider range of assessment information that will help with diagnosis and programming suggestions for teachers.

Pearson is the sole distributor of this product in Canada.

### Telephone Services

Board telephone services (also known as Centrex services), including 911 life-line services, have been provided by Bell Canada as part of the City of Toronto Telecommunications Infrastructure (COTTI) Agreement since 1998 and has been subsequently renewed January 2004 and January 2009.



---

Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee, Report No. 16 (Part 2), January 26, 2011  
Contract Awards [1703]

The COTTI agreement provided the City and the various Agencies, Boards, and Commissions, including all Toronto area school boards with preferred Public Sector pricing. This Agreement, originally to expire on January 14, 2011, has been extended to March 14, 2011.

On October 1, 2010, after a competitive bid process which started in January 2009, the City of Toronto has executed a new Agreement with Bell Canada and is offering to extend the Agreement to the Toronto area school boards. This agreement, called the Integrated Telecommunications Infrastructure Agreement (ITIA), provides Telephone and 911 life-line services for a five year term at preferred Public Sector pricing.

The cost of the services for the Board under COTTI Agreement for a 12 month period is \$3,086,816. For the same services as proposed under the new ITIA the cost for a 12 month period will be \$2,574,457. The annual savings will be approximately \$512,000.

The ITIA is structured with a five year term plus five one-year extensions. During the five year contract term, the participants will have the opportunity to transition to newer technologies, such as VoIP (Voice Over Internet Protocol) or the convergence of voice, data and video communications and messaging (voice mail and email).

#### *Benefits of ITIA*

- Continuation of critical telephone services;
- Reduced telephone service rates due to combined purchase power;
- Opportunity to transition to new technology without risk to access to telephone services.

#### *Risks of Non-Participation*

- Substantial increase in expenditure for telephone services due to significantly reduced volume;
- Resources to undertake Request for Proposals process to secure a contract for telephone services at rates equal or better than current rates.
- Resources required to transition from the existing contract to a new contract.

---

Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee, Report No. 16 (Part 2), January 26, 2011  
Contract Awards [1703]

### Virtualization Pilot at George Harvey CI using the Citrix XenDesktop/Xenapp Technology

IT Services is looking at ways of minimizing IT costs, increasing efficiencies and moving towards realizing the 1:1 computing solution for all students. Through this pilot at George Harvey CI, we want to evaluate how well we can extend the useful life of older legacy computers as well as provide mobile devices for students to use at school and at home and be able to deliver remote application access to every user. In this pilot we want to address specific issues and look at performance for graphically intense applications, server stability and utilization, printing, and software license management among many other technical issue handling.

Although the Board is experiencing serious capacity issues, it is of most importance that we explore opportunities already exploited by many other K-12 school boards and post secondary education systems in addressing the “Any device, Anytime, Anywhere” concepts for the 21<sup>st</sup> century learner as expressed in the Vision of Hope.

A small sample listing of other educational institutions using virtual technology:

Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board; Durham Technical Community College; Montgomery Independent School District (ISD), Houston, Texas; Lakota Local Schools; Rocklin Unified School District; Saginaw Intermediate School District; DeVry; Oxford University, University of Toronto; University of Alberta; Scottsdale Community College (Arizona); Central Michigan University; University of Maryland; University of North Texas Dallas; Université de Rennes (France); American River College, Arizona State University, Bellarmine University, Berkshire School, Capital Community College, Louisburg College, Midwestern University, Mount Anthony Middle School, NY Network, Notre Dame Academy, Rogue Community College, North Star Charter School, Sacramento City College, Scottsdale Community College, Shenandoah School Corporation, Spalding University, University of California San Francisco, Three Rivers Community College, Utica College, Virginia Wesleyan College, Wittenberg University.

This 1:1 virtualized computing environment will provide access to interactive, dynamic and collaborative online resources, which will allow teaching and learning to transcend the walls of the classroom, facilitating access to instructions, materials and collaboration beyond the bricks of the schools – allowing for student-to -teacher and student-to-student interaction to occur before, during, after school, at home or virtually anywhere a student can be connected to the internet.

The impact of this technology on student engagement, student learning and achievement is powerful. A 1:1 virtualized computing environment allows for the integration of technology into student learning when and as needed – through the teaching and learning process. This enables students to work at their preferred learning style as they construct knowledge.

---

Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee, Report No. 16 (Part 2), January 26, 2011  
Contract Awards [1703]

The Board/Citrix pilot is an inclusive model. The design provides substantial access to a wide range of licensed software, internet access as well as other TDSB resources. The pilot leverages existing computers in school hence providing an opportunity to extend the life of legacy hardware. In addition, students and staff can also use their own devices within the virtualized environment. George Harvey CI can creatively utilize funds to purchase additional computers for students that will enable them to access technology to further their learning, regardless of socio-economic background.

The ubiquitous nature of technology (1:1 computing) helps to support the development of ICT skills in the school. School leadership can develop on-going professional learning and mastery of technology as a teaching tool.

The ultimate goal is to provide our students and staff with educational tools that will enhance the learning process, the engagement process and ultimately the success rate of our students. Education is a partnership anchored on collaborative sharing, exploring, supporting, facilitating, and learning. Technology will help connect our staff and students to the information age and learning for the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

With Citrix technology solutions users can have the opportunity to access their virtual desktop and subscribe to multiple Board applications on-demand from any PC, Mac, thin client, tablet or smart-phone. This enables virtual work styles, device flexibility, and user mobility.

Technology has long been recognized as a teaching and learning tool that helps all students, at all levels of achievement. Research shows that it improves attendance, student engagement, and student's achievement. George Harvey C.I. is looking to introduce this pilot to enhance the teaching and learning process for Grade 9 students and teachers beginning February 2011 followed by a rollout to the entire school.

The pilot will provide every student with a portable wireless device, which will enable the student to access work from school or from home. The technology will be an additional tool for teachers to deliver the ICT curriculum, and it will make lessons more relevant considering the impact of technology in all aspects of students' lives, as it allows the opportunity to deliver multimedia content including audio, video, animations, and simulations, as part of interactive learning experiences.

Students will also be able to bring their own device (e.g. wireless-enabled laptop) to access the services, provided that the device is sufficiently powerful and has the necessary software.

Based on the results of the pilot and the availability of additional funding, the initiative could be expanded to the entire Board after appropriate RFP processes and other funding considerations are finalized.

---

Administration, Finance and Accountability Committee, Report No. 16 (Part 2), January 26, 2011  
Contract Awards [1703]

IT Services staff have had initial discussions with Citrix Systems Inc. to design a desktop virtualization solution for the pilot that will deliver windows desktop solutions as an on-demand service to any user, anywhere. Citrix has agreed to provide free of charge design and technical expertise support for the pilot setup valued at ~\$130,000.

The following is a breakdown of costs for the Grade 9 portion of the pilot:

Hardware (includes 10 servers)	\$ 93, 000
Mobile Devices (225)	141, 356
Citrix Licenses	<u>183,070</u>
Total	\$417,426

Funding for the pilot will be provided by IT Services operating budget.

*For the Board's decision see page 59.*

## Planning and Priorities Committee

### Report No. 20, February 28, 2011

A meeting of the Planning and Priorities Committee convened on Monday, February 28, 2011, from 7:05 to 10:14 p.m., in Committee Room A, 5050 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario, with Trustee Pamela Gough presiding until 8:10 p.m., then Trustee Bolton presiding until the conclusion of the meeting.

The following members were present: Trustees Chris Bolton, Michael Coteau, Gerri Gershon, Howard Goodman, Pamela Gough, Maria Rodrigues, David Smith and Soo Wong. Also present were Trustees Sheila Cary-Meagher, Shaun Chen, Chris Glover, Mari Rutka and Student Trustees Zane Schwartz and Williams. Regrets were received from Trustees Cathy Dandy and Elizabeth Moyer. Trustee Smith participated by electronic means.

The Committee decided to report and recommend as follows:

<u>Part A: Committee Recommendations</u>
--

#### 1. Pupil Accommodation Review Process Revisions [1726] (amended by the Board)

The Committee considered a staff report (see page 89), presenting information to the Committee on the pupil accommodation process revisions.

Committee's recommendation or action regarding the staff recommendation:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Concur<br><input type="checkbox"/> Amend<br><input type="checkbox"/> Disregard | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Refer<br><input type="checkbox"/> Postpone consideration (defer)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Other |
|---|--|

On motion of Trustee Goodman to refer the staff report back to staff, amended by Trustee Gershon, the Committee **RECOMMENDS** (as amended by the Board, see page 5) that the staff report presenting information on the pupil accommodation process revisions be received in light of additional information provided in the briefing note, Additional Changes to Pupil Accommodation Review Process.

The Committee recommended that the matter be referred back to staff for further revisions and presented to the Board at the regular meeting scheduled for March 9, 2011.

Staff recommended that the report be received.

#### 2. Staff Allocation 2011-12 [1719] (amended by the Board)

The Committee considered a staff report (see page 96) presenting the staffing levels of school-based staff for 2011-12.

---

 Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 20, February 28, 2011

Committee's recommendation or action regarding the staff recommendation:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Concur           | <input type="checkbox"/> Refer                          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amend | <input type="checkbox"/> Postpone consideration (defer) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Disregard        | <input type="checkbox"/> Other                          |

On a motion of Trustee Goodman, as amended by Trustee Gershon, the Committee **RECOMMENDS** (as amended by the Board, see page 5) that the following staffing levels for school-based staff for 2011-12 be approved:

The Board decided that the following allocation of school-based staff for 2011-12 be approved:

- (a) *Elementary Teachers:* 10,399 FTE positions of elementary teacher as set out in the staff report;
- (b) *Secondary Teachers:* 5,900.0 FTE positions of secondary teacher as set out in the staff report;
- (c) *Elementary Vice-principals:* 257 headcount positions of Elementary school vice-principal, as set out in the staff report;
- (d) *Secondary and Junior High School Vice-principals:* 176.0 FTE positions of Secondary school vice-principal, as set out in the staff report;
- (e) *Educational Assistants:* 493.5 FTE positions of educational assistant in the regular program, as set out in the staff report;

Target the reduction of educational assistants, regular program with effect from September 1, 2015 to reflect the level of provincial funding pending review on a yearly basis, during the staff allocation process;

- (f) *Early Childhood Educators:* 272.0 FTE positions of early childhood educators as set out in the staff report;
- (g) *Special Education Classroom Support:* 2,494 FTE positions of Special Education classroom support as set out in the staff report;
- (h) *School Office:* 1,224.0 FTE positions of school office clerical in accordance with the model set out in the staff report;
- (i) *School-Based Safety Monitors:* 124.0 FTE positions of school-based safety monitor as set out in the staff report and additionally the financial equivalent of 89.0 FTE school-based safety monitors;
- (j) *Lunchroom Supervisors:* 1,405.0 headcount positions of Lunchroom Supervisor as set out in the staff report and additionally for Full-Day Kindergarten (FDK) classrooms not offering *Before and After School Programs* to a maximum of 272 headcount;

---

Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 20, February 28, 2011

- (k) *Aquatics Instructors*: 96.0 FTE positions of Aquatics Instructor in the regular program as set out in the staff report;
- (l) *Food Service Assistants*: 44.0 FTE positions of food services assistant as set out in the staff report;
- (m) *Caretaking*: 2,195.5 FTE as set out in the staff report.

At the Committee meeting, on amendment of Trustee Gershon, Part 6 was amended by changing “Reduce the number of Educational Assistants” to “Target the reduction of Educational Assistants” and adding “pending review on a yearly basis during the staff allocation process.”

At the Committee meeting, on amendment to the amendment of Trustee Goodman to change “pending review on a yearly basis during the staff allocation process” to “subject to review in the 2014-2015 staff allocation process” was defeated.

### **3. Potential Funding Reduction to Settlement and Other Community Services.**

On motion of Trustee Gough, the Priorities and Planning Committee **RECOMMENDS**:

Whereas the federal government has deeply reduced the funding or eliminated the funding to a number of settlement services for newcomers, immigrants and marginalized members of our community;

Therefore be it resolved:

- (a) That the Chair write to the Prime Minister of Canada, the Federal Citizenship and Immigration Minister, the Premier of Ontario, the leaders of all Federal and Provincial parties, the Minister of Citizenship for Ontario, and all City of Toronto councillors, to communicate to them the Board’s grave concern about the funding reduction or elimination of funding to settlement services that are critically important to supporting the families and supporting the success and well-being of many Toronto District School Board students and;
- (b) That the Federal Government be encouraged to fully restore funding to these vital, essential, settlement services.

<u>Part B: Information Only</u>
---------------------------------

### **4. Delegations**

The following delegations were heard in accordance with the Board’s procedure for hearing delegations:

#### re Staff Allocation

- Giselle Burton (on behalf of John Weatherup), CUPE Local 4400

---

Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 20, February 28, 2011

re Pupil Accommodation Review Committee

- Dr. Guatam Dey, Co-Chair, Greenholme School Council
- Abdullah Wardhare, Co-Chair, Queen's Plate Drive Parents and Community
- Pam Dogra, Teacher and Elementary Teachers Toronto Representative
- Frans Bronkhurst, Former Member – Jane/Finch ARC
- Nigel Bariffe, Teacher

<u>Part C: Ongoing Matters</u>
--------------------------------

No matters to report

Trustee Chris Bolton  
Chair of the Committee

**Adopted, as amended, March 9, 2011 (see page 5)**



---

Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 20, February 28, 2011  
Pupil Accommodation Review Process Revisions [1726]

### Pupil Accommodation Review Process Revisions [1726]

*As presented to the Planning and Priorities Committee on February 28, 2011 (see page 85).*

In May 2009, the Board approved an Accommodation and Program Review policy and later that year staff developed a related procedure regarding Accommodation Reviews.

Many valuable lessons have been learned since the development of the policy and procedure and the completion of ten reviews in 2010. Staff felt that the completion of these reviews was a good time to reflect on changes that should be made to improve the process.

In October 2010, the Research and Information Services department gathered information about the Pupil Accommodation Review process from informed committee members and central staff through an online survey and focus group sessions.

Trustees have also had an opportunity to provide comments about the process.

The suggested areas for improvement centre around five main themes including communication, community participation, parameters, roles, and time. Key Findings (below) includes comments under each theme.

Staff has structured recommended revisions around three phases of the Pupil Accommodation Review process:

1. Pre Pupil Accommodation Review Process
2. Pupil Accommodation Review Process
3. Post Pupil Accommodation Review Process

Staff's undertaking to improve the process can be found in Pupil Accommodation Review Process Revisions (below).

Given that the areas of improvement concern implementation, staff has made changes to the procedure that was adopted in 2009. The Pupil Accommodation Review Procedure will be revised accordingly.

Although the recommended changes will strengthen and clarify the Accommodation Review process, greater due diligence, coordination, and training is required to ensure successful implementation before, during, and after the process.

The revised process will be used for future Pupil Accommodation Reviews approved by the Board.

Staff will work with the superintendents of education leading the two Pupil Accommodation Reviews approved by the Board in December 2010 to ensure that a more inclusive process is used to encourage community participation.

---

Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 20, February 28, 2011  
Pupil Accommodation Review Process Revisions [1726]

### Key Findings of Research

#### (a) Communication

##### *Focus Group Comments*

- The Board should be more transparent about the purpose of the process and clearly state that it is about closing schools.
- Plain language should be used in Board presentations and the information should be streamlined.
- Follow up communication with the Pupil Accommodation Review Committee (PARC) members and the communities should be ensured.

##### *Trustee Comments*

- Be consistent with the Ministry's Guideline terminology, i.e. Pupil Accommodation Reviews and explain term to the community.
- Use plain language.
- Avoid terms or jargon that are not familiar to the community. e.g. FTE, SOE
- Be honest at every step.
- Maintain constant communication throughout the process and use different communication methods such as school newsletters and community newspapers.
- Develop a fact sheet about the process.
- Answer the question "how will the outcome of the review be better for current and future students?"
- Develop a long-term plan to guide future accommodation reviews and make it public.
- Set a clear goal and vision and give the community a reason to get engaged.
- Have the Communications department prepare summary notes at the end of every meeting and post on the website.
- Ensure PARC members are given current information.
- Provide information to PARC members in advance of meetings to be better prepared.
- Give community members feedback and share how they have contributed to the betterment of students.
- Communicate the process after a PARC to keep community in the loop.
- Inform community prior to the sale of a closed site.

#### (b) Community Participation

##### *Focus Group Comments*

- Community participation in the process should be increased.

---

Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 20, February 28, 2011  
Pupil Accommodation Review Process Revisions [1726]

- Equity issues inherent in the process should be addressed.
- There should be increased opportunities for the public to provide input at the public meetings.
- The Board should better prepare parents in the affected school communities to participate in the process.

#### ***Trustee Comments***

- Be very clear as to why the community has been called together.
- Make sure people understand before moving forward as some people felt the process moved along too quickly.
- Solicit community input.
- Encourage community participation within parameters set by the Board.
- Link individual schools with community facilitators to encourage problem solving at a local level.
- Engage those who represent the local area – not just trustees.

#### (c) Time

##### *Focus Group Comments*

- Appropriate timelines to conduct local feasibility studies.
- Longer and/or more flexible timelines to allow for more meetings.
- Improved planning and preparation for public meetings.
- Streamlining of the process to minimize the time commitment for all participants in the process.

#### ***Trustee Comments***

- Recognize it may have to take more time to complete reviews.

#### (d) Parameters

##### *Focus Group Comments*

- A clearer rationale be provided for inclusion/exclusion of schools.
- The Board should be more open about the staff option(s) from the outset.
- The Board should identify any constraints that may impact the PARC's recommendations at the beginning of the process.
- More opportunity should be provided for the PARC to generate and debate options.
- All the facilities/finance parameters should be provided at the beginning of the process.
- Clear understanding of the process should be ensured from the outset.
- Include boundary changes in the PARC process.

---

Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 20, February 28, 2011  
Pupil Accommodation Review Process Revisions [1726]

### ***Trustee Comments***

- Ensure clear understanding of the process from the outset.
- Stress that the Board of Trustees makes the final decision.
- Present a preferred staff option as a starting point.
- Keep options open.
- Change the mandate of the PARC to allow more than one set of recommendations as well as insights that will help the Board make its decision.
- Revisit the mandate of the PARC so that it includes making recommendations about the future use of a school for program purposes or for external organizations or partners (full service schools).

### (e) Roles

#### *Focus Group Comments*

- The superintendent of education should continue to function as PARC chair.
- A staff pool continue to provide support.
- Facilitators should continue to provide support to the process, but their role needs clarification and all facilitators need appropriate training.
- The role of the school principal should be clarified Trustees and City Councillors should be provided with clearly defined roles.
- Persons representing interest groups need to respect the process to maintain the integrity of the public meetings.
- The Board should better prepare parent representatives on the PARC to participate in the process.
- Attendance at PARC meetings could be improved.

### ***Trustee Comments***

- Review the method of choosing PARC members and be transparent about selection.
- City Councillors need not be on the committee but should be kept informed of progress.
- Choose facilitators who are experts in facilitating a process – they do not need to be experts about an area or TDSB.
- Remember a facilitator has a key role and looks at the process from the outside.
- Share roles with Parent Councils and get community up to speed so that the community can be more supportive and engaged versus surprised.
- Limit the number of reviews done at one time to ensure staff resources are not stretched.
- Align the role of the Toronto Lands Corporation and process with the Board's PARC process in terms of public disclosure of sites to be sold.

---

Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 20, February 28, 2011  
Pupil Accommodation Review Process Revisions [1726]

### Pupil Accommodation Review Process Revisions

#### (a) Pre Pupil Accommodation Review Process

##### *Long-Term Student Accommodation Plan*

Pupil Accommodation Reviews must be a part of a larger system view. This system view can then be further defined by a planning area and the strategic fit of program, facilities and enrolment. The driver of future reviews will be a Long-Term Student Accommodation Plan. This plan will be comprised of key components such as placement of existing programs, the development of new programs, current and projected enrolment, demographics, utilization rates, facility condition and maintenance. This plan will be presented to Board in September 2011 and will be updated annually.

##### *Local Feasibility Studies*

The Long-Term Student Accommodation Plan will support the identification and timing of Local Feasibility Studies. The membership of the Local Feasibility Teams will be expanded to include more staff from central departments such as Facility Services, Strategic Building and Renewal, and Teaching and Learning. The Local Feasibility Teams will gather input regarding the use of space in areas under review from other departments such as Continuing Education, French, Full Service Schools, Safe and Caring Schools, Section Programs, and Special Education and will consider school needs such as Child Care and Full Day Kindergarten. Having more input at this stage will ensure that different needs are identified before a public review begins.

Comprehensive Local Feasibility Studies will ensure that the appropriate grouping of schools is appropriately represented in a Pupil Accommodation Review.

Where warranted, once a Local Feasibility Team completes its due diligence, staff will present a report to the Board seeking approval to launch Pupil Accommodation Reviews.

#### (b) Pupil Accommodation Review Process

##### *Membership of Pupil Accommodation Review Committee*

While the superintendent of education will continue to act as chair of the Pupil Accommodation Review Committee, changes will be made to the membership. The City Councillor will be kept informed of the process on an ongoing basis. Secondary student representatives will continue to be members of elementary school reviews but when secondary schools are named in an Accommodation Review, two students from each secondary school will be chosen as members to represent their school. The role of all members will be clarified.

##### *Support to Committee*

The superintendent of education will continue to be supported by a facilitator but the facilitator's role will be redefined. The facilitator will be an expert in facilitation rather than a subject expert and will adapt engagement strategies to meet the needs of different communities.

---

Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 20, February 28, 2011  
Pupil Accommodation Review Process Revisions [1726]

A central staff committee will be established to support the superintendent of education on an ongoing basis. This committee will provide expertise to the superintendent of education to provide assistance and support throughout the review. The committee will include departments such as Professional Learning, Training and Leadership Development, Model Schools for Inner City, and Parent and Community Involvement.

Team building activities will be added to the initial working meetings of the committee to help foster positive group dynamics.

#### *Mandate of Committee*

The mandate of the committee will be reinforced so that all members are clear about the role of the committee. The message that the committee makes recommendations to help inform the Board of Trustees but it is the Board that makes any final decisions will be reinforced.

#### *Parameters*

The parameters within which the committee will do its work will be clarified. Based on the extensive work performed by the Local Feasibility Team, staff will continue to provide a preferred staff option or options as a starting point (consistent with Ministry of Education guideline) and the committee and the community will have more opportunities to generate and discuss options.

Information regarding financial constraints, revenue sources and/or funding strategies, potential partnerships, and facility upgrades will be presented to the committee so that it is aware of the implications of any recommendation it makes. A clearer rationale for the inclusion of schools in the review will be provided and will be supported by a more comprehensive local feasibility undertaking.

The committee will also have the ability to make recommendations regarding boundary changes as a result of area reconfigurations.

#### *Information Presented to Committee Members*

Every effort will be made to ensure that information is presented in plain language. A glossary of terms will be provided and acronyms will be avoided. Materials will be sent to committee members in advance of working meetings so that they are able to read the materials in advance.

#### *Time*

Longer and more flexible timelines will be available to committees if required or requested. Implications of significantly extending dates will also be shared.

#### *Community Participation*

The Board has an obligation to solicit community participation within the parameters of the review process. Given the uniqueness of communities, different strategies will be used to increase community participation at public meetings and to increase understanding of the process.

---

Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 20, February 28, 2011  
Pupil Accommodation Review Process Revisions [1726]

Planning staff will coordinate regular, ongoing meetings with the superintendent of education to discuss the Accommodation Review process and to design strategies to meet local needs.

The Community and Parent Involvement and the Model Schools for Inner City departments will assist in providing assistance in this area.

(c) Post Pupil Accommodation Review Process

*Community Meetings After the Committee Has Completed Its Work*

The past practice of holding a community meeting to share staff's response to the Pupil Accommodation Review Committee's recommendations and to share information about next steps including the opportunity to make deputations will be incorporated into the Pupil Accommodation Review Procedure.

At the community meeting, staff will also share recommendations relating to deeming a school site surplus to the needs of the Board, the sale of the site, disposition parameters, minor school name changes required to reflect new grade configurations, and proposed implementation timelines.

*Communication of Board Decision*

The past practice of sending letters to parents to communicate the Board's decision to close a school will be included in the Pupil Accommodation Review Procedure. A summary of the Board's decisions and the letter to parents will be posted on the board's website and the school's website.

*Role of Others Following Board Decision*

The Strategic Building and Renewal department will establish a Local School Community Design Team to provide input about facility upgrades to receiving schools. Should a school site be deemed surplus for sale or lease, the Toronto Lands Corporation plays a role.

The roles and responsibilities of the Strategic Building and Renewal department and the Toronto Lands Corporation will be included in the letter sent to parents. These areas will also be requested to maintain an ongoing dialogue with the community and to post pertinent information on the Board's website.

*For the Board's decision see page 85.*

Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 20, February 28, 2011  
Staff Allocation 2011-12 [1719]

### Staff Allocation 2011-12 [1719]

*As presented to the Planning and Priorities Committee on February 28, 2011 (see page 85).*

Board decisions about school-based staff allocations must take into account legislative requirements including the Ministry of Education's Primary Class Size (PCS) and class size system average directives, Collective Agreement provisions, and available resources as well as make an appropriate balance between maintaining stability and responding to changing needs. In certain circumstances Board resolutions specifically designate or remove staff resources to particular schools such as a decision to close a school.

Wherever possible beyond those parameters, a commitment is made to provide decision-making at the Family of Schools level with respect to distribution.

An administrative holdback of approximately of 1% of Secondary Teachers, 0.5% of Elementary Teachers and a small allocation of support staff will not be released until the actual enrolment reaches projection. It is included in the totals presented.

This report is before the Board at this time because staff allocation decisions are required by early March in order to be ready to open schools in September 2011, implement the staffing process as defined by Collective Agreements and prepare for budget setting.

The funding source for the school-based staffing is the Province's grants for 2011-2012. The cost for the teacher and support staff allocations is based on projected 2011-2012 average salary and benefits as follows:

	<u>Costs (\$)</u>	<u>Allocations</u>	
Elementary Teachers	950,684,718	10,386.5	
Secondary Teachers	556,586,031	5,900.0	
Vice-principals – Elementary	29,021,182	257	*
Vice-principals - Secondary and Junior High Schools	21,058,961	176	
Educational Assistants – Regular	23,199,290	493.5	
Early Childhood Educators	14,561,988	272.0	
Special Education Classroom Supports	127,862,931	2,494.0	
School Office Clerical	73,878,982	1,224.0	
School-Based Safety Monitors	6,134,542	124.0	**
Lunchroom Supervisors	12,394,942	1,677.0	***
Aquatics Instructors	5,045,702	96.0	
Food Services Assistants	1,883,771	44.0	
Caretaking	145,223,383	2,195.5	
Total	1,967,536,828		

\* includes 93 Vice-principals with half-time teaching responsibilities;

\*\* does not include additional allocations purchased through safety monies; and

\*\*\* includes FDK Lunchroom Supervisors.



Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 20, February 28, 2011  
Staff Allocation 2011-12 [1719]

Timely approval of staff allocation levels will ensure that staffing for schools is in place for September 2011.

Site surplus declaration begins on 11 April 2011 for Elementary Teachers and Secondary Teachers. For Support Staff, site surplus notifications begin on 21 March 2011.

Staffing calendars for the employee groups have been prepared in concert with the appropriate bargaining unit representatives.

(a) Teachers – Elementary

Source of Funding: Pupil Foundation, Primary Class Size, Special Education, Language, Teacher Qualification and Experience, Learning Opportunities Grants and Education Program Other Grant for Full-Day Kindergarten. Additional staff as allocated through Board Resolutions.

2010-11 Actual: 10,299.5 FTE

2011-12 Proposed: 10,386.5 FTE

	<u>2010-11</u> <u>Actual</u>	<u>2011-12</u> <u>Projected</u>
Regular Program (including FDK)	7,527.5	7,632.5
ESL*	353.5	341.0
Learning Opportunities – Grade 4 to 8	115.0	115.0
Literacy–Reading Recovery/Lit-Num Coaches**	166.0	166.0
Library	262.0	261.0
Guidance	60.0	60.0
Special Education	1,699.0	1,699.0
Model Schools for Inner Cities	23.0	24.0
Section 23	46.0	46.0
Safe and Caring Schools	6.0	6.0
Profile Teachers	41.5	36.0
Total	10,299.5	10,386.5

\*Board motion requires the expenditure of 75% of the ESL portion of the Language Grant on ESL programming. The change in the proposed ESL teacher allocation reflects the projected change in that grant.

\*\*Literacy Numeracy Coaches are currently Elementary Teachers, however through a posting process these roles may be filled with either Elementary or Secondary Teachers.

Criteria for System Standard:

The teacher allocation formula is enrolment-based with consideration for Special Education, Library, Learning Opportunities Index and ESL:

Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 20, February 28, 2011  
Staff Allocation 2011-12 [1719]

- A very small reduction in elementary of 0.4% is projected. However, total teachers are increasing due to the increase in preparation time, the PDT class average in grades 4 to 8 and the increase due to Full-Day Kindergarten (FDK);
- With the exception of FDK classes, JK to Grade 3 classes are capped at 20 students for 90% of classes and at 23 students for 10% of classes; Grades 4 – 8 required to have a system average class size of 23.4 students; FDK classes are required to have a system average of 26 students;
- The actual total Special Education teacher allocation may change minimally because of allocations for other Special Education supports.

*Note: System average means that there are many classes above and many classes below. Cap means no classes will higher than 23.*

(b) Teachers – Secondary

Source of Funding: Pupil Foundation, Special Education, Language, Teacher Qualification and Experience, and Learning Opportunities Grants.

2010-11 Actual: 5,920.5 FTE

2011-12 Proposed: 5,900.0 FTE

	<u>2010-11</u> <u>Actual</u>	<u>2011-12</u> <u>Projected</u>
Regular Program	4,516.5	4500.0
ESL / ESL Reception*	228.0	228.0
Learning Opportunities	92.0	92.0
Library	101.0	101.0
Guidance	250.0	250.0
Special Education	572.0	572.0
Section 23	69.0	69.0
Safe and Caring Schools	17.0	17.0
Model Schools for Inner Cities	0.0	2.0
Attendance/SALEP/CIC/Alternative Programs	24.0	24.0
Profile Teachers	39.0	33.0
E-learning	12.0	12.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,920.5</b>	<b>5,900.0</b>

\*Board motion requires the expenditure of 75% of the ESL portion of the Language Grant on ESL programming. The change in the proposed ESL teacher allocation reflects the projected change in that grant.

Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 20, February 28, 2011  
Staff Allocation 2011-12 [1719]

Criteria for System Standard:

The teacher allocation formula is enrolment-based and driven at each school by level of program chosen by students, with consideration for Special Education, Section 23, Library, Guidance, Learning Opportunities Index and ESL:

- A very small reduction in secondary enrolment of 0.4% is projected;
- Classroom Teachers are allocated to meet the class sizes in the Collective Agreement, which are capped by level of program;
- The actual total allocation of Special Education teachers may change minimally because of allocations for other Special Education supports.

(c) Vice-principals – Elementary

Source of Funding: School Foundation, Special Education, Learning Opportunities and Language Grants.

2010-11 Actual: 257 headcount

2011-12 Proposed: 257 headcount\*

*\*Reflects 93 Vice-principals with half-time teaching responsibilities (46.5 FTE teachers)*

Criteria for System Standard:

The system standard allocation is driven by data from 31 October of the **preceding** year including:

- School enrolment JK to 8;
- Middle school enrolment;
- French Immersion;
- Learning Opportunities Index.

Criteria for Local Decision Making:

Superintendents of education have the discretion to reassign Elementary Vice-principals within the Family using the following criteria:

- Student achievement;
- Program type: dual track (French Immersion and Regular; middle; JK-5; JK-6, JK-8);
- Presence of Special Education programs or an ESL component;
- Linkage with an alternative school;
- Program needs or initiatives already underway;
- Other local school issues.

(d) Vice-principals – Secondary and Junior High Schools

Source of Funding: School Foundation, Special Education, Learning Opportunities and Language Grants.

2010-11 Actual: 177.0 FTE

Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 20, February 28, 2011  
Staff Allocation 2011-12 [1719]

2011-12 Proposed: 176 FTE

Criteria for System Standard:

Secondary Vice-principals have been allocated to schools based on the number of full-time equivalent teachers assigned to each school on 31 October of the previous year. The number of full-time equivalent teachers assigned to a secondary school reflects the programs offered at the school as well as the enrolment.

0-22.0 FTE teachers:	0 Vice-principal
22.5-45.0 FTE teachers:	1 Vice-principal
45.5-109.5 FTE teachers:	2 Vice-principals
110+ FTE teachers:	3 Vice-principals

Criteria for Local Decision-making:

Vice-principals are assigned outside the criteria for system standards at local discretion for program needs, including:

- Special Education;
- Adult Education;
- Alternative Secondary Schools;
- Alternative Programs;
- Other local school issues.

(e) Educational Assistants - Regular Program

Source of Funding: The bulk of the funding Opportunities Grant as well as Language Grants. The Pupil Foundation Grant generates only 31 FTE.

2010-11 Actual: 504.5 FTE

2011-12 Proposed: 493.5 FTE

- includes 69.0 FTE pre-allocated to French Immersion and Alternative Programs
- includes 424.5 FTE to Educational Assistants – Regular Programs

Criteria for System Standard:

- The term “Educational Assistant - Regular Program” includes Educational Assistants – French Immersion (pre-allocated as 59), Educational Assistants – Regular Program (primarily in Kindergartens) and Educational Assistants – Alternative and Safe Schools (pre-allocated as 10).
- A previous Board resolution directs reduction in the job classification of Educational Assistant – Regular Program by an annual attrition.

Criteria for Local Decision-Making:

Of the total number of Educational Assistants – Regular Program:

Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 20, February 28, 2011  
Staff Allocation 2011-12 [1719]

- One third of the allocation of EA-Regular Program is assigned to Family of Schools (FOS) based on Learning Opportunity Index (LOI);
- The remaining 2/3 is provided to the FOS proportionately based on JK/SK enrolment; and
- All of the allocations are provided to the FOS for distribution to the schools within each FOS.

Retraining Opportunities:

- Staff has engaged in conversations with CUPE 4400 around a plan to provide retraining opportunities to these employees to enable them to transition into other job classifications over the next few years, with the intention that in 2015 the allocation will be reduced to reflect the level of provincial funding.
- Currently, an ECE (Early Childhood Educators) and DSW (Developmental Support Worker) course is being offered through Humber College to TDSB employees.

(f) Early Childhood Educators

Source of Funding: Education Program Other (EPO) Grant.

2010-11 Allocation to FDK: 199 FTE

2010-11 Proposed: 272 FTE

Criteria for System Standard:

- 1 Early Childhood Educator is funded for to each Full-Day Kindergarten class with a projected class size of 16 or more;
- Additional Early Childhood Educations may be allocated for *Before and After School Programs* (where applicable) above 272, funded through user fees.

Special Education Classroom Support

Source of Funding: Special Education

2010-11 Actual: 2,494 FTE

2011-12 Proposed: 2,494 FTE

Criteria for System Standard

- School Services – Special Education assigns classroom support positions such as specialized Educational Assistant, Noon Hour Assistant, Child & Youth Worker, Special Needs Assistant, Section 23 and Individual Student Support Assistant – SIPS, support to address identified student and school needs. Students with special needs may require more than one support.

Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 20, February 28, 2011  
Staff Allocation 2011-12 [1719]

Criteria for Local Decision-Making

- The actual total Special Education support staff allocation may change minimally because of allocations for other Special Education supports such as teachers.

(g) School Office Clerical

Source of Funding: School Foundation, Special Education, Learning Opportunities and Declining Enrolment Grants.

2010-11 Actual: 1,232.5 FTE

2011-12 Proposed: 1,224.0 FTE  
*\*reflects declining enrolment and school closures*

Criteria for System Standard:

The staff allocation committee, in consultation with superintendents of education and the Toronto School Administrators' Association, is working on a system standard allocation model. CUPE 4400 is aware that this process is underway. Consultation will continue including Trustees, with a target for implementation of September 2012.

As a transition, during 2011-2012, a small holdback will be used to address emerging issues with minimal disruption. Schools will be assigned at a minimum 1.0 FTE Office Administrator; stand alone elementary alternative schools will be allocated a 1.0 FTE Office Administrator; other elementary alternative schools will have a minimum allocation of 0.5 FTE office clerical; and secondary alternative schools will be allocated a minimum of 1.0 FTE office clerical.

Criteria for Local Decision-Making

To allow for local decision-making, superintendents of education will have the flexibility to move allocations within their Family of Schools to address local needs.

(h) School-Based Safety Monitors

Source of Funding: Safe Schools and the Learning Opportunities Grants to support funding of these staff.

2010-11 Actual: 125.0 + a portion of the financial equivalent of 89.0 FTE

2011-12 Proposed: 124.0 + a portion of the financial equivalent of 89.0 FTE

Criteria for System Standard:

- FTE in every regular secondary school.

Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 20, February 28, 2011  
Staff Allocation 2011-12 [1719]

- The remainder is allocated through a quadrant-based decision-making process with the support of Safe & Caring Schools Administrators.

Criteria for Local Decision-making:

- Board approved the following in March 2008  
*Therefore, with regard to School-based Staff Allocation, 2008-09, the Board decided that the following staffing levels of school-based staff for 2008-2009 be approved: 124.0 FTE positions in the same model for distribution as 2007-08 except for that allocation includes an increase of 26.0 FTE, as shown on page 161, and additionally the financial equivalent of 89 FTE School-based Safety Monitors for the purpose of enhancing school safety*
- The allocation responds to the degree of need established by the application of a number of criteria. These criteria were established following system-wide consultation by an advisory committee. They are largely data driven and include:
  - Discipline (suspensions, expulsions);
  - Safe school transfers;
  - Trespass notices/letters;
  - Special Education;
  - Learning Opportunities Index;
  - School community (location, facility, community);
  - Student enrolment.

(i) Lunchroom Supervisors

Source of Funding: The Ministry Funding Model provides no direct funding for these positions. The Board uses the Learning Opportunities Grants to support funding of these staff.

2010-11 Actual: 1,419 headcount

2011-12 Proposed: 1,405\* headcount  
*\*reflects a reduction due to school closures and declining enrolment*

Criteria for System Standard:

- assigned to every Elementary and Junior High School

Criteria for Local Decision-Making:

- A Board-approved formula determines most of the allocation and is based on the following:

<u>Grades 1-8 Headcount</u>	<u>Allocation</u>
1-99	1
100-224	2
225-449	3

Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 20, February 28, 2011  
Staff Allocation 2011-12 [1719]

450-699	4
700-949	5
950-1199	6
1200+	7

The remaining available allocation is available to superintendents of education, working with the principals in their Families of Schools, to assign, using the following guidelines:

- Patterns in students remaining for lunch;
- Physical lay-out of lunch facilities in schools.

#### Lunchroom Supervisors – FDK

Source of Funding: The Ministry currently funds the implementation incremental costs of Full Day Kindergarten (FDK) through an EPO grant.

2010-11 Actual: 210 headcount

2011-12 Proposed: 272 headcount\*

#### Criteria for System Standard:

- \*For FDK classrooms that do not offer a *Before and After School Program* requiring an additional Early Childhood Education (ECE), a Lunchroom Supervisor may be assigned as needed.
- The allocation for 2011-2012 cannot be confirmed until confirmation of *Before and After School Programs* are determined, based on sufficient interest in a parent fee cost recovery program, which occurs during in the spring of the preceding school year.

#### (j) Aquatics Instructors – Regular Program

Source of Funding: Professional/Paraprofessional Supports portion of the Foundation Grant.

2010-11 Actual: 96.0 FTE

2011-12 Proposal: 96.0 FTE

#### Criteria for System Standard:

Legal requirements (i.e. two certified adults to be “on deck” during pool operation) drive the staff allocation. In secondary schools, the second certified adult is a qualified teacher.

#### (k) Food Services Assistants

Source of Funding: Professional/Paraprofessional Supports portion of the Foundation Grant.

2010-11 Actual: 44.0 FTE

2011-12 Proposed: 44.0 FTE



Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 20, February 28, 2011  
Staff Allocation 2011-12 [1719]

Criteria for System Standard:

- Food Services Assistants are assigned to those secondary schools where food services is part of the curriculum.

(l) Caretaking

Source of Funding: School Operations Grant.

2010-11 Actual: 2,198.0 FTE

2011-12 Proposed: 2,195.5 FTE

*\*As a result of school closures and reduction of square footage, allocation is reduced by 5.50 FTE, 3.0 FTE have been reinvested.*

Criteria for System Standard:

- School caretaking staff form a part of the total caretaking complement which includes provision for non-school sites.
- A Board-approved formula assigns site allocations on the following components:
  - Base allocation factor (calculated using square footage);
  - Portable factor (to compensate for additional time spent servicing portables and portapaks);
  - Permit factor (for high permit activity);
  - Childcare factor (existence of a childcare centre);
  - Legal/operational complexity factor (such as guarded steam plants or complex/unique plants);
  - Enrolment factor;
  - Swimming pool factor.

Criteria for Local Decision-Making

- The equivalent of 12.0 FTE is provided to superintendents of education and family team leaders.

<u>ELEMENTARY TEACHING</u> <u>2011 TIMELINES – TRANSFER AND SURPLUS</u>	
November, 2010	School Staffing Committees are established
First week of February 2011	Verification exercise for the purpose of determining seniority for Elementary teachers
2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> weeks of February	Distribution of procedures for Transfer of Elementary Teachers
March 1	Deadline: Part-time teaching assignment or an extension of the part-time

Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 20, February 28, 2011  
Staff Allocation 2011-12 [1719]

	teaching assignment for 2011-12
Prior to March 1	Staff meetings held to discuss school surplus and appeal procedures
Week of March 7	Principals receive school Seniority Lists
March 21	Four Over Five applications due
Week of March 21	Anticipated release of Teacher Allocation pending March Board approval
April 1	Deadline: Leave of Absence or an Extension to a Leave of Absence for 2011-12 Deadline: Teachers on leave to indicate their intent to return
April 6	School Closure Transfer Process Begins
By April 8	Teacher Requested Transfers
April 11	School Surplus Declaration
April 15	Principals notify Employee Services of School Surplus and submit all known vacancies to Employee Services
Prior to April 15	School Staffing Models approved prior to April 15 by Family of Schools superintendent of education
April 20	Administrative Placements
April 26 to May 5	First Vacancy Posting
May 15	Deadline: Letters of resignation/retirement
May 17 to 25	Second Vacancy Posting
May 25	Teacher Transfer Process ends
May 25	Remaining School Surplus Teachers placed as vacancies occur; interim notification to Board Surplus Teachers
May 26 - June 10	Teacher Exchange Transfer
June 30	Confirmation of Board Surplus Teachers

<u>SECONDARY TEACHING</u> <u>2011 TIMELINES – TRANSFER AND SURPLUS</u>	
January 29, 2011	Section 1.01 Seniority Verification Forms to be distributed to teachers
February 2	P.O.R Round 2 Posting
February 4	Teachers return Seniority Verification Forms to principal
February 8	Information for Seniority Lists to be returned to Secondary Teaching Office Deadline for Qualification Review Form (Noon)
February 14	Blue Binder Information Session for New Administrators
March 1	Seniority Lists to be available in schools Deadline: Applications for Leave of Absence and Half-time Teaching Without Pay Requests (Noon) Deadline: Full-time Teaching Requests (Noon)

Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 20, February 28, 2011  
Staff Allocation 2011-12 [1719]

<u>SECONDARY TEACHING</u> <u>2011 TIMELINES – TRANSFER AND SURPLUS</u>	
	Deadline: Transfer applications (Noon)
March 21 (tentative)	Blue Binder Highlights & Staff Allocation Roll Out
March 23	P.O.R Round 3 Posting
March 31	Applications for Secondment requests should be submitted by the end of March 2011 and no later than 30 June 2011 Deadline: Facilitated Transfer Requests
April 4	Principals to inform teachers they are tentatively surplus to the school Tentative school surplus, staffing summary, vacancies, teacher timetables to Secondary Teaching Office
April 15	Principals inform teachers in writing that they are surplus to school
April 20	P.O.R Round 4 Posting
April 27	Meeting with teachers regarding school/program closing
May 2	School/Program Closing report vacancy choices (9:00 a.m.)
May 3	School/Program Closing – Placement Meeting
May 4	First Teaching Posting
May 10	First Teaching Posting at Noon
May 11, 12, 13, 16	Section 1.02 First Teaching Posting Interviews will be held
May 17	Principals inform Secondary Teaching Office of successful candidates
May 15	Deadline: Notice of Retirement (as per Collective Agreement)
May 19	Identification of Pull Backs (Noon)
May 24	Deadline: Withdrawal of Transfer Requests (Noon) Confirmation of Pull Backs
May 26	Board Wide All Day Transfer Committee Meeting
May 30	Transfer/Quadrant Placement – NW and SW
May 31	Transfer/Quadrant Placement – NE and SE
June 1	P.O.R Round 5 Posting Final Transfer Meeting
June 3, 6, 7	Board wide placement/bumping meetings
June 9	Teachers advised tentatively surplus to Board/Teachers advised of new placements Beginning of MAPS process
June 13	Second Teaching Posting
June 17	Second Teaching Posting closes (Noon)
June 20, 21, 22	Second Teaching Posting Interviews will be held
June 23	Principals inform Secondary Teaching Office of successful candidates
June 30	Notification to Teachers Surplus to Board/New Placement
July 4	Surplus Teachers' Information Meeting (10 a.m.)
July 6	Board Wide Placement Meeting
July 8	Section 1.03 Deadline: Surplus Teacher Information Forms returned to Secondary Teaching Office

Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 20, February 28, 2011  
Staff Allocation 2011-12 [1719]

<u>SECONDARY TEACHING</u> <u>2011 TIMELINES – TRANSFER AND SURPLUS</u>	
August 16	Board wide placement meetings resume
September 1	Final Deadline for Pull Back and Placement (Noon) Final Confirmation of MAP (Noon)
October 15	Deadline: Leave Applications for Semester II

<u>SUBJECT TO REVISION</u> <u>UNIT C ANNUAL STAFFING PROCESS</u> <u>2011-12 FISCAL STAFFING YEAR</u> <u>Calendar of Significant Dates</u>	
February 21, 2011	Notification by Academic Services to Employee Services of movement of Special Education programs
March 7	Employee Services offers option of transfer to Educational Assistants in Special Education programs that are being moved
March 9	Board Meeting for regular program school-based allocation approval
March 14-18	Release of individual school allocations and regional allocations
March 14-18	MARCH BREAK
March 21	Draft Site Surplus and Vacancy Reports sent to principals and Managers
March 21-25	Employee Site Surplus Letters + Brochures available for delivery
March 28	Vacancies posted (includes opportunities for Lateral Transfer)
April 5	Job Postings close
April 8	Job Posting Application packages/notifications of lateral transfer available to principals/managers
April 15	Early consideration for full-year applications for Leave of Absence
April 20	Identification of Board Surplus
April 21	Interviews completed and recommendations sent to Employee Services by principals/managers
April 22	GOOD FRIDAY
April 25	EASTER MONDAY
April 27	Outstanding job competitions rescinded and vacancies moved to surplus procedures
April 27-29	Board Surplus Declaration Employee Letters + Brochures available for delivery
April 27-29	Employee Services co-ordinate multiple offers to employees and confirm with principals/Managers
May 2-6	Employee Services drop-in Open House for surplus employees
May 6-19	Notification of lay-off
May 11	Surplus Employee Information Forms to be returned to Employee Services
May 18	Staffing Committee begins placements

Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 20, February 28, 2011  
Staff Allocation 2011-12 [1719]

### Dates Specific to Special Needs Assistants

February 25, 2011	All Special Needs Assistants receive Information Forms and Brochure
TBD	Release of Regional Allocations
March 7	Employee Services drop-in Open House for Special Needs Assistants regarding staffing process
March 14	Deadline for principals to submit requests for exceptional circumstances consideration
March 14	Deadline date for return of Information Forms
March 14-18	MARCH BREAK
April 22	GOOD FRIDAY
April 25	EASTER MONDAY
April 27-29	Board Surplus Declaration Employee Letters + Brochures available for delivery
June 1	Specific School Allocations released
June 3	Staffing Committee begins placements of SNA's
June 3	Notification of lay-off

<u>SUBJECT TO REVISION</u> <u>UNIT D CUPE 4400 ANNUAL STAFFING PROCESS</u> <u>2011-12 FISCAL STAFFING YEAR</u>	
April, 2011	Section 1.04 Consultation re caretaker Allocations
May, 2011	Section 1.05 Caretaking allocations released to schools
Mid May	Section 1.06 Facility Services to report head caretaker, shift leader, caretaker and part-time cleaner vacancies
May 24	Surplus identification reported to Employee Services
May 30	Site surplus and system surplus notifications to all employees by registered mail
June 1	Posting: head caretakers, shift leaders, caretakers, part-time cleaners
June 24	Placement Meeting
TBD	Effective date of Transfer for head caretakers and shift leaders
TBD	Effective date of Transfer for caretakers and part-time cleaners

<u>SUBJECT TO REVISION</u> <u>UNIT A (OSSTF-PSSP)</u> <u>ANNUAL STAFFING PROCESS TIMELINE</u> <u>2011-12 FISCAL STAFFING YEAR</u>	
February 28, 2011	Applications for Self Funded Leave Plan
March 9	Board Meeting for regular program school-based allocation approval
March 14 – 18	Release of school, regional and central allocations

Planning and Priorities Committee, Report No. 20, February 28, 2011  
Staff Allocation 2011-12 [1719]

<u>SUBJECT TO REVISION</u> <u>UNIT A (OSSTF-PSSP)</u> <u>ANNUAL STAFFING PROCESS TIMELINE</u> <u>2011-12 FISCAL STAFFING YEAR</u>	
March 14 – 18	WINTER BREAK
March 31	Centrally-assigned staff declare interest in assignment to different groupings of schools and/or different geographic regions
March 31	Early consideration for full-year Leaves of Absence without Pay
March 31	Applications for Job Sharing/Job Exchange and temporary reductions to part-time status
April 22	GOOD FRIDAY
April 25	EASTER MONDAY
April 26 – 29	Draft surplus/vacancy reports for school-based staff sent to principals and Supervisors by Employee Services
May 2 – 13	Staffing Committee begins placement meetings-central vacancies release to job posting process
May 2	Surplus declaration letters and Placement Preference Forms provided to school-based and regionally-based Employees
May 9	Surplus Employees return completed placement forms to Employee Services
May 17	Staffing Committee continues placement meetings
May 24	School-based Surplus placements finalized
May 30	Release of remaining vacancies to job posting process

*For the Board's decision see page 85.*

**Special Education Advisory Committee**  
**Report No. 19 (Part 1), February 14, 2011**

A meeting of the Special Education Advisory Committee was convened on Monday, February 14, 2011 from 7:10 to 8:55 p.m., in the Boardroom, 5050 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario, with Paul Cross presiding.

The following committee members were present: Diana Avon, Richard Carter, Paul Cross, Dr. Robert Gates, Clovis Grant, Steven Lynette, Anita Nielsen, Tammy Simon and Trustee John Hastings. Regrets were received from Loris Bennett, Bonnie Buxton and Trustees Chris Glover and Howard Kaplan.

The following committee alternates were present: Andrea Boulden, Sheelagh Hysenaj and Gal Koren.

Part A: Committee Recommendations

No matters to report

Part B: Information Only

**1. Creation of Position of Parent/Guardian Facilitator, Special Education**

The matter, including the recommendations of SEAC, will be presented for consideration when the staff report requested by the Board on September 7, 2010, is placed on an agenda for consideration.

**2. Staff Allocation**

SEAC received an update from staff (see SEAC:011B, page 1) on the trends and issues related to the delivery of intensive support programs for students with special needs for 2011-12.

**3. Business Arising from the Minutes of January 17, 2011**

(a) SEAC Brochure Distribution

Paul Cross reported that the SEAC brochures were distributed to associations and will be circulated to agencies that deal with children. Members were invited to suggest organizations for inclusion on the distribution list.

---

Special Education Advisory Committee, Report No. 19 (Part 1), February 14, 2011

(b) Correspondence Protocol

Paul Cross spoke to the process for handling correspondence received by the chair.

#### **4. Procedural Bylaws Subcommittee**

Steven Lynette reported that a summary of the Board's and SEAC's bylaws will be shared shortly with subcommittee members, following which recommendations will be presented to SEAC.

#### **5. Correspondence**

- Email dated January 17, 2011 from the Toronto Family Network re its correspondence on lack of academic programming, CAS
- Email dated January 27, 2011 from Elaine Chu re a private matter
- Email dated January 27, 2011 from the Toronto Family Network re School Health Support Services Review of Final Report and Survey
- Email dated February 8, 2011 from the Toronto Family Network re Follow up re: Toronto Family Network Correspondence Regarding SEAC November 15, 2010 Minutes re requests for copies of various items
- Email dated February 8, 2011 from Norah Lynn McIntyre, Executive Director, VOICE for Hearing Impaired Children re guidelines for programs and services for students with hearing loss.

#### **6. Senior Superintendent's Report**

The senior superintendent presented a report (see SEAC:011B, page 3) to the Committee. A presentation on the use of smart boards will be made at future meeting.

#### **7. Central Coordinating Principal's Report**

The central coordinating principal presented a report (see SEAC:011B, page 4) to the Committee.

#### **8. Professional Support Services Report**

The manager of Professional Support Services presented a report (see SEAC:011B, page 6) to the Committee.

#### **9. Local SEAC Association Reports**

(a) FASworld Toronto

Gal Koren reported that FASworld was involved in the development of a new manual entitled *Understanding Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD): A Resource for Education Practitioners in Ontario*. Copies were distributed to interested members.



---

Special Education Advisory Committee, Report No. 19 (Part 1), February 14, 2011

(b) Epilepsy Toronto

Steven Lynette reported that Epilepsy Toronto will hold its annual family retreat towards the end of February, 2011 and Purple Day on March 26, 2011 to celebrate and raise awareness of epilepsy.

(c) Learning Disabilities Association of Toronto District

A workshop for parents and educators entitled “The Motivation Breakthrough: 6 Secrets to Turning on the Tuned-Out Child” will be held on February 23, 2011. The presenter is Richard Lavoie. A copy of the brochure will be emailed to members.

## **10. Scarborough Parent Council**

Trustee Hastings and Steven Lynette volunteered to represent SEAC at the Scarborough Parent Conference 2011 at the exhibitor booth on April 30, 2011 at the Scarborough Civic Centre. Associations were asked to bring their material for display at the conference to the next meeting.

Paul Cross  
Chair of the Committee

**Received March 9, 2011 (see page 6)**

## **Human Resources and Professional Learning Committee**

### **Report No. 14, February 16, 2011**

A meeting of the Human Resources and Professional Learning Committee convened on Wednesday February 16, 2011, from 6:09 to 7:45 p.m. in Committee Room A, 5050 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario, with Trustee Elizabeth Moyer presiding.

The following members were present: Trustees Elizabeth Moyer (Chair), Jerry Chadwick, Howard Goodman and Sheila Ward. Regrets were received from Trustee Stephnie Payne. Also present were Trustees Sheila Cary-Meagher, Chris Glover and Gerri Gershon.

The Committee decided to report and recommend as follows:

#### Part A: Committee Recommendations

No matters to report

#### Part B: Information Only

### **1. Maintaining Statistics of Job Applicants and Newly Hired Employees [1717]**

On motion of Trustee Goodman, the Committee received a staff report (see page 116)) presenting a report on the demographics of the internal successful and unsuccessful job applicants and the retention and promotion of newly hired employees in accordance with the Board's employment equity policy.

### **2. Employment Equity**

On motion of Trustee Goodman, the Committee received an update from staff on employment equity and heard a staff presentation.

### **3. Draft Supervisory Officer Performance Appraisal**

This matter was withdrawn from the agenda by staff with the agreement of the Chair of the Committee. Trustees Goodman and Ward did speak briefly to the matter however, and asked that trustees be consulted before staff reported back to Committee on this item.

### **4. Lunchroom Supervisors: Job Description and Hiring**

Staff confirmed that the possibility of providing Lunch Room Supervisors with CPR training would be reviewed.

<p><u>Part C: Ongoing Matters</u></p>
---------------------------------------

No matters to report

Trustee Elizabeth Moyer  
Chair of the Committee

**Received March 9, 2011 (see page 6)**

---

Human Resources and Professional Learning Committee, Report No. 14, February 16, 2011  
Maintaining Statistics of Job Applicants and Newly Hired Employees [1717]

Maintaining Statistics of Job Applicants and Newly Hired Employees [1717]

*As received by the Human Resources and Professional Learning Committee on February 16, 2011 (see page 114).*

On 24 May 2006, the Board decided that staff report annually on the demographics (as defined in Policy P.029: Employment Equity) of the internal successful and unsuccessful job applicants and that a report on the retention and promotion of newly hired employees be published annually.

In June 2004, the Board approved an Employment Equity Policy. In February 2005, the Board approved the establishment of an Employment Equity Office and administration of a Self-Identification Census to be completed by all employees. In June 2006 the Workforce Census took place and the results were published in March 2007.

One of the goals of the Workforce Census was to provide a baseline on which to measure future progress toward the desired goals. In keeping with this goal, Employee Services continues to administer the workforce census as a self-identification survey to all newly hired employees. The data collected on new hire employees for 2010-2011 (Chart 1 below) is based on respondents' information to the voluntary Self Identification Survey and reflects the hiring demographics. The demographic challenges are driven by the need to hire to specific assignments (e.g. 115 new elementary hires to French assignments). We will continue to encourage Faculties of Education to increase their recruitment of racialized candidates particularly in the area of French.

Moreover, (Charts 2, 3 and 4 below) provide further breakdowns and comparators for additional analysis. In particular, Chart 2 for Teacher New Hires provides a breakdown between Elementary and Secondary Teachers. Chart 3 for Teacher New Hires provides comparators with the City of Toronto Population, the Toronto Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) and the TDSB Census & Student Demographics. Chart 4 for Support Staff New Hires provides a breakdown between Unit A through E.

There is no data regarding the promotion of newly hired employees for 2010-2011 due to the requirements for promotion. Support Staff can apply for promotion following completion of the probationary period. Teachers have an opportunity to apply for promotion to a Position of Responsibility (POR) having completed two years of successful teaching experience. As per Ont. Reg. 184/97, a teacher must have 5 years successful experience to acquire the Principal's Qualifications in order to be considered for promotion to Vice-principal or Principal.

The tracking process for internal successful and unsuccessful job applicants has begun. Phase 1 oversaw the development and implementation of a demographic questionnaire for Teachers and Vice-principals seeking a promotion to the Vice-principal and Principal ranks accordingly. For the 2009/2010 VP/P promotion cycle there were a total of 108 promotions of which 18% were racial minorities and 41% were male.

Phase 2 involves the development of a demographic questionnaire to be completed for individuals seeking a Schedule II position.

Human Resources and Professional Learning Committee, Report No. 14, February 16, 2011  
 Maintaining Statistics of Job Applicants and Newly Hired Employees [1717]

Chart 1: Statistics On Respondents To Self Identification Survey

	Support Staff						Teachers				
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011		2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
	TDSB CENSUS				Respondents	TDSB CENSUS				Respondents	
Total No. of Respondents	6,797	226	119	93	191	11,237	605	403	119	485	
Female	4,843	149	77	51	164	7,978	402	296	86	357	
	71.3%	65.9%	64.7%	58.6%	89.1%	71.0%	68.0%	73.4%	72.3%	75.2%	
Male	1,954	76	42	36	20	3,259	189	102	31	118	
	28.7%	33.6%	35.3%	41.4%	10.9%	29.0%	32.0%	25.3%	26.1%	24.8%	
Aboriginal	62	1	1	2	0	101	9	4	3	3	
	0.9%	0.4%	0.8%	2.2%	0.0%	0.9%	1.5%	1.0%	2.5%	0.6%	
Racial Minorities	2,062	98	48	38	92	2,495	187	139	39	164	
	30.3%	43.4%	40.3%	40.9%	48.2%	22.2%	31.0%	34.5%	32.8%	34.1%	
Persons w/ Disabilities	419	9	8	4	8	539	41	23	4	15	
	6.2%	4.0%	6.7%	4.3%	4.3%	4.8%	9.1%	5.7%	3.4%	3.1%	
*BGLTTT Persons	n/a	3	4	0	5	483	59	20	6	23	

Human Resources and Professional Learning Committee, Report No. 14, February 16, 2011  
 Maintaining Statistics of Job Applicants and Newly Hired Employees [1717]

*Bisexual, Gay, Lesbian, Transgender, Transsexual or Two-spirited.										
New Hires					Support Staff					Teachers
Total					1,369					619

**Chart 2: Statistics On New Hire Respondents To Self Identification Survey, Breakout Between Elementary And Secondary Teachers**

Designated Groups	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011 Respondents	2010-2011 Elementary	2010-2011 Secondary
	TDSB Census						
Total No. of Respondents	11,237	867	403	119	485	329	156
Female	7,978	609	296	86	357	256	101
	71.0%	70.2%	73.4%	72.3%	75.2%	80.0%	65.2%
Male	3,259	258	102	31	118	64	54
	29.0%	29.8%	25.3%	26.1%	24.8%	20.0%	34.8%
Aboriginal	101	15	4	3	3	3	0
	0.9%	1.7%	1.0%	2.5%	0.6%	0.9%	0.0%
Racial Minorities	2,495	299	139	39	164	110	54
	22.2%	34.4%	34.5%	32.8%	34.1%	33.5%	34.6%
Persons w/ Disabilities	539	52	23	4	15	12	3
	4.8%	6.0%	5.7%	3.4%	3.1%	3.7%	1.9%
BGLTTT Persons	483	59	20	6	23	12	11
	4.3%	6.8%	5.0%	5.0%	7.0%	5.4%	10.2%
New Hires						Elementary	Secondary
Total					619	370	249

Human Resources and Professional Learning Committee, Report No. 14, February 16, 2011  
 Maintaining Statistics of Job Applicants and Newly Hired Employees [1717]

**Chart 3: Teacher Comparators**

Comparators City Of Toronto / Toronto CMA & TDSB Census And Students								TDSB Statistics On Teacher Respondents To Self Identification Survey			
	City of Toronto Population (2006)	*Toronto CMA Census 2006 Teachers	Toronto CMA Census 2006 Elem. Teachers	Toronto CMA Census 2006 Sec. Teachers	TDSB Census 2006-2007	TDSB Parent Survey K-6	TDSB Student Survey 7-12	TDSB 2007-2008	TDSB 2008-2009	TDSB 2009-2010	TDSB 2010-2011
Total No. of Respondents		74,590	47,710	26,880	11,237	n/available	n/available	867	403	119	485
Female	**51.7%	75.6%	83.8%	61.1%	71.0%	49.0%	48.0%	70.2%	73.4%	72.3%	75.2%
Male	**48.3%	24.4%	16.2%	39.0%	29.0%	51.0%	52.0%	29.8%	25.3%	26.1%	24.8%
Aboriginal	0.5%	0.5%	0.6%	0.4%	0.9%	0.1%	0.3%	1.7%	1.0%	2.5%	0.6%
Racial Minorities	***46.9%	18.5%	17.9%	19.8%	22.2%	69.0%	67.0%	34.4%	34.5%	32.8%	34.1%
Persons w/ Disabilities	n/available	n/available	n/available	n/available	4.8%	6.0%	5.0%	6.0%	5.7%	3.4%	3.1%
BGLTTT Persons	n/available	n/available	n/available	n/available	4.3%	n/available	8.0%	6.8%	5.0%	5.0%	7.0%

\* The Toronto Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) includes the following regions: the City of Toronto, east to include Pickering and Ajax, north to include Georgina, King, Caledon, New Tecumseh and Mono Townships, west to include Halton Hills, Milton and Oakville. The Toronto CMA is the smallest geographical unit for which we have workforce comparison data.

\*\* Percentage of 20-64 Age Population City of Toronto

In this analysis, the City of Toronto extends from Steeles Avenue in the north to Lake Ontario in the south and includes the former City of Etobicoke in the west and the former City of Scarborough in the east.

\*\*\* Percentage of Total Age Population, City of Toronto

Human Resources and Professional Learning Committee, Report No. 14, February 16, 2011  
 Maintaining Statistics of Job Applicants and Newly Hired Employees [1717]

Chart 4: Breakout For Support Staff - Units A Through E

	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	Respondents 2010-11	2010-2011	2010-2011	2010- 2011	2010-2011	2010-2011
Designated Groups	TDSB Census				Support Staff Units A - E	Unit A - OSSTF	Unit B	Unit C - Central	Unit D	Unit E - Maint. &
						Prof. Stud. Srvcs.	Con. Ed. Instr.	Sch. Off. Staff	Caretakers	Skilled Trades
Total No. of Respondents	6,797	226	119	93	191	23	5	156	5	2
Female	4,843	149	77	51	164	22	5	133	4	0
	71.3%	65.9%	64.7%	58.6%	89.1%	100.0%	100.0%	88.7%	80.0%	0.0%
Male	1,954	76	42	36	20	0	0	17	1	2
	28.7%	33.6%	35.3%	41.4%	10.9%	0.0%	0.0%	11.3%	20.0%	100.0%
Aboriginal	62	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0.9%	0.4%	0.8%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Racial Minorities	2,062	98	48	38	92	6	3	81	2	0
	30.3%	43.4%	40.3%	40.9%	48.2%	26.1%	60.0%	51.9%	40.0%	0.0%
Persons w/ Disabilities	419	9	8	4	8	1	0	6	0	1
	6.2%	4.0%	6.7%	4.3%	4.3%	4.4%	0.0%	3.9%	0.0%	50.0%
BGLTTT Persons	n/a	3	4	0	5	0	0	5	0	0
	n/a	1.3%	3.4%	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	0.0%	0.0%
New Hires										
Total					1,369	24	74	1,151	57	63



---

Ad Hoc Information Technology Committee, Report No. 1, January 6, 2011

## **Ad Hoc Information Technology Committee**

### **Report No. 1, January 6, 2011**

A meeting of the Ad Hoc Information Technology Committee was convened on Thursday, January 6, 2011, from 5:15 to 6:40 p.m., in the Executive Meeting Room, Fifth Floor, 5050 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario, with Sheila Ward presiding.

In attendance were: Trustees Michael Coteau, Chris Glover, Howard Goodman, Howard Kaplan, Elizabeth Moyer, Sheila Ward (Chair pro tem) and Student Trustee Zane Schwartz.<sup>1</sup> Trustees Coteau and Goodman participated by electronic means.

The Committee decided to report and recommend as follows:

<u>Part A: Committee Recommendations</u>
--

No matters to report

<u>Part B: Information Only</u>
---------------------------------

#### **1. Overview of Information Technology Services**

Staff presented information on the current status of the Board's information technology services and requirements.

Staff undertook to contact other school boards with IT needs similar to the TDSB for comparison purposes and report back to the Committee on January 25, 2011.

<u>Part C: Ongoing Matters</u>
--------------------------------

No matters to report.

Sheila Ward  
Chair of the Committee, pro tem

**Received March 9, 2011 (see page 6)**

---

<sup>1</sup> Membership will be considered at the special meeting scheduled for January 11, 2011.

---

Special Education Advisory Committee, Report No. 18, January 17, 2011

## **Special Education Advisory Committee**

### **Report No. 18, January 17, 2011**

A meeting of the Special Education Advisory Committee was convened on Monday, January 17, 2011 from 7:05 to 9:20 p.m., in the Boardroom, 5050 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario, with Paul Cross presiding.

The following committee members were present: Loris Bennett, Bonnie Buxton, Richard Carter, Paul Cross, Dr. Robert Gates, Clovis Grant, Steven Lynette, Anita Nielsen, Ginny Pearce, Tammy Simon and Trustees Chris Glover, John Hastings and Howard Kaplan.

The following committee alternates were present: Andrea Boulden, Elaine Dodsworth-Lever, Sheelagh Hysenaj, Margarita Isakov, Gal Koren, Krystyna Ross and Tina Shier.

Regrets were received from Judy Moir and Susan Musgrave.

<u>Part A: Committee Recommendations</u>
--

No matters to report

<u>Part B: Information Only</u>
---------------------------------

#### **1. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair**

Karen Forbes assumed the position of chair of the meeting and after reviewing the guidelines for the election of Chair and Vice-chair of the committee, she invited nominations for the position of Chair and Vice-chair of SEAC for the period January to December 2011.

Paul Cross and Trustee Howard Kaplan were appointed Chair and Vice-chair of SEAC, respectively, for a term ending December 2011.

Paul Cross presided over the remainder of the meeting.

#### **2. Staff Allocation**

SEAC heard an update from staff on the trends and issues related to the delivery of intensive support programs for students with special needs, as the process to allocate staff for the period 2011-12 begins.

### **3. Business Arising from the Minutes of November 15, 2010**

#### **(a) Membership Renewal Process**

Staff reported that at its meeting on December 15, 2010, the Board appointed members and alternates that will comprise SEAC for the December 2010 to November 30, 2014 term. The motion re the selection process and composition of SEAC membership, which was referred by Board to the Human Resources and Professional Learning Committee (HRPLC), was not moved by the HRPLC.

#### **(b) SEAC Response to the Ministry's SEAC Web Site**

SEAC's response was sent to the Ministry of Education electronically.

#### **(c) Creation of Position of Parent/Guardian Facilitator, Special Education**

Karen Forbes provided a process and reference material (SEAC:010B, page 1) by which to receive input from members regarding the possible position of Parent/Guardian Facilitator, Special Education. After discussion, members were invited to review the material and submit suggestions to Karen Forbes, who will present a report on suggestions and research at the next meeting.

### **4. Trustees' Reports**

Trustee Glover:

- Budget discussions were underway at the Provincial level. Deputations will be heard on February 1, 2011. Visit the Government's web site for more information.
- A forum on Special Education is being planned for Ward 2. Discussions are underway regarding its format.

### **5. Subcommittee Membership**

A list providing information on the role of the various subcommittees was circulated and members were invited to advise Margo Ratsep which subcommittees they wished to join. Those interested in returning to a subcommittee were also asked to inform Margo Ratsep of their intention.

### **6. Reports/Updates from Representatives on TDSB and other Committees**

#### **(a) Membership and Bylaws Subcommittee**

Steven Lynette reported that the subcommittee created a comparison between the Board's and SEAC's bylaws, copies of which will be shared with members.

---

Special Education Advisory Committee, Report No. 18, January 17, 2011

(b) Communications Subcommittee

Clovis Grant reported that the SEAC parent brochure has been completed and fifty copies distributed to principals in all TDSB schools. The brochure has been posted with translations on the SEAC web site. Extra copies were distributed to member associations. The communications subcommittee was invited to develop a communication plan for subsequent years.

(c) Guidelines on Accessible Education and Equity Subcommittee

Richard Carter spoke at the Equity Community Form on December 11, 2010 re Customer Service of the Toronto District School Board to its clients. He expressed disappointment that there was not a focus to a great degree on Special Education at the event.

## 7. Correspondence

Various communications, including e-mails, were received by the Committee. Margo Ratsep spoke to the protocol re the handling of correspondence, a copy of which will be shared with the Chair. SEAC received the correspondence.

## 8. Senior Superintendent's Report

The senior superintendent presented a report to the Committee (see SEAC:010B, page 8).

## 9. Central Coordinating Principal's Report

The central coordinating principal presented a report to the Committee (see SEAC:010B, page 13). Every member received a copy of the Temple Grandin DVD referenced in the report.

## 10. Professional Support Services Report

The manager of Professional Support Services presented a report to the Committee (see SEAC:010B, page 15).

## 11. Local SEAC Association Reports

- (a) Autism Society of Ontario (Toronto Chapter): Ginny Pearce reported that Autism Ontario, in partnership with the Toronto District School Board and the Toronto Catholic District School Board will present a free tax seminar for families with exceptional children on February 17, 2010. Flyers were distributed to members.
- (b) Community Living Toronto: Clovis Grant circulated complimentary copies of the book, *Safe and Secure: Six Steps to Creating a Good Life for People with Disabilities* by Al Et-manski with Jack Collins and Vickie Cammack. The Law Foundation of Ontario and PLAN Toronto provided the books.
- (c) Brain Injury Society of Toronto: Dr. Gates reported that the web listing for the Brain Injury Society of Toronto is [www.bist.ca](http://www.bist.ca).

Paul Cross  
Chair of the Committee

Received March 9, 2011 (see page 6)

---

Stewardship of Fine Art Workgroup, Report No. 1, January 5, 2011

## **Stewardship of Fine Art Workgroup**

### **Report No. 1, January 5, 2011**

A meeting of the Stewardship of Fine Art Workgroup was convened on Wednesday, January 5, 2011, from 4 to 5:02 p.m., in Committee Room A, 5050 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario, with John Hastings presiding.

In attendance were: Trustees Sheila Cary-Meagher, Gerri Gershon, Pamela Gough and John Hastings. Also present was Trustees Chris Bolton.

The Committee decided to report and recommend as follows:

<u>Part A: Committee Recommendations</u>
--

No matters to report

<u>Part B: Information Only</u>
---------------------------------

#### **1. Election of Committee Chair**

The Committee elected Trustee Hastings to serve as Chair of the Committee.

#### **2. Grant Applications and Negotiations With the Art Gallery of Ontario: Update**

The consultants from the Capital Asset Management Group provided an oral update on the status of grant applications that have been submitted. They also informed the meeting that a grant of \$14,000 has been received for repairs to the Malvern War Memorial.

The Director will be meeting with Matthew Teitelbaum, Director and CEO, Art Gallery of Ontario, with regard to a partnership between the AGO and the TDSB to exhibit the Board's fine art collection.

<u>Part C: Ongoing Matters</u>
--------------------------------

No matters to report.

John Hastings  
Chair of the Committee

**Received March 9, 2011 (see page 6)**